This document is made available through the declassification efforts
and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

The Black Vault

The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages released by the U.S. Government & Military.

Discover the Truth at: **http://www.theblackvault.com**

U.S. Department of Justice

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D.C. 20535

February 23, 2018

MR. JOHN GREENEWALD JR.
SUITE 1203
27305 WEST LIVE OAK ROAD
CASTAIC, CA 91384-4520

FOIPA Request No.: 1356840-000
Subject: LEBLANC, DUDLEY

Dear Mr. Greenewald:

You were previously advised we were consulting with another agency concerning information related to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request.

This consultation is complete and the material is enclosed. Material consisting of 16 pages has been reviewed pursuant to Title 5, U.S. Code § 552, and this material is being released to you in its entirety with no excisions being made by the FBI.

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. See 5 U.S. C. § 552(c) (2006 & Supp. IV (2010). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist.

For questions regarding our determinations, visit the www.fbi.gov/foia website under "Contact Us." The FOIPA Request number listed above has been assigned to your request. Please use this number in all correspondence concerning your request. Your patience is appreciated.

You may file an appeal by writing to the Director, Office of Information Policy (OIP), United States Department of Justice, Suite 11050, 1425 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20530-0001, or you may submit an appeal through OIP's FOIAonline portal by creating an account on the following web site: https://foiaonline.regulations.gov/foia/action/public/home. Your appeal must be postmarked or electronically transmitted within ninety (90) days from the date of this letter in order to be considered timely. If you submit your appeal by mail, both the letter and the envelope should be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Act Appeal." Please cite the FOIPA Request Number assigned to your request so that it may be easily identified.

You may seek dispute resolution services by contacting the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at 877-684-6448, or by emailing ogis@nara.gov. Alternatively, you may contact the FBI's FOIA Public Liaison by emailing foipaquestions@fbi.gov. If you submit your dispute resolution correspondence by email, the subject heading should clearly state "Dispute Resolution Services." Please also cite the FOIPA Request Number assigned to your request so that it may be easily identified.

Sincerely,

David M. Hardy
Section Chief,
Record/Information
Dissemination Section
Records Management Division

Enclosure

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Form No. 1
THIS CASE ORIGINATED AT WASHINGTON FIELD

REPORT MADE AT	DATE WHEN MADE	PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE	REPORT MADE BY
WASHINGTON, D. C.	1/9/53	12/22-24,29-31/52 1/2,5-9/53	WILLIAM C. HIGGINS EIW

TITLE	CHARACTER OF CASE
DUDLEY JOSEPH LE BLANC, ETAL	BRIBERY

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

Results of interviews with FTC and FDA attorneys and officials and information re file review at FDA set out. Information re interview with TURNEY GRATZ, former Executive Director, Democratic National Committee, set forth. HORTON'S credit and criminal record set out.

- P -

APPROVED AND FORWARDED:	SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE	DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES
		58-2808-33 RECORDED - 9

COPIES OF THIS REPORT

(3) - Bureau (58-2808) (Encls)
1 - New Orleans (58-91)
2 - Washington Field (58-[illegible])

