or about April 5, 6, and 7, 1939, by F. E. Ketchum from Salem, Oreg.; and charging that it was adulterated.

Adulteration was alleged in that the article purported to be or was represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia and its strength differed from the standard set forth for digitalis since its potency varied between 61 percent and 62 percent of that required.

On May 22, 1940, the Western Trading Co., Inc., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it be properly labeled and that it be disposed of in the manufacture of preparations which are not official, and in which properly calculated extra quantities of the drug should be used to standardize such preparations to their ordinary or usual potency of digitalis extract.

167. Adulteration and misbranding of digitalis tablets. U. S. v. 1 Metal Drum and 10,791 Bottles of Digitalis Tablets. Decree ordering product released under bond for relabeling. (F. D. C. No. 675. Sample No. 47831–D.)

These tablets were represented to contain 92.3 milligrams of powdered digitalis each; whereas they contained approximately 50 milligrams of powdered digitalis each.

On October 5, 1939, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia filed a libel against 1 metal drum containing 70,000 digitalis tablets, and 10,791 bottles containing a total of 1,063,560 digitalis tablets, at Dumbarton, Va., alleging that the article had been introduced into interstate commerce within the period from on or about March 11 to on or about March 23, 1938, by the Maltbie Chemical Co. from Newark, N. J.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. When introduced into interstate commerce, it was labeled: "Each tablet contains: Po. Digitalis, 92.3 Milligrams."

It was alleged in the libel that the article, when introduced into interstate commerce, was adulterated in that its strength differed from that which it purported or was represented to possess.

It was further alleged that the article was misbranded when introduced into interstate commerce in that the representation in the labeling that each tablet contained 92.3 milligrams of powdered digitalis was false and misleading, since each tablet contained less than so represented.

On December 19, 1939, the Wilber Co., Inc., Dumbarton, Va., having appeared as claimant, judgment was entered ordering that the product be released under bond conditioned that it be relabeled in conformity with the law under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

168. Adulteration and misbranding of drugs. U. S. v. 1¾ Gallons of Eczema Lotion and various other drug products. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 1160. Sample Nos. 70301–D, 70303–D to 70306–D, incl., 70308–D, 70309–D, 70311–D, 70312–D, 70313–D, 70315–D, 70321–D, 70322–D, 70324–D to 70329–D, incl.)

These products were adulterated and/or misbranded as indicated hereinafter.

On December 11, 1939, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against the following drugs located at Camden, N. J.: 1¾ gallons of Eczema Lotion, 19¾ gallons of Chlorotonic, 2 pints of Bromoforbia, 4½ gallons of Compound Mixture of Glycyrrhiza, 3¼ gallons of Chill Tonic, 22,300 Compressed Laxatonic Cold Tablets, 22,300 Compressed Nitro Glycerin Compound Tablets, 28,300 Iron, Arsenic, and Strychnine Tablets, 4,200 Strychnin Sulphate Tablets, 2,500 Tablets Three Iodides, 5,500 Tablets Tonic (Aiken), 14,600 Blaud and Sumbul Compound Tablets, 12,800 Ferruginous Tonic Tablets, 13,150 Blaud and Manganese Compound Tablets, 13,000 Cactus Compound Tablets, and 19,700 Cathartic Compound Tablets. It was alleged in the libel that the articles had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about January 30, 1939, by the Pharmacal Products Co., Dr. C. H. Hadley, receiver, from Easton, Md.; and that they were adulterated and/or misbranded.

Analysis of the Eczema Lotion showed that it consisted essentially of small proportions of mercuric bichloride, hydrocyanic acid, nitric acid, glycerin, and water. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representations in the labeling regarding its efficacy in the treatment of eczema and other diseased conditions of the integument, were false and misleading.

Analysis of the Chlorotonic showed that it contained less than 1/6 grain of arsenic chloride per fluid ounce, namely, 0.145 grain of arsenic chloride. It was alleged to be adulterated in that its labeling represented that each fluid ounce