

offered to the profession and to the drug trade. The Okay Specific of Pabst is a specific in the real acceptance of the word. \* \* \* every just and sensible person will recognize the merits of this remedy. The many letters written by druggists from all parts of the country assure us in the frankest terms and without qualification that the Okay Specific is the only remedy which they recommend owing to the extraordinary cures which have been obtained in the most obstinate and complicated cases."

On January 25, 1932, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$500.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**19358. Misbranding of O and O medicine. U. S. v. Fridolin Pabst (Pabst Chemical Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200. (F. & D. No. 23705. I. S. Nos. 13085-x, 13095-x.)**

Investigation of the drug product O and O medicine involved in this action disclosed that the article would not produce certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed for it in the bottle and carton labels and in a booklet shipped with the said article.

On December 21, 1928, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid, an information against Fridolin Pabst, trading as Pabst Chemical Co., Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, from the State of Illinois into the State of Utah, in part on or about August 24, 1927, and in part on or about November 14, 1927, of quantities of O and O medicine that was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of O and O medicine by this department showed that the article consisted essentially of volatile oils, resins, alcohol, and water.

Misbranding of the article was charged in the information for the reason that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the said article, appearing on the bottle and carton labels, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a treatment for infected, inflamed, and discharging mucous membranes, and effective to relieve quickly and heal all soreness, especially in chronic conditions, and effective as a specific for infected, inflamed, and discharging mucous membranes and all soreness; and in that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article, contained in a booklet accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a complete relief for inflammation and soreness and as a preventive of disease, and as a treatment for chronic cases of gleet, and effective as a sure and good remedy for inflammation and soreness and disease and chronic cases of gleet; whereas the said article did not contain ingredients or medicinal agents effective for the said purposes.

On January 25, 1932, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$200.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**19359. Misbranding of Keros. U. S. v. 70 Packages of Keros. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 27235. I. S. No. 31280. S. No. 5389.)**

Examination of a drug product, known as Keros, having shown that the circular accompanying the article contained statements representing that it possessed curative and therapeutic properties which it did not possess, the Secretary of Agriculture reported to the United States attorney for the Northern District of California the interstate shipment herein described, involving a quantity of the article.

On November 12, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 70 packages of Keros, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by Continental Laboratories (Inc.), from New York, N. Y., on or about October 21, 1931, and had been transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of boric acid, carbonates, an organic acid, and a trace of oxyquinoline sulphate.