

Units" and (bottle) "Standardized Cardio-Active Glycosides Of Squill \* \* \* Each tablet is equal to 2.5 Cat Units as standardized by the U. S. P. Cat Method" were false and misleading, since the article when tested in accordance with the method set forth in the United States Pharmacopoeia, Twelfth Revision, for tincture of digitalis did not contain an amount of the cardio-active glycosides of squill equivalent in potency to 2.5 "cat units" of digitalis but possessed a lesser potency.

DISPOSITION: April 16, 1948. A plea of guilty having been entered, the defendant was fined \$200, together with costs.

**2513. Adulteration and misbranding of Oleum Paracamphine, adulteration of thiamine hydrochloride tablets, and misbranding of Astringodyne. U. S. v. Saint Louis Pharmacal Co. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$400. (F. D. C. No. 24073. Sample Nos. 40754-H, 53627-H, 53628-H.)**

INFORMATION FILED: January 26, 1948, Eastern District of Missouri, against the Saint Louis Pharmacal Co., a corporation, St. Louis, Mo.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about April 20, September 30, and October 9, 1946, from the State of Missouri into the States of Illinois and Indiana.

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Oleum Paracamphine*. Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the quality of the article fell below that which it purported and was represented to possess. It was represented as an antiseptic, whereas it was not an antiseptic. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement "An Antiseptic" was false and misleading, since the article was not an antiseptic; and, Section 502 (e) (2), the article was not designated solely by a name recognized in an official compendium and was fabricated from two or more ingredients, and its label failed to bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient.

*Thiamine hydrochloride tablets*. Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the strength of the article differed from, and its quality fell below, that which it purported and was represented to possess, since it purported and was represented to contain 5 mgms. of thiamine hydrochloride in each tablet, whereas it contained a smaller amount.

*Astringodyne*. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statements "Containing Zinc Iodide . . . 0.46%," "Iodine . . . 0.6," "Ephedrine, alkaloid . . . 1" were false and misleading, since the article contained no iodine and contained materially less than 0.46 percent of zinc iodide and 1 percent of ephedrine alkaloid.

DISPOSITION: October 29, 1948. A plea of nolo contendere having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$400.

**2514. Adulteration and misbranding of Salicyline tablets. U. S. v. C. B. Kendall Co., Inc., and Claude B. Kendall. Pleas of guilty. Fine of \$150 against each defendant. (F. D. C. No. 24227. Sample Nos. 83126-H, 83151-H.)**

INFORMATION FILED: July 12, 1948, Southern District of Indiana, against C. B. Kendall Co., Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., and Claud B. Kendall, president of the corporation.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about May 15, 1947, from the State of Indiana into the State of Kentucky.

LABEL, IN PART: "Tablets Salicyline No. 2. Enteric Coated. Kendall."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the strength of the article differed from that which it purported and was represented to possess. Each tablet of the article was represented to contain 3 milligrams of thiamine hydrochloride, equivalent to 1,000 International Units of vitamin B<sub>1</sub>, and to contain 5,000 units of vitamin D. Each tablet contained less thiamine hydrochloride and less vitamin D than represented.

Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement "Each Tablet Contains: \* \* \* Thiamine Hydrochloride 3 mg. (1000 International Units B<sub>1</sub>) Vitamin D . . . 5000 Units" was false and misleading.

DISPOSITION: November 26, 1948. Pleas of guilty having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$150 against each defendant.

**2515. Adulteration and misbranding of Viblex. U. S. v. Ray F. McMullin (Endocrine Products Laboratory), and Walter E. Sterz. Pleas of nolo contendere. Fines, \$51 against Ray F. McMullin and \$2 against Walter E. Sterz. (F. D. C. No. 24283. Sample No. 36468-K.)**

INFORMATION FILED: September 3, 1948, Southern District of California, against Ray F. McMullin, trading as Endocrine Products Laboratory, Los Angeles, Calif., and Walter E. Sterz, a pharmacist for the laboratory.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about January 23, 1948, from the State of California into the State of Washington.

