

calcium, less than one-fifth the daily requirement for iodine, and less than one-third the minimum daily requirement for iron.

The information alleged misbranding of the article, three other drug products, and a device, under the provisions of the law applicable to drugs and devices as reported in the notices of judgment on drugs and devices, No. 1041.

DISPOSITION: On September 27, 1943, the defendant having entered a plea of nolo contendere, the court imposed a fine of \$500 on count 1 of the information, which involved charges against the "Vitaminerals VM No. 1" both as a food and a drug; and \$500 on Count 3, which involved a drug; and placed the defendant on probation with respect to the remaining 3 counts, which involved drugs and the device.

6599. Misbranding of Wel-being. U. S. v. 288 Tins and 24 Tins of Wel-being. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 9554. Sample No. 12942-F.)

LABEL FILED: March 17, 1943, District of New Jersey.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about February 18, 1943, from Portland, Oreg., by the Wel-being Co.

PRODUCT: 288 3-ounce tins and 24 12-ounce tins of Wel-being, at New Brunswick, N. J.

VIOLATIONS CHARGED: Misbranding, Section 403 (a), the name of the article, "Wel-being," and certain statements in its labeling were false and misleading since the name and statements represented and suggested that the article, when taken as directed by cats, dogs, pets, and fur-bearing animals, would create a feeling of well-being and was a highly concentrated food treatment and supplement; that it was a concentrated food and tonic; that it would aid condition; that it would overcome itching and scratching; that it would aid in body building; that it would restore energy; that it would promote a glossy coat; that it would remove intestinal parasites; that it would aid in whelping and produce vigorous litters; that it would stimulate the appetite; that it was an appetizing nutritional concentrate; that it would prevent skin irritations due to diet deficiency; that it would be effective in stubborn cases; that it would increase body weight; that it was a protective food; that it would supply needed food elements; that it was an appetizing addition to regular rations; that it would avoid starving and dangerous methods of treatment; that it would replace recognized medicinal treatment; that it was a new, simple, scientific pet treatment for any condition; that it would be effective for all worms and seasonal skin infections, poor condition, watery eyes, hair falling out, lack of pep, and poor appetite; and that it would maintain good health and guard against worms, whereas the article was not a product of the nature so represented and suggested, and would not accomplish the results claimed.

The article was also alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to drugs as reported in notices of judgment on drugs and devices, No. 1094.

DISPOSITION: On July 8, 1943, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

6600. Misbranding of Western Spinach Tablets. U. S. v. Harry Clayton House (Western Natural Foods Co.) Plea of guilty. Fine of \$100 on count 1, involving a drug product, and \$50 and costs on count 2, involving the spinach tablets. (F. D. C. No. 9653. Sample No. 30613-F.)

INFORMATION FILED: On July 30, 1943, in the Western District of Washington, against Harry Clayton House, trading as the Western Natural Foods Co., Seattle, Wash.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about September 3 and October 17, 1942, from the State of Washington into the State of Idaho.

PRODUCT: Analysis of the spinach tablets showed that they consisted essentially of dried or powdered spinach.

VIOLATIONS CHARGED: Misbranding, Section 403 (a), the statement in the labeling of the article which represented and suggested that it would be efficacious in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of blood disorders and anemia was false and misleading since it would not be so efficacious.

The article was also alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to drugs as reported in notice of judgment on drugs, No. 1083.

DISPOSITION: On August 30, 1943, the defendant having entered a plea of guilty, the court imposed a fine of \$100 on count 1 of the information, relating to another drug product, and \$50 and costs on count 2, relating to the spinach tablets.