

active principles of adrenal cortex, anterior pituitary, ovarian, and posterior pituitary were not present in the article in significant proportions, if at all, and since lymphatic and thymus tissues contain no known active principles.

On August 24, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**1339. Misbranding of Magnetic Ray appliances. U. S. v. 8 Magnetic Ray Devices and 100 Circulars, and 3 Magnetic Ray Devices and Circulars. Default decrees of condemnation. Four devices and 2 sets of circulars ordered delivered to the government; remainder ordered destroyed. (F. D. C. Nos. 11863, 12046. Sample Nos. 9262-F, 59455-F.)**

On or about March 14 and 23, 1944, the United States attorneys for the Western Districts of Michigan and Louisiana filed libels against 8 Magnetic Ray devices and 100 circulars at Muskegon, Mich., and 3 Magnetic Ray devices and a number of circulars at Lake Charles, La. On May 18, 1944, a supplemental libel was filed against 3 more of the devices at Lake Charles, La. It was alleged in the libels that a number of the devices had been shipped between the approximate dates of December 3, 1943, and January 12, 1944, by Frank B. Moran, trading as the Magnetic Ray Co., from Dallas, Tex., to Muskegon, Mich.; that the remainder had been consigned by that shipper to Orange, Tex., and from there transported by the consignee, Mrs. John Martin, to Lake Charles, La., on or about February 28, 1944; and that the devices, when introduced into and while in interstate commerce, were accompanied by circulars entitled "Magnetic Ray Treatment," and "Directions for Taking Magnetic Ray Treatments."

The device consisted of a coil of wire made in the form of a belt, to which was fastened a wire to be connected with an ordinary lighting circuit. When so connected it would produce a magnetic field.

The device was alleged to be misbranded because of false and misleading statements in the accompanying circulars which represented and suggested that it would be efficacious in the treatment of asthma, arthritis, anemia, Bright's disease, bladder trouble, bronchitis, colds, hay fever, constipation, catarrh, catarrhal deafness, diabetes, eczema, epilepsy, goiter, hemorrhoids, heart diseases, headaches, high blood pressure, indigestion, insomnia, impotence, low blood pressure, lumbago, menstrual troubles, neuralgia, neuritis, nervous troubles, obesity, paralysis, rheumatism, sciatica, sinus troubles, tuberculosis, tumors, ulcers, varicose veins, prostate disorders, and affections of the pelvic organs; that it would promote sound and refreshing sleep, relieve nervous irritability and pain, and exert a revitalizing influence upon the sexual or procreative glands; that it would increase physical and mental efficiency, clear the complexion, tone up the system, restore and preserve health, cause the absorption of abnormal growths and deposits, such as tumors, goiter, and blood clots, and improve circulation; and that it would be effective to avoid and eliminate autotoxemia. The article would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On April 8 and December 7, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the products were ordered destroyed, with the exception of a number of the devices and circulars, which were ordered delivered to the government.

#### DRUGS FOR VETERINARY USE

**1340. Misbranding of Pom-U-Soy. U. S. v. Pom-U-Soy Co., Ltd. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. D. C. No. 12559. Sample No. 47851-F.)**

On October 27, 1944, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio filed an information against the Pom-U-Soy Co., Ltd., a partnership, Cincinnati, Ohio, alleging shipment of a quantity of the above-named product on or about November 15, 1943, from the State of Ohio into the State of Arkansas.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of water, containing extracts of plant drugs.

The article was alleged to be misbranded because of false and misleading statements on its label and in an accompanying circular entitled, "Read What Users Say About 'Pom-U-Soy'," which represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious in the cure, mitigation, treatment, and prevention of coccidiosis and blood disorders; that it would afford protection continuously, from hatching through the life of the poultry; that it would be efficacious as an everyday health builder for a laying flock, and as a disease

preventive for chickens; that it would keep the laying flock in good condition, insure that the flock would eat right, keep infection from the poultry flock, and cause chickens to drink more water and feather out better; that it was an all-around cure for chicken diseases; and that it would be efficacious in the correction of blood in the droppings. It would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On November 17, 1944, a plea of guilty having been entered on behalf of the defendant, the court imposed a fine of \$100.

