work makes strenuous demands on mental and physical endurance. If you could use more endurance, try the Knox Gelatine endurance diet, yourself. Have members of your family try it. * * * Ask people to try Knox Gelatine for greater endurance * * *. How To Take Knox Gelatine For More Endurance—Less Fatigue * * * Stock the new 32-envelope economy package and make the Knox Endurance Routine easy for your customers. * * * Answering Your Customers Question About Knox Gelatine * * * The latest research development—and the most wide-spread—is the use of Knox Gelatine in building endurance and resistance to fatigue. Booklets on Knox Gelatine for greater endurance * * * are available on request."

The article was also alleged to be misbranded in violation of the provisions of the law applicable to drugs, as reported in D. D. N. J. No. 497.

On August 15, 1941, the Charles B. Knox Gelatine Co., Inc., having appeared as claimant and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond conditioned that the circulars and booklets be removed from the packages under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

2549. Adulteration and misbranding of R M Dietary Supplements Vitamin A and D. U. S. v. 38 Bottles of R M Dietary Supplements Vitamin A and D. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered distributed to hospitals. (F. D. C. No. 4304. Sample No. 8319–E.)

This product was represented to contain 3,140 International Units of vitamin A and 314 International Units of vitamin D per tablet, but contained not more than 30 U. S. P. units of vitamin A and not more than 150 U. S. P. units of vitamin D. (By definition, 1 U. S. P. unit of vitamin A or D is equivalent to 1 International Unit of the same vitamin.) A large core of cotton extended more than half way to the bottom of the bottle and tablets surrounded the cotton. When the cotton was removed, the tablets filled the bottle approximately half full.

On April 12, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota filed a libel against 38 bottles of the above-named product at Minneapolis, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 2, 1940, by Ryer Mouser from Los Angeles, Calif.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that valuable constituents, namely, vitamins A and D, had been wholly or in part omitted or abstracted therefrom.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements on the label were false and misleading: "Each Tablet Contains Vitamin A from fish liver oil * * * 3140 I. U. Vitamin D from fish liver oil 314 I. U." It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its container was so filled as to be misleading.

It was also alleged to be adulterated and misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to drugs, as reported in D. D. N. J. No. 477.

On May 29, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered distributed to hospitals chosen by the marshal in his discretion.

2550. Adulteration and misbranding of Ace High Effervescent Preparation. U. S. v. 14 Cases of Ace High Effervescent Preparation. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3117. Sample No. 33399–E.)

This product contained borax, an added poisonous or deleterious substance. Furthermore, the labels did not bear the required ingredient statement, and those of a portion falsely stated the presence of citric acid.

On October 2, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut filed a libel against 14 cases, each containing 24 jars, of Ace High Effervescent Preparation at New Haven, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 30, 1940, by Premium Color Works from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. It was labeled in part: (Jars) "Ace High Effervescente [or "Effervescent Preparation"] * * * Net 4 Ozs. Packed For The Pepe-Maisano Co. New Haven, Conn."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it contained an added poisonous or deleterious substance, borax, which was unsafe within the meaning of the law.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the words "citric acid" in the statement of active ingredients on some of the labels were false and misleading since citric acid was not present; and in that it was fabricated from two or more ingredients and did not bear the common or usual name of each of the ingredients.

On February 21, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.