was operated by an electric motor to produce motion of the pedals, seat, and handle bars.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the booklets were false and misleading. These statements represented and suggested that the use of the *Exercycle* as directed would be effective to keep one fit, to correct overweight in various portions of the body, to improve posture, to prevent and correct intestinal, circulatory, and nervous disturbances, to maintain all organs of the body in a healthy state, to change mental attitude, to strengthen bones and joints, to protect against gall bladder disturbances, to relieve backache, dysmenorrhea, arthritis, and myositis, and to overcome muscle weakness resulting from poliomyelitis. The use of the *Exercycle* as directed would not be effective for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: On May 15, 1947, the Exercycle Co. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered against the *Exercycles*, and it was ordered that they be released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency.

On June 17, 1947, judgment of condemnation was entered against, the booklets entitled "Keeping Fit," "Health in Action," and "Interesting Exercycle Facts," and it was ordered that they be destroyed.

DRUGS FOR VETERINARY USE

2238. Misbranding of Beebe Rispol. U. S. v. Beebe Laboratories, Inc., and Dr. Sivert Eriksen. Pleas of guilty. Fines, \$100 against individual and \$300 against corporation. (F. D. C. No. 21480. Sample No. 19762–H.)

INFORMATION FILED: On or about June 5, 1947, District of Minnesota, against Beebe Laboratories, Inc., St. Paul, Minn., and Dr. Sivert Eriksen, general manager.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about March 2, 1946, from the State of Minnesota into the State of Iowa. A number of accompanying circulars entitled "Beebe Bulls Eye" were shipped during the month of April 1946.

PRODUCT: Analysis showed that the product was a solution containing essentially camphoraceous oils, menthol, methyl salicylate, formaldehyde, and soap.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the circulars were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article when used as directed would be efficacious in helping to stimulate deep breathing of poultry, and that it would be efficacious in the cure, mitigation, and treatment of colds, bronchitis, pneumonia, air sac infection, and deep-seated conditions of poultry, and calf pneumonia and colds of pigs. The article would not be efficacious for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: September 23, 1947. Pleas of guilty having been entered, the court imposed fines of \$100 against the individual and \$300 against the corporation.

2239. Misbranding of Germ-O-Tone. U. S. v. Dean M. Schlarbaum (Germ-O-Tone Laboratories). Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$200. (F. D. C. No. 22023. Sample Nos. 44905–H, 44906–H.)

INFORMATION FILED: April 8, 1947, District of Arizona, against Dean M. Schlarbaum, trading as the Germ-O-Tone Laboratories, at Phoenix, Ariz.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: During the period from July 17 to August 3, 1946, from the State of Arizona into the State of California.

PRODUCT: Analysis disclosed that the product consisted essentially of an aqueous liquid containing compounds of calcium, sulfur, iodide, and probably nitrate.

Nature of Charge: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the labels of the article were false and misleading since they represented, suggested, and created the impression that the article was efficacious in the prevention and removal of intestinal worms in poultry, livestock, and dogs, and of lice, mites, bluebugs, fleas and ticks from all age poultry, livestock, and dogs; that it would be efficacious in the prevention of diarrhea, coccidiosis, and other bowel troubles in baby chicks, poults, growing and adult poultry, and livestock; and that it would be efficacious in the treatment of distemper in all types of livestock, of sorehead, roup, ear canker, and sore hocks in rabbits, and of sorehead, roup, and chickenpox in poultry. The article was not efficacious in the treatment, prevention, and removal of such conditions.