and tired and run-down conditions; were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On May 15, 1942, the defendants entered pleas of guilty and the court fined each one $200.

731. Misbranding of Renair Pomade. U. S. v. Frederick Godfrey (Adams Products Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, $300. (F. D. C. No. 4183. Sample No. 33157-E.)

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy as a treatment for baldness or thinning and falling hair.

On February 12, 1942, the United States attorney for the Northern District of New York filed an information against Frederick Godfrey, Adams, N. Y., alleging shipment, in the name of the Adams Products Co., on or about May 14, 1940, from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey of a quantity of Renair Pomade which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part as follows: (Jars) "Renair Pomade and Massage Stimulate the Scalp. * * * For Thinned Areas. * * * For Falling Hair."

Analysis showed that the article was an amber-colored ointment containing betanaphthol and volatile oils with cedar-like odor in small amount incorporated in a base consisting chiefly of petrolatum and a smaller amount of fatty material.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that its labeling bore representations that, when used alone or in conjunction with certain pulling, massaging, and kneading treatments recommended in the labeling, it would produce beneficial effects in the treatment of baldness, falling hair, and thinned hair, whereas it would not produce the beneficial effects claimed for it in the labeling, whether used alone or in conjunction with such treatments.

On April 20, 1942, the defendant entered a plea of guilty and the court imposed a fine of $300.

732. Misbranding of Betene. U. S. v. 350 Cans and 130 Cans of Betene. Decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond to be relabeled. (F. D. C. No. 6877. Sample No. 64672-E.)

On February 16, 1942, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania filed a libel (amended March 21, 1942) against 480 cans of Betene at Rochester, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 25, 1941, from Rochester, N. Y., by the L. H. Stewart Corporation; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of a mixture of dried skim milk, dried egg yolk, soya bean tissues, wheat bran, wheat germ, salt, agar agar, calcium phosphate, chondrus (Irish moss), and saccharin, flavored with cocoa, vanillin, and coumarin, together with certain added vitamin substances.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented and suggested that when consumed as directed, it would cause an increase in weight, would give vigor and vitality to the user and that it constituted a sure, sane, safe, and effective way to reduce, were false and misleading since its use would not accomplish such results.

It also was alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in F. N. J. No. 3840.

On May 21, 1942, the L. H. Stewart Corporation having appeared as claimant, and having admitted that the allegations of the libel were substantially correct, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it be relabeled under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

733. Misbranding of Camelline. U. S. v. 9 Dozen Bottles of Camelline. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6948. Sample No. 63431-E.)

On March 7, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon filed a libel against the above-named product at Portland, Oreg., alleging that it had been shipped on or about August 28, 1941, by Walter M. Willett from San Francisco, Calif.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article showed that it consisted essentially of calcium carbonate, bismuth, subcarbonate, alcohol, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements on the bottle label and in an accompanying circular suggesting and representing that it was efficacious in preventing tooth decay, freckles, sunburn, poison ivy, poison oak, and in relieving the irritation caused by poison oak and poison ivy, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.