

It was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it would eliminate bacteria, guard against toxins and ptomaines, promote healing, provide healthy granulation with a minimum of scar tissue, keep lesions from becoming infected, and control hemorrhage; that it would prevent diphtheria and other infections, both external and internal; that it would be useful in surgery, obstetrics, and gynecology as an all purpose antiseptic, would be useful for sterilizing instruments, for intrauterine use after removal of retained placental tissue, postpartum infection, or after curettage; that it was an adequate medication in dentistry for toothache, pyorrhea, trench mouth, gingivitis, bad teeth, and ulcerations of the buccal cavity; that it was an appropriate treatment for diseases of the eye, ear, nose, and throat including tonsillitis, septic sore throat and diphtheria; for conditions of the gastro-intestinal tract such as stomach ulcers, colitis, diarrhea, dysentery, typhoid fever, amoebic dysentery; conditions of the genito-urinary tract such as cystitis, balanitis, gonorrhoea, chancroid, and syphilitic lesions; and for skin conditions including varicose ulcers, carbuncles, boils, burns, scalds, erysipelas, and athlete's foot, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On April 22, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

#### DRUGS FOR VETERINARY USE

**790. Misbranding of Security Roup and Cold Remedy for Poultry, Security Worm Powder, and Security Gas Colic Remedy. U. S. v. The Jersee Co., Inc. (Security Food Co.) and Fred J. McCann. Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$250. (F. D. C. No. 6425. Sample Nos. 43195-E, 43196-E, 49858-E, 57552-E.)**

The labeling of these veterinary products bore false and misleading representations regarding their curative and therapeutic efficacy and also failed to comply with certain other labeling requirements of the law.

On May 18, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota filed an information against the Jersee Co., Inc., doing business as the Security Food Co. at Minneapolis, Minn., and Fred J. McCann, president of Jersee Co., Inc., alleging shipment on or about February 22, March 17, and July 28, 1941, from the State of Minnesota into the States of Nebraska, Illinois, and Mississippi of quantities of the above-named drugs which were misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of Security Roup and Cold Remedy for Poultry showed that it consisted essentially of copper sulfate, potassium permanganate, and talc. It was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented that when used in conjunction with certain specified procedures and certain sanitary measures, it would be efficacious in the treatment of roup and cold in fowl and poultry, that it would prevent fowl and poultry from contracting cold and roup, and that another drug, Security Cholera Remedy, would be efficacious in the treatment or prevention of bowel troubles in fowl and poultry, were false and misleading since the articles would not be efficacious for such purposes. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the label failed to bear a statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count and in that it was fabricated from two or more ingredients and the label failed to bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient.

Analysis of the Security Cholera Remedy showed that it consisted essentially of potassium alum, ferrous sulfate, and talc. It was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented that it would be efficacious as a remedy for cholera in poultry; that it was a positive and quick relief for cholera, indigestion, dysentery, diarrhea, and all bowel troubles in poultry including chicks 1 or 2 months old and fowl over 2 months old; that it was a preventive against bowel irregularities in chicks and fowl; that when used in conjunction with certain specified procedures and certain sanitary measures it would be efficacious in the treatment of the said disease in fowl and poultry and that the use of another drug, Security Roup and Cold Remedy, would be efficacious in the treatment of roup and cold in fowl and poultry, were false and misleading since the articles would not be efficacious for such purposes. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the labeling failed to bear a statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count and in that it was fabricated from two or more ingredients and the label failed to bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient.

Analysis of the Security Worm Powder showed that it consisted essentially of sodium chloride, iron sulfate, sulfur, charcoal, and plant material including anise and areca nut. It was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented that it was the safest and surest remedy in existence

for worms, that every lamb has worms in its stomach at birth, that worms may be easily prevented by judicious use of the article, that it was a standard remedy for worms in horses, sheep, swine, and cattle and was recommended by leading farmers and breeders to be a cheap and practical remedy for worms, that when administered to horses, it would regulate the bowels, blood, and digestive organs, that it would save feed by expelling worms, grubs, and bots, that the presence of worms in animals is usually due to a diseased condition of the system, that it would expel small worms from the large bowels and round or giant worms (*Eustrongylus gigas*) from the kidneys, bladder, and intestines, that it would tend to invigorate the digestive organs and bowels, that if administered to horses in the absence of worm symptoms it would prevent worms and would prevent horses getting in poor condition, that it was a mild purge, was harmless to the digestive organs and would leave the horses in better condition than before such administration, that it would prevent development of a new group of worms in horses, that it contained no poison or powerful drugs, that it would tend to correct the system so that worms would not be apt to return, would improve the general appearance of horses; whereas it was not the safest and surest remedy in existence for worms, every lamb does not have worms in its stomach at birth, it was not a standard remedy for worms in horses, sheep, swine, and cattle, and was not a cheap and practical remedy for worms, the presence of worms is not usually due to a diseased condition of the system, it was not harmless to the digestive system, would not leave horses in better condition than before such administration, it did contain poison or powerful drugs, it was not a mild purge, and would not be efficacious for the purposes for which it was recommended. It was alleged to be misbranded further (1) in that the label failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count; and (2) in that it was fabricated from two or more ingredients and the label failed to bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient.

Analysis of the Security Gas Colic Remedy showed that it consisted essentially of a hydroalcoholic solution containing volatile oils, ether, emodin-bearing plant material, sodium sulfite, and a trace of alkaloids. It was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented that it was entirely different from all other colic remedies, that the moment it entered the stomach of the animal it neutralized the gases and acids in the stomach caused by the fermentation of food; that after administration, relief was immediate on the same principle as a chemical fire extinguisher; that when it reached the stomach it immediately formed other gases which subdued and neutralized those already there and which had caused colic; that one bottle was sufficient to cure colic in horses, mules, and cattle; that it would be efficacious in the cure, mitigation, treatment, and prevention of cases of kidney, wind or spasmodic colic, grippe, flatulent or acute indigestion; that it would be efficacious in the treatment of engorgement colic, obstruction colic, worm colic, flatulent colic, and spasmodic or cramp colic, and was a positive remedy for alfalfa or lucerne bloat; that it was a "security" remedy and was insurance against all forms of colic in horses, mules, and cattle, were false and misleading since it was not entirely different from other colic remedies and would not be efficacious for the purposes recommended. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the label failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count, and in that its label failed to bear a declaration of the common or usual name of each active ingredient.

On May 18, 1942, pleas of guilty having been entered on behalf of the defendants, the court imposed a fine of \$250. as a general sentence on all counts for both defendants.

**791. Misbranding of Security Gas Colic Remedy. U. S. v. 5 Cases and 1 Case of Security Gas Colic Remedy. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6099. Sample No. 49858-E.)**

The labeling of this veterinary product bore false and misleading therapeutic claims and also failed to contain a statement of the quantity of the contents and a list of the active ingredients.

On November 13, 1941, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi filed a libel against 6 cases containing a total of 26 bottles of Security Gas Colic Remedy at Bolton, Miss., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 28, 1941, by the Security Food Co. from Minneapolis, Minn.; and charging that it was misbranded.