

April 7, 1944. The article was labeled in part: "Harris' 121 Remedy Alterative and Stomachic Tonic."

Examination of a sample disclosed that the article consisted essentially of a solution in water of potassium iodide, 11.4 grains per fluid ounce, arsenic trioxide, 0.007 grain per fluid ounce, mercuric chloride, 0.045 grain per fluid ounce, and a bitter drug such as gentian extract.

The article was alleged to be misbranded because of false and misleading statements, appearing in an accompanying circular entitled "Get the Poison Out of Your System . . . Take Harris' 121 Remedy," regarding the efficacy of the article in eliminating poison from the system, building up the system, restoring strength, health, and the health functions of the body, fortifying the system against many diseases, and treating rheumatism, flu aftermath, thick blood, pimples, boils, muscular aches and pains, swollen glands, and rheumatic pains.

On August 17, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1332. Misbranding of Fero-B-Plex, Minerals Plus, sarsaparilla root U.S.P. with sassafras bark, Cetabs, fenugreek tea, and BoLax Laxatives Tablets. U. S. v. 141 Packages of Fero-B-Plex, 4 Packages of Minerals Plus, 9 Packages of Sarsaparilla Root U.S.P. with Sassafras Bark, 8 Packages of Cetabs, 11 Packages of Fenugreek Tea, 46 Packages of BoLax Laxative Tablets, and a number of booklets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 12078. Sample Nos. 70727-F, 70728-F, 70767-F to 70771-F, incl.)

On April 3, 1944, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington filed a libel against the above-mentioned products at Seattle, Wash., alleging that they had been shipped between the approximate dates of July 15, 1942, and January 20, 1944, by LeLord Kordel and LeLord Kordel Products from Chicago, Ill.; and charging that they were misbranded.

Analysis disclosed that the Fero-B-Plex contained iron, calcium, phosphorus, vitamin B₁, vitamin B₂, and niacin; that the Minerals Plus contained calcium, phosphorus, iron, iodine, and vitamin D; that the sarsaparilla root U.S.P. with sassafras bark consisted essentially of sarsaparilla root and a small proportion of sassafras bark; that the Cetabs contained 31 milligrams of ascorbic acid per tablet; that the fenugreek tea consisted essentially of fenugreek seeds; and that the BoLax Laxative Tablets consisted essentially of powdered plant material including laxative plant drugs such as senna and buckthorn.

The articles were alleged to be misbranded in that the statements in an accompanying booklet entitled, "What You Can Do About Relieving the Agonies of Arthritis," which represented and implied that the articles were of value in the treatment of arthritis were false and misleading since they were not of value in the treatment of arthritis whether taken alone, in combination, or in conjunction with certain diets recommended in the labeling.

The articles were also alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in notices of judgment on foods.

On September 30, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

1333. Misbranding of Hale's Honey of Horehound and Tar, and Glenn's Sulphur Soap. U. S. v. 22 Packages and 52 Packages of Hale's Honey of Horehound and Tar, and 190 Boxes of Glenn's Sulphur Soap. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 12114. Sample Nos. 66238-F, 66239-F, 77214-F.)

On April 13, 1944, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York filed a libel against 22 packages, containing 2 fluid ounces each, and 52 packages, containing 4 fluid ounces each, of Hale's Honey of Horehound and Tar, and 190 boxes, each containing 3 cakes, of Glenn's Sulphur Soap at New York, N. Y., alleging that they had been shipped on or about February 8 and 23, 1944, by the Century National Chemical Co., from Paterson, N. J.; and charging that they were misbranded.

Examination of the Hale's Honey of Horehound and Tar showed that it contained tar, chloroform, and syrup.

The article was alleged to be misbranded because of false and misleading statements in the labeling which misrepresented and suggested that the article was effective for coughs, colds, hoarseness, whooping cough, sore throat, loss of voice, or inflamed or irritable conditions of the respiratory mucous membranes.

Examination of the Glenn's Sulphur Soap showed that it was a soap containing sulfur.

The article was alleged to be misbranded because of false and misleading statements in the labeling regarding the efficacy of the article in the treatment of skin infections in general, chronic eczema, pimples, skin eruptions, and blackheads, and in bringing about a healthful condition.

On May 9, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

1334. Misbranding of Kloronol. U. S. v. 130 Packages and 140 Bottles of Kloronol. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 12707, 13403. Sample Nos. 77785-F, 85006-F, 85007-F.)

On June 19 and August 29, 1944, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed libels against 130 packages and 140 bottles, each containing 1 fluid ounce, of Kloronol at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., by the Sumlar Co., between the approximate dates of January 21 and June 26, 1944.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of small quantities of ephedrine sulfate, epinephrine hydrochloride, chlorobutanol, thymol, eucalyptol, methyl salicylate, potassium bicarbonate, and borax, dissolved in water and colored red.

The article was alleged to be misbranded because of false and misleading statements on its labels and in the accompanying circulars entitled, "Prompt Relief from Acute Discomforts of Sinus Trouble Head Colds," and "Evidence of Results," regarding the efficacy of the article in relieving sinusitis and the acute discomforts of head colds. The article was alleged to be misbranded further in that the warnings required by law to appear on the labeling were not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices in the labeling) as to render them likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use, since the warnings had been printed in type of a very inconspicuous size at the bottom of the first page of the circular.

On July 12 and October 10, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1335. Misbranding of Dr. E. R. Moras' Eyecream. U. S. v. 6 Packages of Dr. E. R. Moras' Eyecream. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 12157. Sample No. 54034-F.)

On April 10, 1944, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California filed a libel against 6 packages of the above-named product at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 1, 1944, by Dr. E. R. Moras from Highland Park, Ill.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of petrolatum and lanolin containing vitamins A and B.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on its label, "Eyecream treatment has proved helpful in eye strain and many of its symptoms and in dispensing with glasses," was false and misleading since the article would not be effective to produce the results claimed; and in that the statements in accompanying circulars entitled "Detoxication, Elimination Nutrition, Why Detoxyl," "How to Use Eyecream and Your Eyes," and "Eye Truths," which represented and suggested that the article would relieve eyestrain and its various symptoms, relieve or cure granulated lids, sties, and astigmatism, penetrate the mechanism of the eye, strengthen or restore eyesight to normal, remedy sore or inflamed eyes, obviate the necessity for wearing glasses, or the need for stronger glasses, enable the user to dispense with glasses, prevent or relieve cataract, and prevent loss of eyesight and dim, blurring sight, were false and misleading since the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients which would be effective to produce the results stated and implied.

On May 9, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.