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the strength of the article differed from that which it was represented to possess, since each cubic centimeter of the article was represented to contain 2 milligrams of riboflavin, 100 milligrams of niacinamide, and 50 milligrams of thiamine hydrochloride, whereas each cubic centimeter of the article contained less than those amounts of riboflavin, niacinamide, and thiamine hydrochloride.

Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statements "Each cc. Contains Riboflavin (B<sub>2</sub>) . . . 2 milligrams \* \* \* Niacinamide . . . 100 milligrams Thiamine Hydrochloride . . . 50 milligrams" were false and misleading.

**DISPOSITION:** November 29, 1948. Pleas of nolo contendere having been entered, the court imposed fines of \$51 and \$2 against Ray F. McMullin and Walter E. Sterz, respectively.

**2516. Adulteration and misbranding of Millard's Triple Prescription Formula Tablets No. 1 and misbranding of Millard's Triple Prescription Formula Tablets No. 2 and No. 3. U. S. v. The Millard Co. and Millard H. Krasne. Pleas of guilty. Fines of \$120 against the company and \$80 against the individual, together with costs. (F. D. C. No. 24260. Sample Nos. 68556-H, 99645-H.)**

**INFORMATION FILED:** July 9, 1948, Southern District of Iowa, against the Millard Co., a partnership, Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Millard H. Krasne, a member of the partnership.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about May 21 and June 25, 1947, from the State of Iowa into the States of Missouri and Nebraska.

**PRODUCT:** Analyses disclosed that the *Tablets No. 1* in the May 21 shipment were compressed white tablets consisting essentially of acetylsalicylic acid; that the *Tablets No. 2* in that shipment were brown-coated tablets consisting chiefly of phenolphthalein and aloin; that the *Tablets No. 1* in the June 25 shipment were white compressed tablets containing much less than the declared amounts of caffeine and aspirin and more than the declared amount of acetophenetidin; and that the *Tablets No. 2* in the latter shipment consisted of brown-coated tablets containing chiefly phenolphthalein, aloin, podophyllin, and calcium carbonate. The composition of the *Tablets No. 3* agreed substantially with the label declaration.

**LABEL, IN PART:** "Tablets No. 1 \* \* \* Contains: 5 Gr. Acetylsalicylic Acid, 2 Gr. Caffeine, 1½ Gr. Acetophenetidin," "Tablets No. 2 \* \* \* Contains: Aloin, Podophyllin, Sodium Salicylate, Ginger extract of Belladonna," and "Tablets No. 3 \* \* \* Contains: Carotene, Thiamin Hydrochloride, Ascorbic Acid, Riboflavin, Calcium Pantothenate, Nicotinamide, and Pyroxidine."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** *Tablets No. 1.* Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the strength of the tablets differed from that which they purported and were represented to possess. The tablets purported and were represented to contain 5 grains of acetylsalicylic acid, 2 grains of caffeine, and 1½ grains of acetophenetidin, whereas the tablets in the May 21 shipment contained less than 2 grains of caffeine and less than 1½ grains of acetophenetidin and the tablets in the June 25 shipment contained less than 5 grains of acetylsalicylic acid, less than 2 grains of caffeine, and more than 1¼ grains of acetophenetidin. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling of the article which represented and suggested that each tablet contained 5 grains of acetylsalicylic acid, 2 grains of caffeine, and 1¼ grains of acetophenetidin, were false and misleading. Further misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling of the article, which included an enclosed booklet entitled "I Hope Sincerely That My Medicines Relieve Your Pains Promptly," were false and misleading. Such statements represented and suggested that the article would be effective to relieve congestion; that when used in conjunction with *Tablets No. 2* and *Tablets No. 3*, it would be effective to eliminate pain caused by rheumatism, arthritis, neuritis, sciatica, and leg cramp, and to improve health, vigor, and endurance; and that when used in conjunction with *Tablets No. 2*, it would be effective to activate the liver, to produce more bile, and to improve assimilation. The article would not be effective for such purposes.

*Tablets No. 2.* Misbranding, Section 502 (a), a statement in the labeling that the article contained sodium salicylate was false and misleading, since