

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.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the circular regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed: "Prophylactic * * * It is highly recommended for the treatment of leucorrhoea ('whites'), cervicitis, vaginitis, catarrhal inflammations and other vaginal conditions associated with disagreeable discharges, whether specific or not. * * * producing a complete as well as thorough antiseptics of the organ. * * * In leucorrhoea, etc. * * * as a prophylactic against infection, specific or otherwise."

On January 4, 1932, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19360. Adulteration and misbranding of Glyco-tan-phene. U. S. v. 22 Bottles of Glyco-tan-phene. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 27586. I. S. No. 44732. S. No. 5572.)

Examination of a drug product, known as Glyco-tan-phene, from the shipment herein described showed that the labeling bore statements representing that the article possessed antiseptic, curative, and therapeutic properties which in fact it did not possess.

On December 21, 1931, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 22 bottles of Glyco-tan-phene at Cincinnati, Ohio, consigned by the Hagedon Chemical Co., from Indianapolis, Ind., alleging that the article had been transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Ohio, on or about October 17, 1931, and charging adulteration and 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 small proportions of phenol, tannin, and menthol, and glycerin and water, colored with a brown dye. Bacteriological examination showed that the article was not antiseptic.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it was sold under its own standard of strength, to wit, antiseptic, when in truth and in fact the strength of said drug fell below such professed standard in that it was not antiseptic.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the label, "An Antiseptic," was false and misleading. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the following statements appearing in the labeling, regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed: (Bottle label) "Indicated in the treatment of Tonsillitis, Pharyngitis, Uvulitis, Pyorrhoea, Sore and inflamed conditions of the Throat and Mouth."

On January 29, 1932, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19361. Misbranding of Phosphorcin. U. S. v. 3 1/3 Dozen Bottles of Phosphorcin. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 26202. I. S. No. 28254. S. No. 4480.)

Examination of the drug product Phosphorcin, involved in this action, showed that the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed for it in the circular shipped with the said article.

On April 10, 1931, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of three and one-third dozen bottles of Phosphorcin, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped by Eimer & Amend, from New York, N. Y., in part on or about November 15, 1930, and in part on or about January 23, 1931, and had been transported from the State of New York into the State