**1341. Misbranding of Mor-Milk for Pigs and Hogs, Mor-Milk for Calves, and Mor-Milk for Poultry. U. S. v. Utley Noble (Mor-Milk Co.).** Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 on each count, a total fine of \$450 and costs. (F. D. C. No. 11335. Sample Nos. 32090-F, 32091-F, 37312-F, 37967-F.)

On April 17, 1944, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed an information against Utley Noble, trading as the Mor-Milk Co., Dixon, Ill., alleging shipment of a quantity of the above-named products between the approximate dates of February 2 and April 30, 1943, from the State of Illinois into the States of Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Michigan.

Analysis of the Mor-Milk for Pigs and Hogs showed that the product consisted of a pink powdered material containing, chiefly, starch, protein, water, crude fiber, and small amounts of phenol and the sulfates, phosphates, nitrates, carbonates, chlorides, and oxides of calcium, iron, copper, potassium, and sodium. The article was alleged to be misbranded because of false and misleading statements in the accompanying leaflet entitled "More-Milk," regarding the efficacy of the article in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of worms in hogs, and in insuring healthy hogs.

Analysis of the Mor-Milk for Calves showed the product consisted of a pink powder containing, chiefly, starch, protein, water, crude fiber, and small amounts of the phosphates, carbonates, chlorides, and oxides of calcium, iron, and sodium. The article was alleged to be misbranded because of false and misleading statements in the above-mentioned leaflet regarding the efficacy of the article in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of scours in calves.

Analysis of the Mor-Milk for Poultry showed that the product consisted of a white powder containing, chiefly, starch, protein, sugars, crude fiber, and small amounts of phenol and the sulfates, phosphates, nitrates, carbonates, chlorides, and oxides of calcium, iron, copper, potassium, and sodium. The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) because of false and misleading statements in the accompanying circular entitled, "What Have You Got That I Haven't Got," regarding the efficacy of the article in insuring the good health of baby chicks to the adult stage; (2) because of false and misleading statements in the circular regarding the efficacy of another drug, "Chick Mash," in the maintenance of health and thriftiness in chicks, and in the treatment or prevention of coccidiosis, and the efficacy of a food, "Egg Mash," in causing the production of the maximum number of eggs, and in maintaining health in poultry flocks; and (3) because of false and misleading statements in the accompanying circular entitled "Mor-Milk," regarding the efficacy of another drug, "Mor-Milk For Pigs and Hogs," in keeping worms in hogs at a minimum, and as a cheap insurance for healthy hogs. It was alleged to be further misbranded in that it was not designated solely by a name recognized in an official compendium, and was fabricated from two or more ingredients, one of which was "Special Fowl Remedy Mother Vance Compound," and the label of the article did not bear a statement of the active ingredients contained in the "Special Fowl Remedy Mother Vance Compound."

The articles, with the exception of the Mor-Milk for Poultry, were also alleged to be adulterated and misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in the notices of judgment on foods.

On October 16, 1944, the defendant having entered a plea of guilty, a fine of \$50 on each count, a total fine of \$450 and costs, was imposed.

**1342. Misbranding of G. T. A. Cattle Mineral, and Superior Chemicals. U. S. v. 113 Bags of Cattle Mineral, 84 Cans, 198 Bags, and 250 Bags of Superior Chemicals, and an unknown number of Circulars. Decree of condemnation. Products ordered released under bond.** (F. D. C. No. 11155. Sample Nos. 8225-F to 8228-F, incl.)

On November 23, 1943, the United States attorney for the District of North Dakota filed a libel against 113 100-pound bags of G. T. A. Cattle