

ances of the water system; that it would alleviate the ills of humanity; and that it would be efficacious in the relief of many ailments, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes. (3) In that it was fabricated from two or more ingredients and its label failed to bear a statement of the common or usual name of each ingredient. (4) In that the label failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of contents in terms of measure.

On March 10, 1942, the defendant entered a plea of guilty and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

663. Misbranding of Barkolyn. U. S. v. 9 $\frac{2}{3}$ Dozen Packages of Barkolyn. Decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6586. Sample No. 54362-E.)

This product consisted essentially of extracts of plant drugs including laxatives, and strychnine; and the labeling failed to bear adequate directions for use, adequate warnings for the protection of users, and a statement of the quantity or proportion of strychnine that it contained.

On December 24, 1941, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 9 $\frac{2}{3}$ dozen packages of Barkolyn at Lock Haven, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 30, 1941, by Standard Medicines Co. from Columbus, Ohio; and charging that it was misbranded.

It was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that the labeling failed to bear adequate directions for use since it was a laxative and the directions appearing on the labeling, which provided for continuous use, were inadequate since, if followed, they might lead to dependence on a laxative; and the directions for use by children were inadequate since they were indefinite. (2) In that the labeling failed to bear adequate warnings against use in those pathological conditions or by children where its use might be dangerous to health, or against unsafe dosage or duration of administration, in such manner and form, as are necessary for the protection of users, since it failed to contain a warning that use of a preparation containing strychnine by children and elderly persons might be especially dangerous and since it also failed to contain a warning that a laxative should not be taken when suffering from nausea, vomiting, abdominal pains, or other symptoms of appendicitis, and that frequent or continued use might result in dependence on laxatives. (3) In that it contained strychnine and its label failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of strychnine that it contained.

On January 31, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

664. Misbranding of Bosak's Horke Vino. U. S. v. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ Dozen Bottles of Bosak's Horke Vino. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6395. Sample No. 74943-E.)

The labeling of this product failed to bear adequate directions for use and failed to bear a statement revealing the name and quantity of strychnine present in the article and also bore false and misleading therapeutic claims.

On December 17, 1941, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York filed a libel against 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ dozen bottles of Bosak's Horke Vino at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 4 and December 3, 1941, by Gold Seal Manufacturing Company from Scranton, Pa.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of small proportions of aloin and strychnine, alcohol, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that its labeling did not bear adequate directions for use since it was a laxative preparation and the directions for use were inadequate for a laxative preparation, and in that the directions failed to place a limitation on the period of time for taking the recommended daily dosage. (2) In that the following statements appearing in the labeling, "Nature's Tonic * * * This Tonic has been found a valuable aid in cases of Indigestion, Dyspepsia * * * Nervousness, General Debility, and in other derangements of the digestive organs," and also "These goods are labeled to conform to requirements of New Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law, which is effective June 25th, 1939," were false and misleading since it was not a tonic, it did not possess natural tonic properties bestowed by nature, it was not a valuable aid in the case of indigestion, dyspepsia, nervousness, general debility, and any other derangements of the digestive organs, and it was not labeled to conform to the requirements of the law. (3) In that strychnine was

one of its ingredients and its label failed to bear the name and quantity of such ingredient.

On January 14, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

665. Misbranding of Grover Graham Remedy. U. S. v. 37 Bottles and 71 Bottles of Grover Graham Remedy. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6213. Sample No. 74151-E.)

The labeling of this product in addition to failure to bear adequate directions and warning statements, contained false and misleading therapeutic claims.

On November 14, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 37 6-fluid-ounce bottles and 71 12-fluid-ounce bottles of Grover Graham Remedy at Jersey City, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about January 20 and July 15, 1941, by S. Grover Graham Co., Inc., from Newburgh, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article showed that it consisted essentially of magnesia, sodium bicarbonate, sodium bromide, extract of ginger, a small proportion of chloroform, alcohol, and water flavored with peppermint oil and colored with a violet red dye. Analysis of a sample of Graham's Pills showed that they contained aloe, podophyllin, gamboge, and capsicum.

The article was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that the labeling did not bear adequate directions for use since those given provided for an excessive amount of sodium bromide, and no limitation was put on the amount of bromide to be administered daily. (2) In that the labeling failed to bear adequate warnings against use in those pathological conditions where its use might be dangerous to health, or against unsafe dosage or methods or duration of administration in such manner and form as are necessary for the protection of users, since it did not bear any warning that frequent or continued use might lead to mental derangement, skin eruptions, or other serious effects; and that it should not be taken by those suffering from kidney diseases. (3) In that statements in the labeling representing that it would be efficacious for treatment of indigestion, bloating, dyspepsia, gastritis, constipation, and other forms of stomach disorders and distress due to faulty digestion; and that it was harmless, not habit-forming, and could be taken with perfect safety, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for the purposes recommended, it was not harmless, it was habit-forming and could not be taken with perfect safety since it contained a material proportion of sodium bromide, a habit-forming drug. (4) In that the following statement regarding another drug (cartons) "For temporary relief from occasional constipation we recommend Graham's Pills, and intestinal eliminant specially prepared for use with this remedy," was false and misleading since it represented that Graham's Pills, when used in conjunction with Grover Graham's Remedy, would be efficacious for the purposes for which the latter article was recommended.

On January 8, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

666. Misbranding of Herb Doctor Compound. U. S. v. 56 Bottles of Herb Doctor Compound. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6359. Sample No. 54335-E.)

On December 5, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 56 bottles of Herb Doctor Compound at Lancaster, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 25, 1941, by Strong Cobb & Co. from Cleveland, Ohio; and charging that it was misbranded in that its labeling failed to bear adequate directions for use, since those given provided for its use under conditions which might have rendered it injurious to the user by creating a dependence upon laxatives to move the bowels.

On January 5, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

667. Misbranding of laxative cold tablets. U. S. v. 172 Tins of Norwich Laxative Cold Tablets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6719. Sample No. 90408-E.)

The labeling of this product in addition to failure to bear adequate warning statements, also contained false and misleading therapeutic claims.

On January 16, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of Rhode Island filed a libel against the above-named product at Newport, R. I., alleging