coughs, the mouth often fills with froth. If not checked it may cause deat Use F. W. McNess' ChickO giving it in all drinking water, a teaspoonful to pint of water. * * * First signs of disease. A healthy comb is clean, brig red in color. Any change from this, such as white spots or scurvy, dark r black, purple color on the comb are sure indications of trouble. Healt droppings are firm, solid and tipped with white. If droppings are soft, gre light brown or yellowish in color and especially the white tip is absent, lo out for trouble. On a first indication of disease give F. W. McNess' ChickO the drinking water."

On November 8, 1935, no claimant having appeared for the property, ju ment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered by the court that t product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture*

25073. Misbranding of Anti Headache Tablets. U. S. v. 336 Packages of A Headache Tablets. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, s destruction. (F. & D. no. 33646. Sample no. 47699–A.)

Examination of the product involved in this action disclosed that it c tained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing c tain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling.

On October 10, 1934, the United States attorney for the Northern Distr of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 336 packa of Anti Headache Tablets at Oakland, Calif., alleging that the article h been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about August 3, 1933, by Furst Thomas, from Freeport, Ill., to Oakland, Calif., and charging misbranding violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "A Headache Tablets * * * Manufactured for Furst-McNess Co. * * Freeport, Illinois, U. S. A."

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially acetanilid (3.28 grains), caffeine, sodium bicarbonate, and starch.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that following statements regarding its curative or therapeutic effects and bo upon its package were false and fraudulent: "These tablets are a boon to th who suffer from violent headaches. * * * Where the headache is cau by Indigestion, Sour Stomach * * * LaGrippe, and similar disorders, th tablets will aid in relieving not only the headache, but the disordered condi of the system as well."

On November 8, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condem tion, forfeiture, and destruction was entered.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agricultur*

25074. Adulteration and misbranding of Lambert's Powders. U. S. v. L bert's Remedies, Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, $10. (F. & D. no. 33 Sample no. 22075–A.)

This case involved a drug preparation which was adulterated and misbran because of deficiency in acetanilid; and which was further misbranded bec of the therapeutic claims and the representations that it was not habit-form or injurious, borne on the labels, examination having shown that it contai no ingredients capable of producing the therapeutic effects claimed and i it contained a drug that might be habit forming and injurious.

On September 24, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of M nesota, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the trict court an information against Lambert's Remedies, Inc., trading at Mi apolis, Minn., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food Drugs Act as amended, on or about February 24, 1933, from the Stat Minnesota into the State of Wisconsin, of a quantity of Lambert's Pow which were adulterated and misbranded.

The article was labeled in part: "E. L. Stanley, Discoverer Lamb Powders * * * Lambert's Inc., Laboratories, Minneapolis, Minn."

Analysis showed that the article contained acetanilid (not more than grains per powder), acetylsalicylic acid (6.1 grains per powder), and sal

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength and pu fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold in each of the powders was represented to contain 2½ grains of acetan whereas each of said powders contained less than 2½ grains, namely, not m than 2.07 grains of acetanilid.