JAN 12 1953

WFO 58-417

B. INTERVIEW WITH TURNEY GRATZ

Mr. TURNEY GRATZ, 209 Dale Drive, Silver Spring, Maryland, former Executive Director of the National Democratic Committee, was interviewed at his office at 1627 K Street, N. W. Mr. GRATZ by way of background advised that he had been second in command in the National Democratic Committee up until his acceptance of the position as Vice President of the Hadacol Company in March of 1951. Mr. GRATZ stated that he met DUDLEY LeBLANC a short time before this when LeBLANC came into the Democratic Party National Headquarters and introduced himself. GRATZ stated that shortly after their meeting, in casual conversation, he told LeBLANC that he intended to get out of politics and enter private business. Whereupon LeBLANC stated that he would hire GRATZ. Mr. GRATZ advised that LeBLANC offered him the position as Vice President of the Hadacol Company and that he was to have charge of all the export business. GRATZ advised that he told LeBLANC at the time of his acceptance of this vice presidency that the only thing he wanted to be connected with and handle would be the export business and that he would not use his personal friends and contacts for any special favors for LeBLANC. GRATZ stated that there was no doubt in his mind but that LeBLANC wanted to make him Vice President of the Hadacol Company because of his (GRATZ') knowledge of people in public life. Mr. GRATZ advised that LeBLANC had several pending matters in Washington, D. C., that he wanted GRATZ to handle. GRATZ stated that these matters were not those pertaining to the export business, and he merely did them as favors for LeBLANC. He stated that in one situation he attempted to get alcohol rebates expedited for LeBLANC but was unsuccessful. He went on to explain that in this instance the LeBLANC industry, which was a large user of alcohol, was entitled to a tax rebate inasmuch as the alcohol which they purchased was for medicinal purposes. Under the existing regulations, LeBLANC had to pay the regular tax on the alcohol at the time of purchase, but, upon application at the Internal Revenue Bureau, the LeBLANC industry would be reimbursed for the amount of excess tax which they had paid. Mr. GRATZ advised that, as a result of this system, the LeBLANC industries had thousands of dollars tied up in alcohol tax rebates. According to Mr. GRATZ, LeBLANC was considerably upset over this situation and presented the problem to GRATZ and requested that GRATZ contact the Alcohol Tax Unit and see what could be done to expedite these payments. Mr. GRATZ stated that, as a result of this request by LeBLANC, he approached the Alcohol Tax Unit and asked if they could expedite the payments. Mr. GRATZ did not recall the name of the individual he contacted. He stated he was advised that LeBLANC would receive his payment in the due course of business just like any other claimant and that no special effort would be made to push his ahead of other payments.

58 2908-[illegible]33

WFO 58-417

Mr. GRATZ stated that on another occasion LeBLANC requested him to attempt to get the Office of Price Stabilization to render a favorable decision regarding the price of Hadacol. Mr. GRATZ stated that in this instance LeBLANC had made arrangements to purchase bottles, machinery, and labels in order to reduce the size of the bottle of Hadacol; however, he wanted to retain the former sales price of the larger bottles of Hadacol. Mr. GRATZ stated that he personally contacted Mr. MIKE DiSALLE concerning this situation and was advised by DiSALLE that he would have to file an application for the change of price. GRATZ stated he had received no special consideration at that time. Mr. GRATZ advised that, to the best of his knowledge, nothing further had been done about this situation.

Mr. GRATZ pointed out that on another occasion LeBLANC approached him on the problem of getting honey rebates from the Department of Agriculture. Mr. GRATZ explained that in order to help the "bee industry" the Government was offering rebates or subsidies to firms that found a new use for honey. He stated that this was apparently set up so that the bee industry would become more prosperous. The Hadacol Company used approximately 12 drops of honey per bottle of Hadacol as a flavoring agent in order to make the medicine palatable. As a result, the Hadacol Company, according to Mr. GRATZ, became the largest user of honey in the United States. Because of this, Mr. LeBLANC was of the opinion that this subsidy should be paid to his firm. Mr. GRATZ stated that he went to the Department of Agriculture with DUDLEY LeBLANC and in several conferences with the Department of Agriculture attempted to get these payments. Here again, Mr. GRATZ advised, he was unsuccessful in getting payments for LeBLANC. Mr. GRATZ could not recall whom he had contacted or had conferences with in the Agriculture Department concerning this matter.

Mr. GRATZ advised that DUDLEY LeBLANC wanted him to go to the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration on his behalf and attempt to use his knowledge of the people connected with these agencies for LeBLANC's benefit. Mr. GRATZ said that the only contact he would make with the Federal Trade Commission would be to find out what they wanted the Hadacol Company to do and that, thereafter, LeBLANC and his company would have to comply with the regulations as set forth. He stated that he emphatically told LeBLANC that he could get him no special favors. Mr. GRATZ advised that he knew Senator MEAD, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, only as a political acquaintance. He had no connection with him socially or officially and that the only time he had ever been in MEAD's office was in answer to a request of MEAD for information during the investigation conducted by JOHN H. BASS.

