

might cause serious blood disturbances, anemia, collapse, or dependence on the drug.

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that it was dangerous to health when used in the dosage, or with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling; in that the labeling failed to bear a statement of the common or usual names of the active ingredients, including the quantity of acetanilid since the declaration of the quantity of acetanilid was incorrect; and in that its labeling failed to bear adequate directions for use and adequate warnings for the protection of users.

On June 29, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

147. Misbranding of Nervease Headache Powders. U. S. v. 99 Packages of Nervease Headache Powders. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 521. Sample No. 69457-D.)

These powders contained acetanilid and caffeine. They would be dangerous to health when used in the dosage, or with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling. Moreover, their labeling bore false and misleading representations regarding their efficacy in the conditions indicated below.

On August 30, 1939, the United States attorney for the District of Maine filed a libel against 99 packages of Nervease Headache Powders at Bangor, Maine, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about March 27, 1939, by the Nervease Co. from Boston, Mass.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that each powder contained 4.6 grains of acetanilid and 0.87 grains of caffeine together with milk sugar and pink coloring.

Misbranding was alleged in that the labeling bore representations that the product was a nervease headache powder, that it had been in use all over this country for 45 years, and that during that time many hundreds of testimonials had been received from people who had been benefited by its use; that it did not contain any opiates or cathartic drugs, that each powder contained $4\frac{1}{2}$ grains of acetanilid combined with other drugs for the relief of pain—especially headache, that it had been found to be a valuable remedy for the relief of pain and discomfort that ladies suffer from at certain periods and that one powder should be taken 2 or 3 times a day for that purpose, that it was an efficient remedy for colds and should be taken in the dosage of one powder every 4 hours for that purpose, that one powder should be taken for headache and that if pain had not disappeared in 30 minutes another powder should be taken; that in most cases of headache one powder would give relief in from 5 to 15 minutes; that if the second powder did not give relief it would indicate that the pain proceeded from some cause that the powder would not remove, and that it would be advisable to try a Rochelle powder and to wait for at least 2 or 3 hours before taking a third powder; which representations were false and misleading since the article was not efficacious for the purposes so recommended. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that it was dangerous to health when used in the dosage, or with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling.

On September 28, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

VAPORIZING DEVICES

148. Misbranding of Hexadrin. U. S. v. 25 Packages of Hexadrin. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 1602. Sample No. 75142-D.)

This device consisted of a glass tube so shaped as to permit its being fitted into the nostril, and to which was attached a rubber tube fitted with a mouthpiece. The glass tube contained a roll of cotton saturated with an oily medication. The user by blowing into the mouthpiece forced the medicated vapor into the nasal passages. The device would be dangerous to health when used in the dosage, or with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling, which bore directions that the tube be inserted in the nostril, that the mouthpiece be placed between the lips, and that the user blow, gently at first, gradually increasing the pressure until the effects could be felt deep in the nasal passages.

On March 7, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of North Dakota filed a libel against 25 packages of Hexadrin at Bismark, N. Dak.,

consigned about November 6, 1939, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce by the Murray Products Co. from San Francisco, Calif.; and charging that it was misbranded for the reasons appearing above.

On June 11, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

149. Misbranding of Nazoscope. U. S. v. 135 Packages of Nazoscope. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 199. Sample No. 40912-D.)

This device consisted of a vaporizing chamber (containing a wick) of such size and shape as to permit its fitting into the nostril and to which was attached a rubber tube fitted with a mouthpiece. An accessory medicament labeled "Nazone," which accompanied the article, consisted essentially of volatile oils (including spearmint oil), alcohol, and water. The device would be dangerous to health when used in the dosage and with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling, which contained directions that 10 to 15 drops of Nazone be placed on the wick, the appliance inserted into the nostril, that the glass mouthpiece on the end of the rubber tube be placed between the lips, and that the user blow gently, gradually increasing the pressure until the effects could be felt deep in the nasal passages.

On March 14, 1939, the United States attorney for the District of Utah filed a libel against 135 packages of Nazoscope at Salt Lake City, Utah, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 21, 1938, by the Murray Laboratories from Santa Monica, Calif.; and charging that it was misbranded.

On May 25, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

NIPPLE SHIELDS

Nos. 150 and 151 report the seizure and disposition of nipple shields which were made essentially of lead. They were potentially dangerous because lead poisoning might result in infants fed from the breasts of mothers using the device.

150. Misbranding of nipple shields. U. S. v. 71 Boxes of Dr. Wansbrough's Metallic Nipple Shields. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 1914. Sample No. 6973-E.)

On May 21, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of Montana filed a libel against 71 boxes of Dr. Wansbrough's Metallic Nipple Shields at Great Falls, Mont., alleging the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 1, 1936, by the Glasco Products Co. from Chicago, Ill.; and charging that it was misbranded.

The article, a device, was alleged to be misbranded in that the representations in the labeling that it was for the prevention and cure of sore nipples, that it should be applied as soon after delivery as possible, that in using it the only attention required was to wipe the nipple previously to nursing and apply immediately afterwards, and that it was in no way likely to be injurious to the infant, were false and misleading in that the said representations gave the impression that the device was a preventative and cure for sore nipples; whereas it was not a safe and appropriate remedy or cure for sore nipples but was a dangerous drug. The device was alleged to be misbranded further in that the labeling was misleading since it failed to reveal the facts, material in the light of the representations made therein, and material with respect to consequences which might result from the use of the device under the conditions of use prescribed in the labeling and under such conditions of use as are customary and usual, that the use of the device in accordance with the directions might cause fatal lead poisoning in infants fed from breasts of mothers using said device. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that it was dangerous to health when used with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, and suggested in the labeling thereof.

On July 25, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

151. Misbranding of nipple shields. U. S. v. 15 Boxes of Dr. Wansbrough's Metallic Nipple Shields. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 151. Sample No. 48920-D.)

On February 3, 1939, the United States attorney for the District of Rhode Island filed a libel against 15 boxes of the above-named article at Providence,