

wool wax (lanum). It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements on the label, "Prostatic Absorbent" and "Soothing and relieving Chronic conditions of the Prostate and Bladder neck," were false and misleading; and for the five further reasons appearing in the first paragraph of this notice.

Analysis of a sample of Aesculus Pile Cerate showed that it consisted essentially of ichthammol, tar oil, and extracts of plant drugs incorporated in petrolatum. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the designation "Pile Cerate" and the statement "Relieves Bleeding, Itching, Blind, Protruding, Ulcerated Piles," on the carton label were false and misleading; and for the four further reasons appearing in the first paragraph of this notice.

Between December 31, 1940, and January 29, 1941, default decrees were entered ordering that the products be destroyed.

437. Misbranding of Syn-O-Scope and Synex. U. S. v. 9 Packages of Syn-O-Scope and 8 Bottles of Synex. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 3551, 3552. Sample Nos. 52531-E, 52532-E.)

Each package of the Syn-O-Scope consisted of a vaporizing apparatus and a small unlabeled vial of liquid. The vaporizing apparatus would have been dangerous to health when used according to directions, and the label also bore false and misleading therapeutic claims. The vial of liquid and the bottles of Synex also failed to comply with certain labeling requirements of the law.

On December 23 and on or about December 27, 1940, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Washington filed libels against the above-named products at Spokane, Wash., alleging that the articles had been shipped on or about August 24, 1940, by Syn-O-Scope Laboratories from Los Angeles, Calif.; and charging that they were misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the liquid contained in each package of Syn-O-Scope and of Synex showed that they consisted essentially of alcohol (19.5 percent by volume), camphor, eucalyptus oil, and water.

The Syn-O-Scope was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that it would be dangerous to health when used in the dosage or with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling, namely, "Syn-O-Scope The Modern and Scientific Instrument for the Application Of Medicaments To Irritated And Congested Nasal Passages. Directions: Unscrew the cap where hose is attached to Syn-O-Scope. Allow 15 to 20 drops of medicant to flow into the sponge within the barrel. Replace cap. Then, merely place the tip in the nostril, holding it in position by the hand. Grasp the mouthpiece between the lips and blow. Use the amount of pressure suitable to your own case, but not too hard at first. The harder you blow, the deeper the medicated vapor reaches into the nasal cavities. Each day of active use add 3 to 5 drops of medicament to the sponge." (2) In that the following statements, (carton) "Syn-O-Scope The Modern Treatment For Nasal Irritations And Congestions," and (circular) "Syn-O-Scope The Modern And Scientific Instrument For The Application of Medicaments To Irritated And Congested Nasal Passages," were false and misleading since they represented that it was efficacious for the purposes recommended; whereas it was not efficacious for such purposes. (3) In that the carton and vial containing the liquid did not bear the common or usual names of the active ingredients, including the quantity of alcohol. (4) In that the vial containing the liquid failed to bear a label containing the name and address of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor. (5) In that the carton and vial containing the liquid failed to bear a label containing a statement of the quantity of contents.

The Synex was alleged to be misbranded in that the label failed to bear (1) the common or usual names of the active ingredients; (2) the name and address of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and (3) an accurate statement of the quantity of contents.

On February 24, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

438. Misbranding of Wonder Salve. U. S. v. 13 Cans of Wonder Salve. Consent decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3164. Sample No. 19079-E.)

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy as indicated hereinafter. The article would be dangerous to health when used in the manner recommended and suggested in the labeling.

On October 10, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 13 cans of Wonder Salve at Pittsburgh, Pa.,