

Misbranding was alleged in that the representation in the labeling that the article was a natural diuretic eliminant water used in treating diabetes and kidney and bladder trouble, was false and misleading since it was not efficacious for the purposes so recommended.

On September 15, 1939, the Robinson Spring Water Co., Michigan distributors, Detroit, Mich., having appeared as claimant for the lot seized at Detroit, Mich., and having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it be properly relabeled. On June 25, 1940, an answer having been filed in the Southern District of Florida admitting the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product in that district was ordered destroyed.

207. Misbranding of Rogers' Mineral Extract. U. S. v. 12 Bottles of Rogers' Mineral Extract. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 1606. Sample No. 61879-D.)

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

On March 12, 1940, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi filed a libel against 12 bottles of Rogers' Mineral Extract at Perkinston, Miss., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about January 25, 1940, by the Rogers Mineral Co. from Cullomburg, Ala.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article was a water solution containing approximately 6 percent of mineral matter, mainly iron, aluminum, and sodium sulfates.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that its labeling bore representations that it was efficacious in the treatment of indigestion, hemorrhage of lungs, early stages of consumption, diarrhoea, dysentery or any bowel trouble, pellagra, rheumatism, sores, inactive liver, ulcerated stomach, liver and kidney trouble, flux and other spring and summer diseases, early stages of eczema, burns, backache and general weakness, "T. B. of the bone," skin diseases, that it was a malarial preventative; that it was a natural remedy and purifier which cooperated with the blood system and action of the body in such way that it would give nature an opportunity to build back and restore to the body that which it had lost; that water would dilute the strong destructive acids in all parts of the body, and prepare the way for the product to follow with its healing power; that it was a natural iron tonic for the special purpose of regulating the appetite and causing the food to be assimilated; that it was a general remedy for internal and external use on man or beast; that it was a splendid blood purifier; was nature's remedy; that it would purify the blood and remove pimples from the face; that it was "nature's remedy when one is out of repair and needs treatment"; that it should be poured freely into the hog and chicken troughs for cholera and as a cholera preventative; and was efficacious for sorehead on chickens, which representations were false and misleading since the article was not efficacious for the purposes for which it was recommended.

On June 4, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

VETERINARY REMEDIES *

208. Misbranding of Acme Worm Bouncer. U. S. v. 5 Bags of Acme Worm Bouncer. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 1419. Sample Nos. 46759-D, 49709-D.)

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

On February 2, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin filed a libel against five bags of Acme Worm Bouncer at Monroe, Wis., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 28, 1939, and January 9, 1940, by Acme Feeds, Inc., from Forest Park, Ill.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of charcoal, sulfur, iron oxide, iron sulfate, salt, sodium sulfate, and a small proportion of Epsom salt.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the labeling bore representations that it was a "worm bouncer," that no drenching, dosing, handling, or

* See also N. J. Nos. 172 and 207.