Stubborn Cases of Barb Wire Cuts, Grease Heel, Hard and contracted Feet, Seemingly incurable running sores on neck and shoulders, etc."

On July 13, 1937, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

27721. Misbranding of Emulsified Dionol. U. S. v. 1,762 Bottles of Emulsified Dionol. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond for relabeling. (F. & D. No. 39689. Sample No. 38071–C.)

The label of this product bore false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative and therapeutic effects. It was also labeled to indicate that it consisted of emulsified hydrocarbon oils; whereas it was not an emulsion, and contained ingredients other than hydrocarbon oils.

On June 7, 1937, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 1,762 bottles of Emulsified Dionol at Brooklyn, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce between the dates of January 14 and May 12, 1937, by the Dionol Co. from Detroit, Mich., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted of mineral oil (upper layer), with water and alcohol (lower layer), flavored with methyl salicylate.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements were false and misleading: (Bottle) "Emulsified * * * pure hydro-carbon oils," (carton) "Emulsified * * * a pure, selected hydro-carbon oil."

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the following statements regarding its curative or therapeutic effects were false and fraudulent; (Bottle) "Used in internal inflammatory processes, gastric and duodenal ulcerations, gastritis, colitis, etc. Also as a lubricant in impaction and allied affections"; (carton) "Useful as a lubricant in impaction * * * and allied affections."

On August 17, 1937, the Dionol Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered, and the product was ordered released under bond conditioned that it be relabeled under the supervision of this Department.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

27722. Misbranding of Monitol Bath Treatment. U. S. v. 28 Cans of Monitol Bath Treatment (and two other seizure actions against the same product). Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 39691, 39692, 39693. Sample Nos. 33670–C, 42769–C, 42770–C.)

The labeling of this product bore false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative and therapeutic effects. It was misbranded further because it was labeled to convey the impression that it was a naturally occurring substance; whereas it was a manufactured substance.

On June 8 and June 10, 1937, the United States attorneys for the Western District of New York and the Northern District of Indiana, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in their respective district courts libels praying seizure and condemnation of 59 dozen cans of Monitol Bath Treatment at Buffalo, N. Y., and 28 cans of Monitol Bath Treatment at Fort Wayne, Ind., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 10 and April 12, 1937, by the H. A. Montgomery Co. from Detroit, Mich., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that it consisted essentially of water and an ichthammollike material.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements borne on the metal container were false and misleading when applied to an article that was not a naturally occurring substance: "Monitol is an organic substance of mineral origin * * * Monitol as it comes to you in this container, is a chemical refinement of a prehistoric substance, that oozes to the surface of the earth in pools in a few places on our western plains." It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the following statements regarding its curative or therapeutic effects were false and fraudulent: (Metal container) "Relief from pain is usually experienced after the first Monitol bath. Additional Monitol baths from time to time give increasing relief in most cases. Obstinate cases may require a Monitol bath daily for several days in succes-