58 2808- 33

He stated that he considered MEAD to be a friend in a political sense. He stated that his purpose for telling DUDLEY LeBLANC that MEAD was a personal friend of his was to lay the groundwork for telling LeBLANC that he would not use his personal friends and political connections to LeBLANC's advantage. He stated that he recalled Senator MEAD's calling him regarding some political matter and that, at that time, he told Senator MEAD he was resigning from the National Democratic Committee to accept a vice presidency with the Hadacol Company. Mr. MEAD had told him that they had had considerable difficulty with the Hadacol Company. GRATZ continued that, at that time, Senator MEAD "told me he was awful glad that someone was getting in there who would make him (LeBLANC) behave." GRATZ stated that he told Senator MEAD he "would make LeBLANC comply with Federal Trade Commission regulations and stipulations or he would resign from the company."

Mr. GRATZ advised that he could not recall LeBLANC's talking to him or requesting him to attempt to get an individual favorable to the Hadacol firm appointed as a member of the Federal Trade Commission. He further stated that he had never at any time attempted to secure the appointment of anyone to the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. GRATZ recalled that LeBLANC had wanted to get someone favorable to "patent medicine" appointed to the Food and Drug Administration. In this regard, he had requested that GRATZ help him get someone appointed to this Administration. GRATZ stated that he had asked for a biography of an individual and gave a lot of thought to someone who could be appointed to this Administration and that, as a result, he had introduced MAC HEDRICK to OSCAR EWING, Federal Security Administrator, but he did not recall making any recommendation of anyone for the appointment to the Food and Drug Administration. Mr. GRATZ stated that he is not positive on this point; that he may have recommended some individual, but that he could not recall the name of anyone that he had recommended for a position with the Food and Drug Administration. He stated that he recalled that the meeting he had with OSCAR EWING at the time of the introduction of HEDRICK was rather brief and that EWING had introduced them to some subordinate in the Food and Drug Administration. He stated that this was his only contact with the Food and Drug Administration in regard to the LeBLANC industries.

On another occasion, Mr. GRATZ advised, LeBLANC asked him to make arrangements for LeBLANC to have his picture taken with President HARRY TRUMAN. GRATZ stated he told LeBLANC that he was not that well

58 2808- 33

acquainted with the President and that he could not make such arrangements. He stated that LeBLANC wanted to get this picture so that he could put it on the labels for the bottles of Hadacol. Mr. GRATZ stated that subsequently he received a letter from LeBLANC in which LeBLANC made the statement that he (GRATZ) had told LeBLANC that he would get such a picture. Mr. GRATZ pointed out that he explained to LeBLANC that such a thing was out of reason, and one could not use the high office of the President for such matters.

Mr. GRATZ pointed out that LeBLANC had given him full authority to set up a Washington, D. C., office representing the LeBLANC industries with authority to buy the best of everything. He stated that he was, by this time, becoming suspicious of Mr. LeBLANC and proceeded very cautiously in this regard. Instead of setting up the office under the name of the LeBLANC industries, he purchased the space and furniture under his own name. He stated he did it this way because he was no longer confident that LeBLANC would do as he said he would. Mr. GRATZ stated that, in fact, he had taken a five-year lease on the offices at 915 15th Street and that he is presently subleasing this space.

Mr. GRATZ pointed out that he had been employed with the Hadacol Company for a period of approximately six weeks and that he resigned on April 20, 1951. He stated that all the foregoing incidents occurred during that time and that his entire amount of personal contact with DUDLEY LeBLANC would not total more than 100 hours at the most. Mr. GRATZ pointed out that he "walked out on a quarter million dollars a year because it smelled." He further related that he quit because of several reasons:

1. Because his reputation was suffering from his association with LeBLANC and the Hadacol firm.

2. The export business which LeBLANC had promised to him was not being set up, and no efforts were being made on the part of LeBLANC to do anything in this regard.

3. LeBLANC would not divorce politics from his business and on one occasion on a visit to Louisiana, LeBLANC had introduced him to a public gathering as Executive Director of the National Democratic Committee. On this occasion, he had rebuked LeBLANC and told him that, if he ever introduced him in this manner again, he would publicly refute the statement.

58 2808- 38

4. He stated that he found on his visit to Louisiana that the bank account of the Hadacol Company was overdrawn and that their financial structure was tottering.

