

bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient since the statement on the jar labels and the individual carton labels, "Contains: Stramonium Alk. .05%, Oil of Sassafras, Elder Flowers, Bayberry, Rosin, Beeswax, in a Suitable Base," was not a statement of the active ingredients.

On February 27, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**687. Misbranding of Savol and Savol Cream. U. S. v. 2 $\frac{1}{8}$  Dozen Packages of Savol and 2 $\frac{1}{8}$  Dozen Packages of Savol Cream. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 5901, 5902. Sample Nos. 64167-E, 64168-E.)**

The labels of both of these products, in addition to bearing false and misleading claims, failed to bear the required ingredient and accurate quantity of contents statements. Furthermore, the cartons containing the bottles of Savol were unnecessarily large.

On September 29, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio filed libels against the above-named products at Youngstown, Ohio, alleging that they had been shipped within the period from on or about June 23 to on or about August 13, 1941, by the Savol Chemical Co. from Mercer, Pa.; and charging that they were misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the articles showed that Savol consisted essentially of cresols, alkali soaps and water; and that the Savol Cream consisted essentially of zinc oxide, barium sulfate, petrolatum, and perfume materials.

The Savol was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that statements in the labeling which represented that it would be efficacious to protect against and prevent serious infection; that it would be efficacious in the treatment of bites of animals, open sores, irritation of the throat or nasal passages arising from catarrh, hay fever, or kindred ills; that it would minimize the possibility of infected sores, abscesses, boils, felons, and all complications due to infections, and that it would always be helpful and often curative, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes; and (2) in that its container was so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

The Savol Cream was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented that it was an antiseptic and would be efficacious in the treatment of cuts, boils, felons, sores, ulcers, itching and all forms of piles, eczema, skin affections in general, and bites of animals; that it would be efficacious for the after treatment of carbuncles and erysipelas and in the treatment of sore throat, croup, and enlarged glands when used on the neck, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

Both products were alleged to be misbranded (1) in that their labels failed to bear the common or usual names of the active ingredients; and (2) in that their labels failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of contents.

On November 26, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**688. Misbranding of Waft-Surgical. U. S. v. 11 Gallon Bottles of Waft-Surgical. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5810. Sample No. 49661-E.)**

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading antiseptic and therapeutic claims and also failed to bear the common or usual names of the active ingredients.

On September 22, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas filed a libel against the above-named product at Rusk, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce from Springfield, Ill.; a portion on or about April 20, 1940, by Waft Products, Inc., and the remainder on or about June 13, 1941, by the Federal Cosmetic Sales Corporation; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of water and formaldehyde, with small amounts of terpineol and a yellow-green coloring material.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it had a phenol coefficient of 70, that it would be efficacious as an antiseptic, disinfectant, fungicide, germicide, parasiticide, in the dilutions suggested; that it would be of value as a wet dressing or application on wounds in the dilutions suggested; that it would inhibit disease producing micro-organisms and would be efficacious for sterilization of surgical instruments; that it would be efficacious for general prophylactic treatment; that it would be efficacious in the treatment of wounds and infections, would neutralize fetid odors; would control obnoxious odors incident to tissue breakdown due to cancer, gangrene, "infected amputations," pus drainage, fistulae, urinary fecal, etc.; that when used as a wet dress-

ing it would trap emanating odors; that it was efficacious as a douche for cancer and infections of the cervix and vagina; that because of its high phenol coefficient it might be diluted 300 to 400 times and still retain its antiseptic properties; and that it would be efficacious as a safeguard against fungi and "parasitical infections" of animals, were false and misleading, since its phenol coefficient was less than 1 and it would not be efficacious for the purposes claimed. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its label did not contain the common or usual names of the active ingredients.

On October 25, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**689. Misbranding of Lash's Bitters. U. S. v. 28 Bottles of Lash's Bitters. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6772. Sample No. 85438-E.)**

On January 31, 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 October 27, 1941, by Lash, Inc., from Anaheim, Calif.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it was essentially a water-alcohol extract of laxative plant drugs such as cascara sagrada and senna.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that statements on the label which represented that it was a regulator, that it would exert a beneficial influence upon the digestive organs, that it was an adequate remedy for indigestion, headaches, and loss of appetite arising from imperfect digestion, and that its use as an adequate treatment for chronic constipation were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the following statements were false and misleading since frequent or continued use would be likely to result in a state of dependence upon laxatives to move the bowels: "The system does not become habituated to its use. Its properties do not cause the harsh after effects which may accompany cathartics."

On March 25, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**690. Misbranding of Todd's Capsules. U. S. v. 28 Packages and 11 Packages of Todd's Capsules. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6307. Sample Nos. 79317-E, 79328-E.)**

On December 1, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio filed a libel against 28 packages each containing 6 yellow boxes of 50 capsules each; and 11 packages each containing 1 orange box, 2 green boxes, and 3 yellow boxes of 50 capsules each, at Canton, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped within the period from on or about August 16 to on or about November 21, 1941, by J. E. Todd, Inc., from Kenmore, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination of samples of the article showed that the capsules consisted essentially of magnesium oxide (approximately 0.16 grains), calcium carbonate (approximately 2 grains), sodium bicarbonate varying in the different colored boxes from 2.1 to 3.8 grains, a gum resin such as olibanum, small proportions of an iron compound and sulfur, and sand varying from 2.5 to 4.3 grains per capsule.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements on the label, "For relief of conditions of excessive acidity in the human body and the gradual alleviation in that way of aches and pains that may be symptoms of or associated with those conditions, which symptoms may be popularly referred to as 'rheumatic' \* \* \* Caution: No immediate relief may be expected from these capsules and they should be allowed a reasonable time, according to particular conditions in each indicated case, for the best possible results," were false and misleading since it was not an adequate treatment for conditions and symptoms popularly referred to as "Rheumatic" and would not effect relief from such conditions after a reasonable, or after any other, time.

On February 26, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**691. Misbranding of Hi-V Vitamins capsules. U. S. v. 48 Dozen and 24 Dozen Cartons of Hi-V Vitamins. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond to be relabeled. (F. D. C. No. 6927. Sample No. 87506-E.)**

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading claims regarding its efficacy to restore and maintain health and prevent or correct disease conditions, and represented that it contained all the vitamins essential in normal nutrition;