

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements in the labeling false and fraudulently represented it to be effective in the treatment of gastric and duodenal ulcer, gastric inflammation, hyperacidity, and irritable colon; effective to provide a protective coating for inflamed surfaces, to afford rapid and effective relief from pain and associated symptoms of peptic ulcer, effective in gastro-intestinal inflammations and border-line cases of hyperacidity; effective as a treatment for stomach ailments and ulcers; effective to supply a protective coating for ulcer wounds and other irritations and inflammations; effective to secure lasting, enduring benefits; effective to absorb excess hydrochloric and other free acids, as effective in the treatment of alcoholic stomachs following sprees; effective to relieve spasmodic pains; effective as a treatment for persistent nausea and vomiting, cramp-like pains, gastric hemorrhage, pains in epigastrium, nonspecific ulcerative colitis, gastric disturbance, distress at night; and effective to produce increase in weight, induce better ingestion and assimilation, and cause increase in bile secretions.

On May 8, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

24686. Misbranding of Baker's Cough Syrup. U. S. v. 69 Bottles of Baker's Cough Syrup. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35394. Sample no. 28948-B.)

This case involved a drug preparation the labeling of which contained unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims.

On April 18, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of New Hampshire, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 69 bottles of Baker's Cough Syrup at Nashua, N. H., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 21, 1935, by the Baker Extract Co., from Springfield, Mass., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of extracts of plant drugs such as white pine, sassafras, and wild cherry, tar, chloroform, alcohol, sugar, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the labeling were statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article and were false and fraudulent: (Bottle) "Relieves Coughs, Hoarseness, Influenza, Bronchitis, Croup, Whooping Cough and Inflamed Conditions of the Throat and Lungs"; (carton) "For the Relief of Coughs, Hoarseness, Croup and many Inflamed Conditions of the Throat. * * * Valuable in affections of the throat and for relieving obstinate coughs * * * It relieves the contraction of the throat muscles and has a soothing effect upon the inflamed membranes."

On May 22, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

24687. Misbranding of Chlorine Respirine. U. S. v. 53 Dozen Packages of Chlorine Respirine. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35062. Sample no. 11896-B.)

This case involved a drug preparation the labeling of which contained unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims. The labeling was further objectionable since the article was represented to contain available chlorine, whereas it contained no available chlorine.

On February 16, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 53 dozen packages of Chlorine Respirine at Denver, Colo., consigned by the Chlorine Respirine Co., Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce from the State of Illinois into the State of Colorado in various shipments between the dates of January 1 and March 12, 1925, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of calcium compounds incorporated in petrolatum, and that it contained no available chlorine.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements in the labeling were false and misleading, since the article contained no available chlorine: (Carton) "Chlorine * * * Chlorine Respirine liberates