9179. Misbranding of Cadomene Tablets. U. S. * * * v. 19 Packages of * * * Cadomene Tablets * * *. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 14211. Inv. No. 26338. S. No. E–3057.)

On January 18, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 19 packages of Cadomene Tablets, consigned on or about September 8 and October 28, 1920, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Blackburn Products Co., Dayton, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Maryland, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the tablets consisted essentially of zinc phosphid, strychnine, and iron salts.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the following statements were false and fraudulent since the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed for it: (Bottle label) "Invigorating * * * for the Treatment of * * * Neurasthenia (Nerve Exhaustion), General Debility, Melancholy, Dizziness, Heart Palpitation, Trembling Weakness, Waning Strength, Functional Irritation of the Urinary Tract, Languor and many other Symptoms due to * * * Worry, Grief, Intemperance, Dissipation, Overwork, Mal-Nutrition, Convalescence from Influenza, Etc.;" (circular) "* * * the benefits to be derived from their use, are such as to recommend them to all who may be afflicted with * * * Neurasthenia, Nervous Exhaustion, General Debility, Melancholy, Dizziness, Heart Palpitation, Trembling Weakness, Waning Strength, Functional Irritation of the Urinary Tract, Languor and many other symptoms due to * * * Worry, Grief, Intemperance, Dissipation, Mal-Nutrition, Overwork, Etc. * * * valuable for those who are despondent, nervous, irritable and unable to act naturally under the most ordinary circumstances. * * *."

On February 26, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. Ball, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9180. Misbranding of Prescription 1000 External and Prescription 1000 Internal. U. S. * * * v. 10 Bottles of Prescription 1000 External and 9 Bottles and 30 Bottles of Prescription 1000 Internal. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 10624, 10625. I. S. Nos. 13960–r, 13962–r. S. Nos. E–1541, E–1547.)

On or about June 18 and 23, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 10 bottles of Prescription 1000 External and 9 bottles and 30 bottles of Prescription 1000 Internal, at Troy and Schenectady, N. Y., alleging that the articles had been shipped on or about March 15 and May 16, 1919, by the Reese Chemical Co., Cleveland, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of New York, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The articles were labeled in part: "Prescription 1000 External * * * in obstinate cases of Gonorrhea or Gleet

* * *;" "Prescription 1000 Internal * * * Most Efficient Treatment For Gleet and Gonorrhœa * * * A Very Good Treatment For Bladder Troubles Frequent Urination Inflammation * * *"

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the Prescription 1000 External consisted of a dilute aqueous solution of potassium permanganate, and that the Prescription 1000 Internal consisted essentially of a slightly alkaline emulsion of balsam of copaiba flavored with methyl salicylate.

It was alleged in substance in the libels that the articles were misbranded for the reason that the above-quoted statements were false and untrue and were known to be so by the shippers aforesaid, and the contents of said bottles were not able to produce, nor did any of the bottles contain any ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing, the effects claimed for them in the printing aforesaid found upon the cartons and in the circulars accompanying the same, and said labeling, being false and untrue and fraudulent, was in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

On July 22, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the products be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9181. Adulteration and misbranding of Big G. U. S. * * * v. 88 Bottles of * * * Big G. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10657. I. S. No. 13961-r. S. No. E-1560.)

On or about June 21, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 88 bottles of Big G, at Troy, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about July 14, 1917, by the Evans Chemical Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Big G."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of a solution of borax and berberine. No hydrastine was present.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was adulterated for the reason that upon said cartons was printed in English, French, German, and Spanish certain words stating the contents to be a compound of borated goldenseal, whereas, in fact, the article did not contain and did not consist of a compound of borated goldenseal, and such statement was false and untrue, and the strength and purity of the article fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the labeling of the article alleged and declared it to contain a compound of borated goldenseal, whereas, in truth and in fact, it did not contain a compound of borated goldenseal, and for the further reason that it did not contain any ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the therapeutic effects claimed for it on the said bottle label, carton, and in the accompanying booket, to wit, "* * * A compound of Borated Goldenseal The remedy for Catarrh, Hay Fever, and Inflammations, Irritations or Ulcerations of mucous membranes or Linings of the Nose, Throat, Stomach and Urinary Organs;" and further that the label on the bottle stated the contents to be a non-poisonous tonic for divers diseases therein named, including hay fever, itching conditions of the skin and