

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the tags affixed to the device and in the accompanying booklets and cards were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the device would be effective to loosen and stop baby's cough and make him sleep better and sleep all night; that it would aid in drying of sinus drippings which cause coughing, periodic spells of nausea, and the throwing up of mucus; that it would be effective in the treatment of colds, cough, bronchitis, asthma, laryngitis, chronic conditions of head, throat and chest, other respiratory ailments, whooping cough, croup, and coughing after measles; that it would be effective to restore mouth breathers to nose breathers, thereby stopping snoring, wheezing, and rattling; that it would overcome anoxia and anoxemia; that it would clear the breathing passages of sticky mucus, phlegm, and cellular matter; that it would dry up the mucus membranes of the head, throat, and chest, and promote easier breathing and sounder sleep; that it would be of value in tuberculosis to minimize coughing; that it would make the raising of phlegm easy and lessen the likelihood of hemorrhage; that it would prevent intestinal cholic in tuberculosis of the intestines; and that it would relieve body aches and pains, neuritis, neuralgia, arthritis, bursitis, sacro-iliac pain, and muscle spasm. The device would not be effective for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: October 30, 1946. Charles L. Doheney and James K. Heffernan, doing business as the Charles Doheney Co., having appeared as claimants and consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

2038. Misbranding of Sun-Kraft Health Lamps. U. S. v. 941 Sun-Kraft Health Lamps, and a quantity of printed matter. Decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. No. 18705. Sample No. 4387-H.)

LIBEL FILED: December 28, 1945, Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about August 28 and October 23, 1945, by Sun Kraft, Inc., from Chicago, Ill.

PRODUCT: 941 *Sun-Kraft Health Lamps* at Philadelphia, Pa.; also a number of leaflets entitled "Sun-Kraft Cold Quartz Ultraviolet Ray Therapy Lamp," a number of sales manuals entitled "Sun-Kraft Ultra Violet Generator," and a number of display cards entitled "Sun-Kraft Quartz Ultraviolet Ray Therapy Lamps." Attached to each lamp was an envelope containing an additional copy of the leaflet and a booklet entitled "How to Use Your Sun-Kraft."

Examination showed that the device consisted of a cold quartz type lamp mounted on a metal base which would emit ultraviolet radiations of a comparatively low intensity.

LABEL, IN PART: "Sun-Kraft Mercury Quartz Ultra Violet Health Lamp."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements and designs appearing in the labeling were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the device would be efficacious in the treatment of acne vulgaris, alopecia areata, anemia, angina pectoris, arthritis, asthma, birth marks (port wine), bronchial asthma, burns (X-ray), chilblains, cuts, eczema (dry or weeping), ecthyma, erysipelas, fractures, frost bite, high blood pressure, impetigo, loss of hair (following severe infections), lupus vulgaris, low metabolism, pityriasis rosea, polyarthritis, pruritus, psoriasis, pyoderma, rickets, sinus, tuberculosis of the skin, ulcers, varicose ulcer, "vaseykar" nevi, whooping cough, wounds (gun shot), sinus pains, rheumatism, lumbago, arthritis, neuritis, athlete's foot, ringworm, dandruff, lacerations, contusions and strains, hay fever, and catarrh and colds; that the article would kill bacteria, strengthen bones and teeth, stimulate circulation, relieve pains caused by respiratory ailments, prevent infections and contagious diseases, help the healing of stubborn wounds, clear up blemishes and pimples, induce quick healing and promote positive antiseptic action in treating cuts, wounds, and bruises, maintain a healthy complexion, prevent loss of hair and promote its growth, promote and preserve radiant health, build up resistance to disease, insure sturdy growth and sound development of babies and children, and sterilize rooms. The device was not capable of producing the benefits and results stated and implied.

DISPOSITION: January 18, 1946. W. A. Leiser and Co., Philadelphia, Pa., having appeared as claimant, judgment of condemnation was entered and the

product was ordered released under bond to be relabeled under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

DRUGS FOR VETERINARY USE

2039. Misbranding of C. C. C. Formula. U. S. v. Charles C. Craig (C. C. Remedy Co.). Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$100. (F. D. C. No. 20163. Sample Nos. 18687-H, 18694-H.)

INFORMATION FILED: August 13, 1946, Western District of Wisconsin, against Charles C. Craig, trading as the C. C. Remedy Co., at La Valle, Wis.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about May 5 and July 5, 1945, from the State of Wisconsin into the States of Minnesota and Iowa.

PRODUCT: One shipment of this product consisted essentially of water, formaldehyde, oil of wintergreen, and not more than 7.5 percent of sulfanilamide. The other shipment consisted essentially of mineral oil, formaldehyde, and not more than 9.2 percent of sulfanilamide or sulfathiazole.

LABEL, IN PART: "C. C. C. Formula * * * Sulphanilamide," "Triple C. C. C. Formula * * * Sulphanilamide, or Sulfathiazole."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label of the article and in circulars entitled "C. C. Remedy Company's Better Milk Program," accompanying a portion of the article, were false and misleading. The statements in the labeling represented and suggested that the article, when used as directed, would be efficacious in the treatment of garget and mastitis in milch cows, whereas the article would not be efficacious for such purpose. Further misbranding, Section 502 (a), the labeling was misleading since it represented and suggested that the article, when used as directed, contained a significant therapeutic dosage of a sulfonamide, whereas the article, when used as directed, did not contain a significant therapeutic dosage of a sulfonamide.

DISPOSITION: October 29, 1946. A plea of nolo contendere having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$50 on each of the 2 counts of the information.

2040. Misbranding of Chick D-W Tablets and Alkazing. U. S. v. Smithson Products Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200 and costs. (F. D. C. No. 17864. Sample Nos. 22161-H, 22162-H.)

INFORMATION FILED: May 7, 1946, Southern District of Illinois, against the Smithson Products Co., a partnership, Peoria, Ill.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: From the State of Illinois into the State of Missouri. The products were shipped on or about March 5 and May 10, 1945, and a number of accompanying circulars entitled, "Helps for Making More Money from Live-stock and Poultry," were shipped within the period from the latter part of 1944 to on or about May 21, 1945.

PRODUCT: Examination showed that the *Chick D-W Tablets* consisted of green compressed tablets containing, chiefly, copper sulfate, potassium alum, and small amounts of boric acid, siliceous excipient, and green color; and that the *Alkazing* consisted of a red powder containing, chiefly, sodium carbonate and sodium hydroxide, and small amounts of copper carbonate, cresol, and red color, with anise flavor and sweetened with saccharin.

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Chick D-W Tablets*, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label of the article, and certain statements and a picture of a dragon breathing fire, appearing in the circulars were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be effective as an intestinal astringent for poultry; that when used as directed the article would be effective in the prevention and treatment of bowel troubles of chicks and adult fowls; that it would be effective to guard against contagions; that it would help to stop the spread of certain intestinal contagions, such as coccidiosis, fowl cholera, and fowl typhoid; that it would be effective against intestinal disturbances, such as diarrhea and dysentery and pasting up behind in chicks; that it would be effective until all danger signs of diarrhea and dysentery were gone; that it would be effective to help save chicks; that it would be effective against the dread bacillary white diarrhea (*S. pullorum* infection), which may be spread through contaminated drinking water; that it would be effective to ward off certain intestinal diseases, and to help stop the spread of certain intestinal infections; that it would be effective to stop the spread of dysentery and diarrhea through drinking water, and to give