Analysis of a sample disclosed that the article was in the form of capsules, each of which contained 0.21 gram of potassium bromide, 6.4 milligrams of benzedrine sulfate, and thiamine chloride.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength differed from that which it purported and was represented to possess, since it purported and was represented to contain 0.4 gram of potassium bromide in each capsule, whereas it contained not more than 0.21 gram of potassium bromide in each capsule.

The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) because of false and misleading statements on its label and in the accompanying leaflet and circular entitled, "Instructions for Rx 56 Treatment for Alcoholism," and "'Rx56' Special Compound An Aid to Drinkers," respectively, regarding its efficacy in the cure, mitigation, treatment, and prevention of alcoholism; (2) in that the statement on the label, "Potassium Bromide Grams 0.4 * * * Each Capsule," was false and misleading; and (3) in that the article, because of the presence of 6.4 milligrams of benzedrine sulfate, would be dangerous to health when used in the dosage and with the frequency and duration prescribed, recommended, and suggested in the aforesaid circular, i.e., "This treatment for the average patient using 1 to 3 capsules a day."

On October 14, 1944, the defendant having entered a plea of guilty, the court suspended imposition of sentence, and placed her on probation for a period of 2 years, conditioned that she refrain from engaging in the sale of medical articles of any kind.

1304. Misbranding of Lambert's Tablets and Lambert's Powders. U. S. v. Claude M. Stanley (Stanley Drug Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 on first count; sentence suspended on second count, and defendant placed on 1 year's probation. (F. D. C. No. 11410. Sample Nos. 47507-F, 47508-F.)

On June 12, 1944, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota filed an information against Claude M. Stanley, trading as the Stanley Drug Co., at Minneapolis, Minn., alleging shipment on or about July 23, 1943, from the State of Minnesota into the State of Iowa of a quantity of the abovenamed articles.

Analysis showed that the tablets each contained 2½ grains of aspirin, 1¼ grains of acetanilid, and 1¼ grains of salol, and that the powders each contained 5.74 grains of aspirin, 2.44 grains of acetanilid, and 2.81 grains of salol.

The articles were alleged to be misbranded (1) in that they would be dangerous to health when used in the dosage or with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, and suggested in the labeling, (tablets) "Directions Take * * 2 tablets with a glass of water. Repeat dose every 3 or 4 hours, preferably before eating and at bedtime," and (powders) "Directions Adult Dose—The contents of one powder, with a large glass of water, taken before meals, three times a day," since they contained approximately 1½ grains of acetanilid per tablet, and approximately 2½ grains of acetanilid per powder, and their use, as prescribed, recommended, and suggested in the directions, would result in the administration of excessive amounts of acetanilid; (2) in that the labeling failed to bear warnings that frequent or continuous use might cause serious blood disturbances, anemia, collapse, or dependence on the article; and the labeling of the tablets failed to reveal that they should not be given to children; (3) in that the statements in the labeling, (tablets) "For relief of * * * discomfort in * * * muscular aches and pains, neuralgia, common head colds," and (powders) "For Relief Of Simple Colds, * * * Muscular Aches, Body Pains, Caused By Exposure," were false and misleading since the articles would not be efficacious for such purposes; and (4) in that the statements on the box containing the powders, "Acetylsalicylic Acid Grs. 5 * * * Phenyl Salicylate Grs. 2.5," were false and misleading since the article contained materially more than 5 grains of acetylsalicylic acid, and materially more than 5 grains of phenyl salicylate.

On December 1, 1944, the defendant having entered a plea of guilty, the court imposed a fine of \$50 on the first count of the information, suspended imposition of sentence on the second count, and placed the defendant on probation for the period of 1 year.