

save many dollars already invested in chicks and feed; that special care should be taken during treatment that no other source of drinking water be available as this would reduce the amount of the drug the birds would drink and best results would not be obtained; that one tablespoonful of the product to each gallon of drinking water should be given 2 or 3 days each week as a preventative; that where coccidiosis is suspected or active one or two ounces of the product to each gallon of drinking water should be administered until all symptoms of disease are gone; that then directions for prevention should be followed to help avoid a reinfestation; that where coccidiosis in chronic form is suspected 1 ounce of the product should be used to each gallon of drinking water, 2 or 3 days each week and that for turkeys the same proportion should be used as for chickens, which representations were false and misleading since the article was not efficacious for the purposes so recommended.

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

211. Misbranding of Luseaux Duo-Purpose Flock Treatment and Luseaux Duo-Purpose Tablets. U. S. v. 9 Packages and 14 Packages of Luseaux Duo-Purpose Flock Treatment, et al. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 462, 463, 464. Sample Nos. 57071-D, 57072-D, 64420-D.)

The labeling of these products bore false and misleading representations regarding their efficacy in the conditions indicated hereinafter.

On August 22, 1939, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington filed a libel against 82 packages of the above-named products at Bothell, Wash., alleging that the articles had been shipped in interstate commerce by Luseaux Laboratories in part on or about November 25, 1938, from Los Angeles, Calif., and in part on or about May 10, 1939, from Gardena, Calif.; and charging that they were misbranded.

Analysis showed that the articles were of substantially the same composition and consisted essentially of nicotine alkaloid, copper oxide, copper carbonate, and kamala, with inert ingredients.

The articles were alleged to be misbranded in that representations that they were efficacious as treatments for common tapeworms, were efficacious for the treatment and control of both tapeworms and roundworms in poultry, that tapeworm control is not as easy as giving a single treatment, that regular and systematic combating is imperative when tapeworms are known to infest birds, their houses, and runs and that portion of the design consisting of segmented tapeworms, appearing in the labeling of both products and the representation that it is impossible with a single treatment to dislodge all attached tapeworm heads in the labeling of the Flock Treatment, were false and misleading.

On March 25, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

212. Misbranding of Pratt's Hog Powder. U. S. v. Forty-six 3-Pound Packages and Thirty-four 7-Pound Packages of Pratt's Hog Powder. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 1364. Sample No. 78453-D.)

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy in the conditions indicated below.

On or about January 20, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Virginia filed a libel against the above-named quantities of Pratt's Hog Powder at Harrisonburg, Va., consigned by the Pratt Food Co., Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 1, 1939, from Philadelphia, Pa.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of dried sodium sulfate (dried Glauber's salt, approximately 62 percent), bone meal, charcoal (approximately 10 percent), sulfur (approximately 9.5 percent), small proportions of American wormseed, a trace of quassia; iron sulfate (approximately 2.3 percent), and small amounts of copper, manganese, and iodine compounds. In addition, the product in the 3-pound packages contained traces (less than 0.001 percent each) of nickel and cobalt compounds.

Misbranding was alleged in that the package bore representations that the article should be used in the treatment of worms twice a month by forced feeding and that it would help expel many large roundworms, which representations were false and misleading in that the article would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On March 25, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.