Mr. GRATZ advised that he was acquainted with RICHARD BROWN, whom he described as a conscientious, sincere young fellow, who was attempting to keep the Hadacol Company on a sound footing. He stated that he was also acquainted with MAC HEDRICK, whom he described as a former newspaper and advertising man, who represented himself as being the only man who could "handle" LeBLANC. He stated that HEDRICK on several occasions requested that he (GRATZ) take HEDRICK to meet Senator MEAD at the Federal Trade Commission. Mr. GRATZ stated that he had never taken HEDRICK to the Federal Trade Commission and did not know if he had ever become acquainted with Senator MEAD. He stated on another occasion DUDLEY LeBLANC had advised him that HEDRICK had no official connection with the firm. He further advised that he had no knowledge of any money having been given to HEDRICK to "buy influence." Mr. GRATZ stated that L. E. TOWNER and MAC HEDRICK at one time were the advertising agents for the LeBLANC industries and as such would have had access to a considerable amount of money. He stated that he could furnish no information regarding any attempts by anyone connected with the firm to buy influence in Washington or do anything else wrong in connection with Government contacts.

58 2808-

WFO 58-417
RKL/adg

best copy available

C. REVIEW OF FILES OF THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JAMES PIERSON, Division of Regulatory Management, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, made available the Food and Drug files concerning Hadacol to SA WILLIAM K. FENIMORE and SA ROBERT K. LEWIS.

These files were divided into two sections, the first section consisting of five volumes under number 19119. These volumes contained various labels from Hadacol bottles and numerous Hadacol advertisements.

The files reflect a memorandum dated October 21, 1948, reporting an interview between DUDLEY J. LeBLANC, WALTER L. RUBENS, of the Rubens Advertising Company, Chicago, and GEORGE P. LARRICK, Deputy Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration. The memorandum indicates that LeBlanc left a letter with the Food and Drug Administration commenting on the future course of conduct to be followed in the distribution of Hadacol. This letter, dated October 20, 1948, contained in the file, states in part: "I am anxious to comply with every requirement of the law." The letter points out that the Hadacol advertising will be altered, the product will be given control tests, and the booklets entitled "Good Health" will be recalled.

The file contains a memorandum dated October 4, 1948, reflecting that J. SHELLY WRIGHT, Assistant United States Attorney, New Orleans, called R. E. DUGGAN, New Orleans Station, Food and Drug Administration, stating that he wished to bring a court action against Hadacol and wanted to know what Food and Drug was doing on the matter. The memorandum reflects that WRIGHT was informed that reports were being submitted to Washington for decision and also that the Federal Trade Commission was probably interested in the case.

The file contains communications from Louisiana representatives EDWIN E. WILLIS, HENRY D. LARCADE, JR., and F. EDWARD HEBERT, all dated in November 1948, requesting information concerning the proposal of the Food and Drug Administration that the name Hadacol be changed. The files contain a similar communication from Louisiana Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER dated November 26, 1948. The Food and Drug Administration replied to all these inquiries that it had suggested a change of name but had no legal action pending.

A memorandum dated December 9, 1948, reflects a conference between DUDLEY J. LeBLANC, WALTER L. RUBENS, Dr. GEORGE W. HOOVER, and Dr. PAUL B. DUNBAR, Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration. This

[redacted] 58-417
[redacted]/adg

best copy available

[redacted] LeBLANC [redacted] entitled "[redacted]. LeBLANC [redacted] that [redacted] Advertising Agency [redacted] be in charge [redacted] over [redacted] would [redacted] could be continued. [redacted] stated he [redacted] and a new [redacted] made. [redacted] HOOV[redacted] [redacted] time [redacted] impressed by LeB[redacted] the [redacted] experiments [redacted] had made [redacted] under [redacted] time he [redacted]. DUN[redacted] concluded [redacted] that [redacted] the name Hadacol would [redacted] but [redacted] would [redacted] by [redacted].

[redacted] from [redacted] for information [redacted] and [redacted] advertising [redacted]. [redacted] letters [redacted] why the [redacted] and Drug [redacted] had not taken some [redacted] action against [redacted]. The [redacted] and [redacted] replies to these various complaints pointed [redacted] the jurisdiction of Food and Drug was limited to violations of [redacted] labeling laws [redacted] that the Hadacol labels did not conflict with the law. Analyses [redacted] by the Food and Drug Administration showed that the product [redacted] what its label claimed.

