

that the stomach is out of order. One-half to a tablespoonful is usually sufficient. Then take from one to two or even more teaspoonfuls After Meals. As a Tonic take enough After Each Meal to insure one or two full, free, actions of the bowels daily. Dyspeptics should take a large dose, two or more teaspoonfuls, after eating a hearty meal or something which is hard to digest. * * * Sick Headache—When the attack is coming on take several teaspoonful doses one hour apart.”

On May 18, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

24675. Adulteration and misbranding of Watkins Veterinary Balm. U. S. v. 39¾ Dozen Cans of Watkins Veterinary Balm. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35279. Sample no. 12122-B.)

This case involved a drug preparation the labeling of which contained unwarranted curative, therapeutic, antiseptic, and germicidal claims.

On March 23, 1935, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 39¾ dozen cans of Watkins Veterinary Balm at Oakland, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce in various shipments between the dates of November 10, 1934, and January 4, 1935, by the J. R. Watkins Co., from Winona, Minn., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of petrolatum containing a small amount of methyl salicylate. Bacteriological tests showed that it was neither antiseptic nor germicidal.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, namely, “Germicidal Salve * * * Antiseptic dressing.”

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the following statements appearing on the label were false and misleading: “Germicidal Salve * * * It contains a powerful antiseptic which is more highly effective in killing than carbolic acid (phenol) * * * an antiseptic dressing.” Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the following statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article were false and fraudulent: “Inflammation, and congestion of the udders of cows, sows and ewes. * * * for the relief of certain simple disorders peculiar to the udders of cows, sows and ewes, such as hardness, inflammation and congestion. * * * It is helpful in preventing and checking Cow Pox * * * It is valuable for open cuts, galls and sore shoulders in horses. * * * for * * * sores * * * For Cow Pox: Apply to teats before milking. Repeat until healed. * * * In extreme cases * * * Apply Veterinary Balm over affected parts * * * Repeat several times daily according to the seriousness of the trouble. * * * Sores * * * In serious cases * * * Repeat several times daily according to the seriousness of the trouble.”

On April 10, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

24676. Misbranding of Bleachodent Liquid and Bleachodent Paste. U. S. v. 105 Dozen Packages of Bleachodent Liquid and Bleachodent Paste. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35282. Sample no. 28910-B.)

This case involved drug preparations the labeling of which contained unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims.

On March 21, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 105 dozen packages, each containing one bottle of Bleachodent Liquid and one trial-sized tube of Bleachodent Paste, at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 27, 1934, by the Hygienic Pharmacal Laboratories, from New Haven, Conn., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. Certain of the packages were labeled in part: “Manufactured by Bleachodent Dental Laboratories, Inc., New York London Toronto.” Certain others were labeled in part: “Distributed by Bleachodent Dental Laboratories, Inc., New York London Toronto.”