

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements appearing on the display card accompanying the article, "Vitamins For Vitality Improve your health! . . . Take the drudgery out of work . . . Put more pep in your play . . . Reduce colds . . . Cut down fatigue . . . Improve appetite and digestion . . . Build nervous stability . . . Prevent impaired eyesight due to Vitamin deficiencies . . . Build up your blood count . . . Prevent dental cavities, bleeding gums, due to deficiencies of Vitamins D, C, and Calcium," were false and misleading since such statements represented and suggested that the article would be effective for the purposes and conditions stated and implied, whereas it would not be so effective.

The article was also alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of law applicable to foods as reported in the notices of judgment on foods.

On January 14, 1943, William T. Thompson Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

#### VETERINARY USE\*

**998. Misbranding of Mineralized Bloat Stock Salt. U. S. v. 15 Sacks and 10 Sacks of Mineralized Bloat Stock Salt. Default decree of condemnation. Product to be disposed of by destruction. (F. D. C. No. 9039. Sample No. 7381-F.)**

On January 6, 1943, the United States attorney for the District of South Dakota filed a libel against 15 50-pound sacks and 10 100-pound sacks of the above-named product at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 6, 1942, from Sioux City, Iowa, by H. L. Johnson & Co.; and charging that it was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Mineralized Bloat Stock Salt with Potassium Iodide."

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of salt and calcium carbonate with small amounts of sulfur, sodium bicarbonate, sodium and magnesium sulfates, iron oxide, potassium iodide, phosphate, anise, and fenugreek.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the reference to "Bloat" in the name of the article, and the directions for the prevention and treatment of bloat in livestock, appearing in its labeling, were false and misleading since such statements represented and suggested that the article was effective in the prevention and treatment of bloat in livestock, whereas it was not so effective.

On February 15, 1943, no claimant having appeared and the court having found that the product was misbranded and should be destroyed, judgment of condemnation was entered and the marshal was ordered to dispose of the product.

**999. Misbranding of Van-X Ointment. U. S. v. 8 Tubes and 38 Tubes of Van-X Ointment. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 8429. Sample No. 22489-F.)**

On or about September 29, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of Delaware filed a libel against 8 \$1.00-size and 38 \$.25-size tubes of Van-X Ointment at Wilmington, Del., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 18, 1942, from Philadelphia, Pa., by the Totus Manufacturing Co.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of the article showed that it consisted essentially of a vegetable gum, small amounts of salicylic acid, phenol, sulfur, zinc oxide, and 13.5 percent of alcohol.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statement appearing in its labeling: (Tube) "Relief for Itch, Eczema, Skin Irritations—For All Breeds of Dogs \* \* \* Apply to affected parts frequently until healed. In bad cases spread on sores and let dry. \* \* \* Alcoholic contents not over 5%," (carton) "For the Relief of Eczema, Itching, Scratching, and Skin Irritations. Also for mange, blotchy coats, falling hair \* \* \* injuries \* \* \* Stops itching immediately. \* \* \* Active Ingredients \* \* \* Alcoholic contents not over 5%," were false and misleading since the article would not be an effective relief for any known cause of eczema, itching, scratching, skin irritations, mange, blotchy coats, and all forms of injuries as was suggested and represented by such statements. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the statement in its labeling, "Alcoholic contents not over 5%," was false and misleading since the article contained 13.5 percent of alcohol.

An April 12, 1943, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

\*See also No. 961.