The second section of files [redacted] seizure [redacted] of various lots of [redacted]. These files were numbered 6[redacted], [redacted]-41 I, 13-162L, 23-573K, 23-[redacted], 23-433K, 23-[redacted]. 23-12LA, 45-[redacted], [redacted] and 23-5[redacted] through 572K. These files contained information [redacted] place and method of seizure, analysis of the product, and reasons for disapproval of the seizures. It is noted that all of the seizures were disapproved since analysis of the product failed to show any violation of the labeling laws.

D. INTERVIEWS WITH FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

The following interviews were conducted by [redacted] and SA ROBERT K. LEWIS:

Mr. RALPH F. KNEELAND, Jr., Assistant to the Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, stated that he has held his present position since 1940 and was active in the handling of the Hadacol case. He stated that Food and Drug originally thought they could make a case against the LeBLANC Corporation on the theory th

58 2808- 33

the booklet entitled "Good Health" which accompanied Hadacol shipments could be considered as a label. He stated this booklet contained numerous violations of the Pure Food and Drug Laws but that before any action could be brought a Circuit Court decision held that such booklets accompanying products could not be classed as labels. He added that shortly thereafter LeBLANC recalled all these booklets and Food and Drug was therefore unable to bring any action.

KNEELAND stated that he does not recall that he ever met LeBLANC but added that LeBLANC may have called upon Mr. LARRICK, Deputy Commissioner, or Dr. DUNBAR, Commissioner, regarding his problems. He stated that with the exception of Dr. GEORGE HOOVER, he was never contacted by any representative of the LeBLANC Corporation. He stated that Dr. HOOVER had contacted him three or four times strictly on the question of labeling. He stated Dr. HOOVER who was formerly Chief of the Drug Division, Federal Security Agency, did not attempt to exert any influence or pressure in behalf of LeBLANC and in fact desired that the Hadacol label conform with the law.

KNEELAND stated he had never received any gifts from LeBLANC, had no knowledge of any parties held by LeBLANC and had no knowledge of any influence exerted at Food and Drug Administration by anyone in behalf of LeBLANC.

Mr. MORRIS L. YAKOWITZ, Assistant to the Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, advised he has been in his present position a little over four years and was active in the Hadacol case until recently. He stated that when Hadacol was first marketed, highly exaggerated claims were made for it, and Food and Drug considered action on the basis of booklets entitled "Good Health" which if classed as labels were in violation of the Food and Drug Laws. He stated that no action was brought since LeBLANC withdrew all these booklets.

Mr. YAKOWITZ stated that he met DUDLEY LeBLANC on only one occasion which was an official matter regarding labeling of Hadacol. He stated LeBLANC did not attempt any pressure or undue influence at the time of this contact. He also advised that he had been contacted by Dr. GEORGE HOOVER, employed by LeBLANC, whose views tended to support those of the Food and Drug Administration. He stated that HOOVER tried to get LeBLANC to come within the bounds of good conduct.

He stated that he was never contacted by any other representatives of the LeBLANC Corporation with the exception of a HAROLD W. BROWN who had been employed by LeBLANC as a Label Consultant. He stated he met BROWN who had come to Food and Drug on a different matter and was not then employed by LeBLANC and BROWN mentioned to him that LeBLANC had once stated to him that he had brought a large amount of money to Washington and if necessary he would spend it to be allowed to stay in business.

YAKOWITZ stated that ten or twelve Louisiana Congressmen had made inquiry of Food and Drug concerning Hadacol and he said that while inquiries from Congressmen were usually normal and routine, he felt that the large number inquiring about Hadacol was unusual and might have been considered an attempt to influence the Food and Drug Administration.

YAKOWITZ stated he never received any gifts from LeBLANC, had no knowledge of any parties given by LeBLANC, and had no knowledge of any attempt by anyone to influence the Food and Drug Administration on the Hadacol matter.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

CASE ORIGINATED AT: WASHINGTON FIELD			FILE NO.	
REPORT MADE AT: NEW ORLEANS, LA.	DATE WHEN MADE: 1-30-53	PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE: 1-12,22,23,26-53	REPORT MADE BY: EARL COX	EC:FS
TITLE: DUDLEY JOSEPH LE BLANC, ETAL			CHARACTER OF CASE: BRIBERY	

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

Results of interview with E. C. BOUDREAUX, in charge FDA, New Orleans, La., and information from file review of FDA at New Orleans set out. BOUDREAUX met LE BLANC only once; knows of no attempts, undue influence or bribery and feels sure no such attempts were made in New Orleans District with FDA. He knows of no reason to suspect such attempts being directed at officers of FDA in Washington, D. C. File review reflects large collections of labels and advertising data on hadacol and reflects copies of considerable correspondence from FDA officials in Washington to La. members of U. S. Congress in reply to inquiries regarding hadacol investigation.

