

Section 502 (e), the label of the article failed to bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient.

It was also alleged that another article, *American Calcium Pantothenate*, was misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in notices of judgment on foods, No. 8295.

DISPOSITION: June 5, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

DRUGS FOR VETERINARY USE*

1687. Misbranding of Ger-Mo-Kill Wormer & Water Disinfect, Ger-Mo-Kill Sheep and Lamb Bar, and Hog Wormer and Conditioner. U. S. v. Robert S. Cox (Ger-Mo-Kill Chemical Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$300 and costs. (F. D. C. No. 15511. Sample Nos. 8499-F, 8500-F, 8619-F.)

INFORMATION FILED: May 25, 1945, Southern District of Iowa, against Robert S. Cox, trading as the Ger-Mo-Kill Chemical Co., Colfax, Iowa.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: Between the approximate dates of October 28, 1943, and January 18, 1944, from the State of Iowa into the State of Minnesota.

PRODUCT: Analyses disclosed that the *Wormer & Water Disinfect* consisted essentially of naphthalene and small portions of epsom salt, copper sulfate, kamala, nicotine, 0.02 percent, formaldehyde, and creosote; that the *Sheep and Lamb Bar* consisted essentially of naphthalene and small proportions of phenothiazene, 0.56 percent, epsom salt, copper sulfate, and sodium bicarbonate; and that the *Hog Wormer and Conditioner* consisted essentially of epsom salt, copper sulfate, naphthalene, formaldehyde, and small proportions of creosote and oil of chenopodium.

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Wormer and Water Disinfect*, Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in accompanying circulars entitled, "The Benefits of Ger-Mo-Kill Poultry Bars" and "How to Use Ger-Mo-Kill Poultry Bars," were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article possessed germicidal and worm-expelling properties and was a water disinfectant; that it would be effective in the prevention in poultry of coccidiosis, roup, bronchitis, colds, and intestinal infections; that it would be effective in the removal of roundworms, capillaria, pinworms, and tapeworms; that it would be effective in maintaining health and egg production in chickens and turkeys; that it would be effective in preventing worm infestation and blackhead in turkeys and in preventing the spread of coccidiosis, colds, and bronchitis in baby chicks; and that, when administered to fowls, it would destroy worm-eggs, and when administered to baby chicks, it would be effective in preventing worms and would aid in the production of healthy and vigorous pullets. The article did not possess germicidal and worm-expelling properties; it was not a water disinfectant; and it would not be effective for the purposes represented.

Sheep and Lamb Bar, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in an accompanying circular entitled "Ger-Mo-Kill Sheep Bar" were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article possessed germicidal properties; that it would be effective in the elimination and removal of stomach and nodular worms in sheep and lambs; that it would be effective in preventing worms in sheep and lambs and in producing good and large lambs; and that it would be effective as a conditioner for ewes. The article did not possess germicidal properties, and it would not be effective for the purposes represented.

Hog Wormer and Conditioner, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in accompanying circulars entitled "Benefits of Ger-Mo-Kill Pig and Hog Bars" were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article possessed germicidal properties and would be effective as a conditioner; that it would be effective in the removal and destruction of worms in pigs and hogs and in the prevention and treatment of necro and flu in pigs and hogs; that it would be effective in preventing and treating practically all pig trouble and numerous diseases in pigs and hogs; that it would be effective as a conditioner for brood sows; and that it would aid in the production of good, large litters of healthy pigs. The article did not possess germicidal properties, and it would not be effective for the purposes represented.

*See also No. 1665.

DISPOSITION: October 19, 1945. A plea of guilty having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$100 on each of the 3 counts, a total fine of \$300, plus costs.

1688. Misbranding of Sep-Tone. U. S. v. Donald D. Dolan (Dolan Laboratories). Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$200. (F. D. C. No. 15492. Sample Nos. 72064-F, 89736-F.)

INFORMATION FILED: May 7, 1945, Eastern District of Missouri, against Donald D. Dolan, trading as the Dolan Laboratories, St. Louis, Mo.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about June 24 and October 6, 1944, from the State of Missouri into the State of Illinois.

PRODUCT: Analysis disclosed that the product consisted essentially of water, with small amounts of potassium dichromate; sodium, zinc, and copper sulfo-carbolates; ammonium chloride, and an iodide.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the name of the article, "Sep-Tone," was misleading since it represented and created the impression that the article would be an efficacious treatment for septic conditions in poultry, and that it would improve the tone of poultry. The article would not be efficacious for such purposes.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain label statements were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious in the treatment of septic conditions in poultry and rabbits; that it would be efficacious to improve the tone of poultry; that it would be efficacious in the cure, mitigation, treatment, and prevention of enteritis, mycosis, cholera, typhoid, colds, coccidiosis, bronchitis, and other bacterial infections; that it would be efficacious in the treatment of fowls out of condition; and that, in the dilution recommended, it possessed antiseptic properties. The article would not be efficacious for the purposes claimed, and it was not an antiseptic in the dilution recommended.

DISPOSITION: October 16, 1945. A plea of nolo contendere having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$100 on each count, a total fine of \$200.

1689. Misbranding of Illinois Special Sheep Medicine and Illinois Sun Rise Concentrate. U. S. v. 50 Bags of Illinois Special Sheep Medicine and 6 Bags of Illinois Sun Rise Concentrate. Consent decree of condemnation. Products ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. No. 15810. Sample Nos. 22522-H, 22523-H.)

LABEL FILED: On or about April 16, 1945, Eastern District of Missouri.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about January 30, 1945, by the Illinois Manufacturing Co. of Quincy, Quincy, Ill.

PRODUCT: 50 100-pound bags of *Illinois Special Sheep Medicine* and 6 100-pound bags of *Illinois Sun Rise Concentrate* at Lancaster, Mo.

Analyses of samples disclosed that the *Sheep Medicine* consisted essentially of mineral constituents, including 37 percent of salt, tobacco dust, limestone, charcoal, iron sulfate, and small amounts of copper and phosphate, and no potassium iodide; and that the *Concentrate* consisted essentially of plant material, including 20 percent of protein, bran, charcoal, calcium carbonate, soda, sugars, iron oxide, copper sulfate, and yeast.

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Sheep Medicine*, misbranding, Section 502 (a), the following statements in the labeling were false and misleading since the article contained no potassium iodide; it would not assist nature in keeping animals healthy; and it was not effective in the prevention or treatment of stomach worms in sheep and goats: (Bag) "Formula * * * Potassium Iodide"; (circular entitled "Illinois Sheep Medicine (Feed as Directed)") "Assist nature in keeping the animal healthy"; "Under ordinary conditions your sheep and goats should not need drenching for stomach worms where Illinois Sheep Medicine is fed regularly"; "Potassium Iodide."

Concentrate, misbranding, Section 502 (a), the following statements in the labeling were false and misleading since the article would not make oats and wheat more digestible; it was not a substitute for sunshine; it would not enable animals to digest and assimilate nutrients in feed that otherwise would be wasted; it would not furnish minerals essential for digestion, promote vitality, or insure faster growth and development and lower feeding costs; and it was not effective in the treatment of coccidiosis: (Circular entitled "Illinois Sun Rise Concentrate Open Formula") "oats and wheat * * * when Sunrise Concentrate is added, becomes more digestible"; "Sunrise Concentrate contains