

mended, it was an antiseptic within the meaning of the law; whereas it was not an antiseptic within such meaning, and it did not purport to be and was not represented as an antiseptic for inhibitory use as a wet dressing, ointment, dusting powder, or such other use as involves prolonged contact with the body.

On November 4, 1941, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

631. Misbranding of dextrose in physiologic sodium chloride solution. U. S. v. 7 Cases of Dextrose. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4818. Sample No. 49411-E.)

This product, which was intended for intravenous injection, was found to contain lead.

On May 24, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana filed a libel against 7 cases of the above-named product at New Orleans, La., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about March 6 and April 19, 1941, by Hospital Liquids, Inc., from Chicago, Ill.; and charging that it was misbranded in that the statement "Dextrose 5 percent in Physiologic Sodium Chloride Solution Sterile and Non-Pyrogenic" was false and misleading since the label failed to reveal that the article contained lead and was unsuitable for intravenous injection.

On July 8, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

632. Misbranding of Bleything Concentrated Vegetable Compounds. U. S. v. 34 Packages of Concentrated Vegetable Compound Bleything Formula No. 201-A and 22 Packages of Concentrated Vegetable Compound Bleything Formula No. 201-B. Decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5468. Sample Nos. 65836-E, 65837-E.)

On August 29, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado filed a libel against the above-named products at Denver, Colo., which had been consigned by Bleything Laboratories, alleging that the articles had been shipped on or about January 4 and May 4, 1941, from Los Angeles, Calif.; and charging that they were misbranded.

Examination of samples of the articles showed that Formula No. 201-A consisted of tablets weighing approximately 8 grains each, which contained dried plant material yielding less than 1 grain of total mineral constituents; and that Formula No. 201-B consisted of tablets weighing approximately 8 grains each, which contained dried plant material yielding less than 1½ grains of total mineral constituents.

The articles were alleged to be misbranded in that designations in the labeling which constituted devices implying that Formula No. 201-A would supply something which would combat excessive acidity and acidosis; and that Formula No. 201-B would supply minerals which ward off alkalinity and alkalosis, were false and misleading since the articles could not be relied upon by physicians and were not effective for such purposes.

They were also alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in F. N. J. No. 3424.

On October 17, 1941, Bleything Laboratories having signed an acceptance of service and authorization for taking of final decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

633. Misbranding of Earles Vital Vim. U. S. v. 8 Cases of Wheat Germ. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. F. D. C. No. 4770. Sample No. 47271-E.)

On May 19, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against 8 cases, each containing 24 18-ounce packages, of a product labeled "Earles Vital Vim * * * Pure Wheat Germ" at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by W. H. Earles Co. on or about April 25, 1941; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it was essentially wheat germ as labeled.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented that it was efficacious to restore and maintain health and vigor; that it would be efficacious in the prevention and treatment of overweight, underweight, fatigue, colitis, constipation, neuritis, arthritis, stomach troubles, indigestion, high blood pressure, hardening of the arteries, and sleeplessness; that it would be efficacious to strengthen the digestive organs, assist intestinal activity, and bring about good digestion and proper assimilation; and that it

would be efficacious to soothe the nerves and improve the circulation, tone the arteries, invigorate the heart muscles and normalize blood pressure; and ward off or prevent common colds or grip, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

The article was alleged to be misbranded also under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in F. N. J. No. 2994.

On October 1, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

634. Misbranding of Effervescent Kruschen Salts. U. S. v. 21 Dozen Packages of Effervescent Kruschen. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5214. Sample No. 42575-E.)

On July 25, 1941, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 21 dozen 5-ounce packages of Effervescent Kruschen Salts at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 23, 1941, by the Johnstone Drug Sales Corporation from Rochester, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of anhydrous Epsom salt, (18.7 percent), with small proportions of common salt (sodium chloride), potassium chloride, sodium sulfate, potassium sulfate, sodium bicarbonate, and citric acid.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in an accompanying circular which created the impression that it constituted an effective agent for reducing weight, that it had a stimulating effect on the liver and bowels, and that it acted as a mild diuretic, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On November 19, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

635. Misbranding of Joint-Ease. U. S. v. 29 Tubes and 11 Tubes of Joint-Ease (and 1 other seizure of Joint-Ease). Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 6002, 6303. Sample Nos. 59034-E, 59035-E, 87120-E, 87121-E.)

On October 8 and November 28, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia filed libels against 125 1-ounce tubes and 56 2½-ounce tubes of Joint-Ease at Washington, D. C., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce within the period from on or about July 7 to on or about October 23, 1940, by Pope Laboratories from Hallowell, Maine; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article showed that it consisted essentially of salicylic acid and volatile oils including eucalyptol, camphor, menthol, methyl salicylate, and turpentine oil incorporated in petrolatum.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that various statements in the labeling and the designs showing portions of the human anatomy, which represented that it would be efficacious in the treatment of joint diseases, would ease joints, relieve minor joint aches and pains, muscular lameness, strained muscles, stiff neck, and all surface muscular aches and pains, also aches and pains affecting the neck, shoulders, elbows, fingers, knees, and feet, and that it would provide a competent treatment for irritations or miseries due to common colds in nose, throat, and chest, were false and misleading, since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On October 29 and December 22, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

636. Misbranding of papaya syrup. U. S. v. 243 Dozen Bottles and 46 Dozen Bottles of Tropical's Original Papaya Syrup. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond to be relabeled. (F. D. C. No. 4857. Sample No. 62052-E.)

On June 10, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against 289 dozen bottles of papaya syrup at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about February 25, 1941, by Tropical Fruit Products from St. Louis, Mo.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article, which was an opaque, yellow, syrupy liquid, showed that it consisted essentially of sugars, fruit acids, and orange and lemon oils, with the flavor of papaya. No active papain nor other proteolytic enzymes were found.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it would supply energy food which could be easily absorbed; that it would