and harmful substances listed below: Alkaloids...None Narcotics...None Phenolic Substances...None Alcohols...None Veronal, Barbital, and similar compounds...None Metallic Poisons...None (Salts of lead, arsenic, antimony, mercury, tin, bismuth and barium) Di-nitrophenol...None Plant Tissues...None (Pokeweed, bladder wrack, etc.) Thyroid Extract...None,'" were false and misleading since they gave the impression that the article contained no deleterious substances. (3) In that statements in the booklet entitled "How I Reduced," representing that its use would "Do Away With Excess Weight," relieve constipation, that reduction of weight gained by its use usually was permanent; that it would remove heaviness in body, take away that bloated, sluggish feeling; would enable the user to get up full of vim, vigor, and vitality; and that it would relieve gas and acids, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On April 17, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

448. Misbranding of mineral oil. U. S. v. 1,122 Bottles of Mineral Oil. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond for relabeling. (F. D. C. No. 4859. Sample Nos. 56418-E, 56419-E.)

This product was light mineral oil and not heavy mineral oil as suggested by its labeling. Moreover, its labeling failed to bear such warnings as are necessary for the protection of users.

On June 2, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of New York filed a libel against 1,122 bottles of mineral oil at Brooklyn, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce within the period from on or about March 9 to on or about May 3, 1940, by Purex Products, Inc., from Boston, Mass.; and charging that it was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "PuRex Russian Mineral Oil Light."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the designation "Russian Mineral Oil" (in comparatively large type) and the word "Light" (in comparatively small type) borne on the label were misleading, since the term "Russian Mineral Oil" is associated in the minds of purchasers with an oil having a kinematic viscosity, which is substantially higher than that of the article.

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its labeling failed to bear adequate warnings against unsafe methods of administration in such manner and form as are necessary for the protection of users, since the labeling carried no warning against its administration directly before or after meals.

On June 24, 1941, Purex Products, Inc., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond conditioned that it be relabeled to comply with the law.

449. Adulteration and misbranding of solution of citrate of magnesia. U. S. v. 137 Bottles of Solution of Citrate of Magnesia. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3402. Sample No. 20499-E.)

This product contained less magnesium citrate and less citric acid than the amounts required by the United States Pharmacopoeia. Its labeling also failed to bear a statement of the quantity of the contents or a warning against its use in those pathological conditions where its use might be dangerous to health.

On November 23, 1940, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia filed a libel against 137 bottles of the above-named product at Augusta, Ga., alleging that it had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 10, 1940, by the McMillan Drug Co. from Columbia, S. C.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be or was represented as a drug, the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, and its strength differed from the standard set forth therein.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that it was a drug in package form and the label failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of contents; and in that the labeling failed to bear adequate warnings against use in those pathological conditions where its use might be dangerous to health as might be necessary for the protection of users.

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