

effective as a preventive in epidemics; effective as a remedy and treatment for diseases no matter how serious; effective to insure long life and immunity against pains and afflictions; effective as a rapid and steady remedy in acute cases and as a cure in chronic diseases; and effective as a tissue builder.

On February 3, 1934, pleas of guilty were entered and the court imposed a fine of \$100 against each defendant.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22197. Adulteration and misbranding of drug tablets. U. S. v. 15,800 Cold Tablets. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 31537. Sample no. 42736-A.)

These tablets were shipped in response to an order for tablets containing, among other ingredients, 1 grain of acetanilid and 0.625 grain of quinine sulphate. Analysis showed that the tablets contained less acetanilid and quinine sulphate than ordered. The container failed to bear a declaration of the acetanilid.

On November 2, 1933, the United States attorney for the Western District of Oklahoma, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 15,800 drug tablets at Oklahoma City, Okla., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about January 20, 1933, by Strong, Cobb & Co., Inc., from Cleveland, Ohio, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that the tablets contained not more than 0.83 grain of acetanilid and not more than 0.56 grain of quinine sulphate each.

It was alleged in the libel that the tablets were adulterated in that their strength fell below the professed standard under which they were sold, namely, acetanilid 1 grain, quinine sulphate 0.625 grain.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the containers failed to bear a statement on the label of the quantity or proportion of acetanilid contained in each tablet.

On February 2, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22198. Adulteration and misbranding of Petro-Iodo. U. S. v. 14 Bottles of Petro-Iodo. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 31759. Sample no. 46447-A.)

Examination of a sample of Pedro-Iodo showed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling. Tests of the article showed that it would not act as an antiseptic when used as directed.

On December 21, 1933, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Alabama, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 14 bottles of Petro-Iodo at Montgomery, Ala., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about August 30, 1933, by the White Specific Toilet Co., from Nashville, Tenn., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "White's Specific Laboratories."

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that it consisted essentially of 0.05 percent of iodine dissolved in mineral oil. Bacteriological examination showed that the article would not be an antiseptic for internal use.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that its strength fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, viz, "internal antiseptic."

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements on the carton and wrapper, "Internal Antiseptic Oil, * * * clears the intestinal canal of many of the dangerous germs of colds, colitis, appendicitis and typhoid", were false and misleading. The libel further alleged that the article was falsely and fraudulently labeled with respect to its effects in the treatment and prevention of various disease conditions, including ulcerations of the stomach and intestines, colitis, appendicitis, typhoid, cancer of the stomach, constipation, autointoxication, soreness of the bowels, high blood pressure, low blood pressure, enlarged liver, epilepsy, heart trouble, and sore mouth.

On January 10, 1934, the allegations of the libel having been admitted by White's Specific Laboratories, the manufacturer of the product, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22199. Misbranding of Santay-Swiss Anti-Diabetic Tea, Nutro-Links No. 5, Nutro-Links No. 6, and Nutro-Links No. 6 Tablets. U. S. v. 60 Packages of Santay-Swiss Anti-Diabetic Tea, et al. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. nos. 31792 to 31795, incl. Sample nos. 57982-A to 57985-A, incl.)

Examination of the drug products involved in these cases disclosed that the articles contained no ingredients or combinations of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling.

On December 29, 1933, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court libels praying seizure and condemnation of 69 packages of Santay-Swiss Anti-Diabetic Tea, 45 packages of Nutro-Links No. 5, 40 packages of Nutro-Links No. 6, and 71 packages of Nutro-Links No. 6 Tablets at Boston, Mass., alleging that the articles had been shipped in interstate commerce, between September 7 and December 4, 1933, by the Modern Health Products, Inc., from Milwaukee, Wis., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analyses of samples of the articles by this Department showed that the Santay-Swiss Anti-Diabetic Tea consisted of a mixture of plant drugs including peppermint leaves and stems, malva flowers, senna pods, and dog grass; that the Nutro-Links Formula No. 5 consisted of powdered plant material, sodium chloride, and sodium sulphate; that the Nutro-Links Formula No. 6 consisted of powdered plant material, sodium chloride, and sodium sulphate; and that the Nutro-Links No. 6 Tablets consisted essentially of ground plant material, sodium chloride, and sodium sulphate.

It was alleged in the libels covering the first three above-described products that they were misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the labelings were false and fraudulent: (Santay-Swiss Anti-Diabetic Tea) "Health * * * Health Products * * * Anti-Diabetic Tea * * * Modern Health Products * * * Health"; (Nutro-Links No. 5) "The Anti-Diabetic Food * * * Health * * * For Best Results"; (Nutro-Links No. 6) "Anti-Arthritic and Anti-Rheumatic Elements * * * Health * * * For Best Results * * * Health." Misbranding was alleged in the libel covering the Nutro-Links No. 6 Tablets in that the article was falsely and fraudulently labeled with respect to its effects in the treatment of arthritic and rheumatic conditions, uric acid deposits and the "lame" diseases, and in effect, as a vital accessory food and aid to health, remedying the cause of disease and correcting nutritional deficiencies evidenced by the aches, pains, and trials of early, middle, and later life by maintaining the 16 body elements in the proportions ordained by nature.

On February 19, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the products be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22200. Misbranding of Reducine. U. S. v. 5 Cans of Reducine. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 31892. Sample no. 33300-A.)

Examination of a sample of Reducine showed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling.

On January 27, 1934, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of five cans of Reducine at Dallas, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 1 and November 30, 1933, by the Reducine Co., from Otsego, Mich., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that it consisted essentially of tar, potassium iodide (2.26 percent), an iron compound, and soap.