

additional 8 pounds the dose should be increased $\frac{1}{2}$ ounce; that in the vent treatment for turkeys there should be at least 10 days between the 2 treatments, and that the 10 to 1 solution should be used but that one-third as much as recommended in the table should be given; and that the article was as safe as well as a sure worm expeller, which representations were false and misleading since the article was not efficacious for the purposes recommended.

On December 20, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

DRUGS IN DECEPTIVE CONTAINERS*

106. Misbranding of quinine sulfate. U. S. v. 8 Dozen Bottles of Quinine Sulfate. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 630. Sample No. 65983-D.)

The containers of this product were deceptive, since the contents occupied approximately one-half of the available space in the bottle. Moreover, the bottles contained less than one-thirtieth of an ounce, the amount declared on the label.

On or about October 2, 1939, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Florida filed a libel against 8 dozen bottles of quinine sulfate at Tallahassee, Fla., alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about August 28, 1939, by South Georgia Manufacturing Co. from Blakely, Ga.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Misbranding was alleged in that the statement on the label, " $\frac{1}{30}$ of an ounce," was false and misleading when applied to an article that was short weight. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its container was so filled as to be misleading.

On December 19, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

107. Misbranding of salicylic acid. U. S. v. 324 Packages of Salicylic Acid. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 1059. Sample No. 75531-D.)

The containers of this product were filled to slightly less than half their capacity. Weighings of the contents showed shortages from the declared weight in most of the samples examined.

On December 1, 1939, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky filed a libel against 324 packages of salicylic acid at Stanford, Ky., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about August 17, 1939, by the Cumberland Manufacturing Co. from Nashville, Tenn.; and charging that it was misbranded.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation on the labeling that the packages contained three-eighths of an ounce was false and misleading since it was not correct. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its container was so filled as to be misleading.

On January 8, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

108. Misbranding of Eye-Gene Eye Drops. U. S. v. 82 Packages of Eye-Gene Eye Drops. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 975. Sample No. 47985-D.)

The bottles containing this product occupied only 33.17 percent of the capacity of the carton.

On November 14, 1939, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland filed a libel against 82 packages of Eye-Gene Eye Drops at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 29, 1939, by Pearson Pharmacal Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded in that its containers were so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

On December 6, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

109. Misbranding of Locorol. U. S. v. 23 Packages of Locorol. Default decree of condemnation. (F. D. C. No. 919. Sample No. 47982-D.)

The tubes containing this product occupied only 23.8 percent of the volume of the carton.

* See also N. J. Nos. 90, 93, and 94.

On November 18, 1939, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland filed a libel against 23 packages of Locorol at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about August 9, 1939, by Peck & Sterba, Inc., from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded in that its containers were so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading. It was labeled in part: "Locorol for Feminine Hygiene B-package without applicator."

On December 6, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

110. Misbranding of ephedrine jelly. U. S. v. 120 Packages of Ephedrine Jelly. Default decree of condemnation. Product delivered to charitable institution. (F. D. C. No. 914. Sample No. 68144-D.)

The tubes containing this product occupied approximately 20 percent of the capacity of the carton.

On November 10, 1939, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York filed a libel against 120 packages of ephedrine jelly at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 9, 1939, by the Purity Drug Co. from Passaic, N. J.; and charging that it was misbranded in that the cartons were so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

On December 5, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be delivered to a charitable institution.

111. Misbranding of Refill Lanteen Jelly. U. S. v. 66 Packages of Refill Lanteen Jelly. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 977. Sample No. 47981-D.)

The tubes containing this product occupied only 26.8 percent of the total volume of the carton containers.

On November 14, 1939, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland filed a libel against 66 packages of Refill Lanteen Jelly at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 16, 1939, by Lanteen Medical Laboratories, Inc., from Chicago, Ill.; and charging that it was misbranded in that its container was so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

On December 6, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

112. Misbranding of Neo-Synephrin Hydrochloride Jelly. U. S. v. 128 Packages of Neo-Synephrin Hydrochloride Jelly. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 1189. Sample No. 68615-D.)

This product was contained in collapsible metallic tubes which occupied approximately 15 percent of the capacity of the cartons.

On December 14, 1939, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 128 packages of Neo-Synephrin Hydrochloride Jelly at Newark, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 12 and October 13, 1939, by Frederick Stearns & Co. from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded in that its container was so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

On February 8, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

113. Misbranding of First-Aid Bandages. U. S. v. 346 Cans of First-Aid Bandages. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered delivered to public institution. (F. D. C. No. 1005. Sample No. 82507-D.)

The containers of this product were deceptive, since the contents occupied only approximately one-half of the available space in the package.

On or about November 18, 1939, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia filed a libel against 346 cans of bandages at Atlanta, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 25, 1939, by Hampton Manufacturing Co. from Carlstadt, N. J.; and charging that it was misbranded in that its containers were so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading. The article was labeled in part: "Blue Grass First-Aid Bandage Waterproof with Mercurochrome H W & D."

On December 6, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered delivered to a public institution.