- R U C -

DETAILS:

AT NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

In connection with the preparation of this report, Mr. E. C. BOUDREAUX, in Charge Food and Drug Administration, was interviewed and files of FDA at New Orleans were reviewed, consisting of Factory Inspection File #2671 and sample reports on samples of hadacol taken from May, 1945 to May of 1952.

EXPEDITE PROCESSING

Mr. E. C. BOUDREAUX, in charge of New Orleans District FDA, advised that FDA had conducted considerable investigation in an

APPROVED AND FORWARDED:	SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE	DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES
		58-2808-38

COPIES OF THIS REPORT

3 - Bureau (58-2808)
2 - Washington Field (58-417)
1 - New Orleans (58-91)

RECORDED 13

5 FEB 25 1953

38

PROPERTY OF FBI—This confidential report and its contents are loaned to you by the FBI and are not to be distributed outside of agency to which loaned.

best copy available

attempt to make a case against DUDLEY JOSEPH LE BLANC, but most of the data that had been compiled had to do with advertising of the product hadacol rather than with the labeling and therefore was a matter falling within the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission rather than FDA. Mr. BOUDREAUX stated that FDA would have to make its case on mislabeling of the product as to contents and composition or on false claims for the product appearing on the label or some pamphlet accompanying the product. He stated further that it appeared in 1948 that FDA had a case against LE BLANC based upon a pamphlet that was being distributed which made fantastic claims for the therapeutic qualities of hadacol but that copies of the pamphlet were recalled by the LE BLANC Corporation and its use discontinued. Mr. BOUDREAUX stated that subsequent to this a number of samples of hadacol were submitted to FDA, in Washington, D. C. for laboratory analysis to determine whether the product conformed to contents shown on the label, but in each instance it was determined that there was substantial compliance in this regard. Mr. BOUDREAUX stated that he recalls meeting LE BLANC only once, on which occasion Mr. LE BLANC came to the FDA Office in New Orleans to inquire about the FDA investigation of hadacol. BOUDREAUX stated that he told LE BLANC that an investigation was under way because of interstate shipment of the product; that he could make no detailed discussion of the matter pending final decisions in connection with the investigation.

BOUDREAUX stated that LE BLANC indicated that he was making a trip to Washington, D. C. to discuss the matter with FDA officials there in an attempt to clear the matter up. He advised further that to his knowledge, LE BLANC had no further contact with the FDA Office in New Orleans, but apparently directed his attention to officials of FDA and FTC.

Mr. BOUDREAUX stated that he has no knowledge of any attempts being made by LE BLANC or his representative to bribe or influence unduly any officials connected with the Hadacol Corporation. He stated that he feels sure that if any such attempts had been made, prosecutive action would have been undertaken at once as "We were all very anxious here to make a case in this matter." BOUDREAUX stated further that he had no reason to believe that LE BLANC had attempted to bribe or unduly influence any person in Washington, D. C. connected with the investigation. Mr. BOUDREAUX emphasized that investigation conducted in the New Orleans District had to do largely with collections of advertising and labeling data and selections of samples for laboratory analysis and that there was very little contact between local employees of FDA and LE BLANC as LE BLANC conferred frequently with FDA officials in Washington, D. C.

