

October 29, 1940, by Cuban Honey, Inc., from Lansing, Mich.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination of the article showed that it was honey.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the labeling which accompanied it bore representations that carbohydrates in this form (honey) mean "pep" and pep means "a better you"; that it contained many of the necessary mineral salts; that it had been clinically tested, and that such tests had been carried on in cases of bronchial asthma and bronchitis under the care of reputable physicians; that it had been found to be a desirable food supplement to a bland diet in cases of stomach ulcers and other digestive disorders; that the contents of the stomach had been examined at specific intervals and X-rays taken and that all cases showed much greater improvement when El Aguinaldo Cuban Honey was a part of the diet than without it; that the diets used tended to relieve discomfort, increase vitality, improve the appetite and provide a mild laxative; that it had been used in various types of illness with very pleasing results in many cases; that the article would be efficacious as a palliative for local irritations of nose and throat associated with coughs, colds, asthma, and bronchitis; that for sinus and hay fever it should be diluted with water and used as a nasal spray and should be taken internally 1 or 2 teaspoonfuls one-half hour before meals and before retiring; that in stomach ulcers where a soft bland diet would be prescribed and in other digestive disorders it should be used as a special-purpose food, which representations in the labeling were false and misleading since it was not efficacious for the purposes represented and suggested by the labeling.

On September 19 and October 25, 1940, and January 25, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the lot seized at St. Paul was ordered destroyed and those seized at Minneapolis and Cincinnati were ordered delivered to charitable institutions.

378. Misbranding of Brown's Bron-Ki. U. S. v. 27 1-gallon Cans and 8 5-gallon Cans of Bron-Ki. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2364. Sample Nos. 14254-E, 14255-E.)

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

On July 16, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of Delaware filed a libel against 27 gallon cans and 8 5-gallon cans of Brown's Bron-Ki at Dagsboro, Del., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce within the period from on or about May 10 to May 17, 1940, by Brown's Bron-Ki Co. from Lancaster, Pa.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of kerosene with small quantities of volatile oils such as oil of spruce, oil of eucalyptus, oil of tar, and oil of citronella. Bacteriological examination showed that it was devoid of antiseptic properties.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that its labeling contained representations that it was efficacious in the treatment of colds, bronchitis and other diseases of the respiratory tract in poultry, that it was efficacious as a preventive and treatment for brooder pneumonia, that it contained healing and antiseptic ingredients, and that if treatment was undertaken immediately, infection would not develop; whereas the article would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On August 27, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

379. Misbranding of Colicramp Drops. U. S. v. 114 Packages of Colicramp Drops. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3577. Sample No. 46126-E.)

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy in the conditions indicated hereinafter. It was packed in a very narrow, paneled bottle in a carton considerably larger than was necessary.

On December 27, 1940, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York filed a libel against 114 packages of Colicramp Drops at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 6, 1940, by A. G. Groblewski & Co. from Plymouth, Pa.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of alcohol, ether, and small amounts of peppermint, ammonia, ginger, and extracts of plant drugs.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements in the labeling were false and misleading: "Colicramp * * * For relief of Gas in Stomach, Wind Pains in Stomach * * * Heavy or Bloating Feeling after Eating. Also

for Colicky-Like Gas Pains Peculiar to Women (similar statements in foreign language)," since the article was not efficacious for such purposes. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its container was so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading

On March 4, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

380. Misbranding of Colusa Natural Oil. U. S. v. 12 Bottles of Colusa Natural Oil. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2264. Sample No. 16069-E.)

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

On or about July 9, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri filed a libel against 12 2-ounce bottles of Colusa Natural Oil at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 21, 1940, from Hollywood, Calif., by C. W. Colgrove; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted of crude petroleum oil.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it was efficacious in the treatment of athlete's foot or ringworm; that it was efficacious to relieve painful and irritating itching and unsightly blemishes on hands; that it was efficacious in the treatment of eczema, psoriasis, acne, foot burns and cuts and poison oak; that it was efficacious on surface skin irritations acting as a stimulant increasing circulation and thereby aiding in the healing; that it possessed penetrating qualities and reducing properties which would help relieve the discomfort and pain; and that it possessed detergent and mild antiseptic action which would inhibit the spreading of skin irritations and help restore the normal skin surface, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On August 3, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

381. Misbranding of Colusa Natural Oil. U. S. v. 257 1-ounce Bottles of Colusa Natural Oil. Default decree of destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2263. Sample No. 16068-E.)

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

On or about July 9, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri filed a libel against 257 1-ounce bottles of the above-named product at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 16, 1939, by the Swan Manufacturing Co. from San Francisco, Calif.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination showed that it was crude petroleum oil.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements appearing on the label were false and misleading since they represented that it was efficacious for the purposes recommended, whereas it was not efficacious for the purposes recommended: "For external use in the relief and treatment of * * * cuts, eczema, psoriasis, acne, skin blemishes, pyorrhea, varicose veins * * * and hay fever."

On August 3, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment was entered ordering destruction of the product.

382. Misbranding of Durets. U. S. v. 40 Packages of Durets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2161. Sample No. 14678-E.)

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding the conditions indicated hereinafter.

On June 5, 1940, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 40 packages of Durets at Reading, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 25, 1940, by James Lawrence Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted of tablets, each containing theophylline ($\frac{1}{2}$ grain), methenamine (1 grain), sodium biphosphate (2.3 grains), and starch.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it would help to drive out poisonous body wastes; would relieve loss of sleep; was efficacious in the treatment of backache, headache, mental depression, excessive tiredness, pains in the groin, burning, frequent, smarting, painful, or