

forming or harmful drugs; which representations were false and misleading in that they created the impression that the article was an appropriate and harmless medicament for the conditions mentioned therein; whereas it was not such an appropriate and harmless medicament but was a dangerous drug.

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its labeling bore representations that it was efficacious for the relief of toothache, sciatica, neuritis, rheumatism, lumbago, gout, painful menstruation, that it was indicated for all painful diseases and was a valuable nerve tonic and bore directions that in the treatment of painful menstruation one tablet should be taken and repeated after 8 hours; that in the treatment of rheumatism, gout, and lumbago one tablet should be taken morning and night and doubled if the case was severe; and in the treatment of toothache 2 tablets should be taken and that if not relieved one more should be taken after 8 hours; which representations and directions were false and misleading in that the article was not efficacious for the purposes recommended.

On November 17, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**98. Misbranding of Saurinol. U. S. v. 5 Bottles of Saurinol. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 269. Sample No. 56160-D.)**

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy as a relief from sinus, hay fever, exposed cancer, varicose veins, pyorrhea, trench mouth, laceration, ulcers, and skin diseases.

On July 7, 1939, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California filed a libel against five bottles of Saurinol at Oakland, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about June 22, 1939, by Saurinol Distributors Corporation; and charging that it was misbranded for the reasons stated above.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of medium boiling petroleum oil.

On November 30, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**99. Misbranding of VG-341. U. S. v. 39 Jars of VG-341. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 898. Sample Nos. 55995-D, 55996-D.)**

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy in the conditions indicated below.

On November 13, 1939, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against 39 jars of VG-341 at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 14, 1939, by O. E. Henspeter from Vining, Minn.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of sodium hydroxide (94 percent), sodium carbonate (3½ percent), and a trace of potassium carbonate.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that its labeling bore representations that it was efficacious as a vapor gas treatment for hemorrhoids or piles and bore directions for its use, namely, that a toilet jar or bucket should be secured; that 5 inches of steaming, boiling hot water should be placed therein; that the jar or bucket should be tall enough so that the body would be at least 8 inches above boiling water; that the user after removing garments should sit on the jar or bucket, first making certain that vapor and gases do not escape by placing a towel around rim of vessel; that the cork should be removed from a vial and vial and contents dropped in vessel; that the user should remain sitting for 10 minutes and should then lie down and rest for at least 2 hours after treatment; that the second vial or treatment should be taken three nights after the first, and that the third should be taken three nights after the second; that a dilator should be used in case of internal piles; that the one vial usually relieved, but that the quickness of relief depended entirely upon one's physical condition and "acceptability to this type of treatment," and that after the use of the second or third vial and one finds pronounced allayment, comfort, and improvement in one's condition, that the treatment should be continued for complete relief and normal action, which representations were false and misleading, since the article was not efficacious for the purposes recommended.

On December 12, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.