58 2808- 38

NO #58-91

REVIEW OF FACTORY INSPECTION FILE NO. 2671, NEW ORLEANS DIVISION, FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

A review of Factory Inspection File #2671 of FDA, New Orleans, reflects a large collection of advertising and labeling data on the product hadacol, copies of which were forwarded to FDA in Washington, D. C., and in the case of advertising data the New Orleans Office of the FTC. There is included in this file a large quantity of advertising material on hadacol which was received from other field offices of FDA throughout the country and a great many letters of inquiry about hadacol and/or complaints about the product. These letters were answered to the effect that FDA is concerned with conducting investigations relating to violations of labeling laws and that FTC has jurisdiction over violations that might arise in connection with advertising matters. Those inquiring were further advised that the product hadacol contained approximately what the label indicated, according to a number of laboratory analyses made of samples of the product. This file also contains copies of numerous letters from FDA officials in Washington, D. C. to U. S. Senators from Louisiana and Louisiana Congressmen who had made inquiries on behalf of LE BLANC about the Hadacol Corporation investigation during 1948 and 1949. Among those to whom this correspondence was directed were Senator ELLENDER, Senator LONG and Representatives WILLIS, LARCADE, HEBERT, BOGGS and BROOKS.

A memo by Mr. E. C. BOUDREAUX dated October 13, 1948, indicates that LE BLANC visited the FDA Office in New Orleans on October 13, 1948 and conferred with Mr. BOUDREAUX and Mr. B. L. EDGERTON. He is indicated as stating that he planned to extend operations in the product hadacol and he wanted to know how he stood with Federal laws. This memo reflects that LE BLANC stated that he had contacted FTC officials in Washington, D. C. and felt that everything was "okeh" with FTC. The memorandum further indicates that LE BLANC was advised by Mr. BOUDREAUX that investigation was under way but that he, BOUDREAUX, was not in a position to discuss the matter fully pending final decisions. It was indicated that LE BLANC was considering contacting FDA officials in Washington.

The file contains an inspection report dated February 8, 1949 made to FDA in Washington, D. C., calling attention to the use of sound trucks in the advertising of hadacol on which trucks appeared advertising which was believed to be in violation of Food and Drug regulations. The local office requested advice regarding possible violations in this regard. Also contained in this file is a copy of a letter dated June 16, 1949 from LE BLANC to GEORGE LARRICK, FDA Official, regarding the advertising which was printed on the above. This letter indicates that the objectionable printing on all of the other trucks of the LE BLANC Corporation had been painted over and this one truck which had not been re-painted through neglect on part of the garage man, had been used through inadvertence on this one occasion when it was photographed by inspectors of

NO #58-91

FDA. There also appears in this file a copy of a letter dated June 30, 1949 from Mr. GEORGE P. LARRICK, FDA, replying that he was glad to learn that claims involving a number of serious diseases which appeared on the above truck used to transport hadacol remained on the truck through inadvertence.

The file also reflects a memorandum dated July 30, 1951, indicating that Mr. I. H. LUTZKER, representative of WALTER E. HELLER and Company, and Mr. MORRIS L. YARKOWITZ, Assistant to the Commissioner, FDA, discussed the hadacol investigation in connection with inquiry made by LUTZKER whose firm had been requested to act as "factors" for the LE BLANC Corporation. LUTZKER is reported to have stated that he had talked with Mr. HORTON of FTC and got a copy of the stipulation between the LE BLANC Corporation and FTC. LUTZKER indicated that HORTON had said that FTC was about to investigate the present advertising of hadacol to ascertain whether it complied with the cease and desist agreement of August, 1950.

This file further indicates that a Factory Inspection of the Hadacol Corporation is contemplated in the near future to determine the conditions in the plant and the extent and method of present operations.

SAMPLES OF PRODUCT HADACOL SUBMITTED FOR LABORATORY ANALYSIS

A review of these files indicate that a great many samples of hadacol were submitted to the FDA in Washington, D. C., for laboratory analysis to determine whether there was any deficiency in the contents and composition of the product as indicated on the labels. In each instance it was found that there was substantial compliance with the law and the product contained approximately what was indicated on the label.

Samples were submitted on the following dates for analysis:

March 15, 1945
March 8, 1948
July 24, 1948
September 22, 1948
September 24, 1948
September 25, 1948
September 28, 1948 (2 separate samples)
September 29, 1948
October 11, 1948
January 10, 1949
June 10, 1949
May 2, 1941

As was stated above, these samples were found to comply substantially with the laws enforced by FDA and therefore, no further investigation was conducted in connection with the various samples.

- R U C -

58 2808- 38

NO #58-91

REFERENCES:

Washington Field teletype to the Bureau and New Orleans dated January 8, 1953

Washington Field Airtel to the Bureau and New Orleans dated January 13, 1953.

58 2808- 38