potency of less than three tenths of that required by the authority in which described; of a lot of fluidextract of digitalis, a product recognized in the National Formulary, and which was practically inert; and a lot of fluidextract of squill compound which when tested for the physiological activity of its squill content, was found to be practically devoid of activity. The fluidextract of aconite and fluidextract of digitalis, because of their low potency, would not produce certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed on the labels, in the dosages recommended.

On December 17, 1934, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court libels praying seizure and condemnation of 16 bottles of fluidextract of aconite, 13 bottles of tincture of aconite, 8 bottles of fluidextract of digitalis, and 19 bottles of fluidextract of squill compound at New Orleans, La., alleging that the articles had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about March 27, 28, and 30, 1934, by the Southwestern Drug Corporation from Houston, Tex., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

The articles were alleged to be adulterated in the following respects: The fluidextract of aconite and the fluidextract of digitalis were sold under names recognized in the National Formulary, and differed from the standard of strength as determined by the tests laid down therein, and their own standard of strength was not stated on the container; the tincture of aconite was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, and differed from the standard of strength as determined by the test laid down therein, and its own standard of strength was not declared on the container; the strength of the fluidextract of squill compound fell below the standard or quality under which it was sold, namely, "Fluid Extract Squill Compound * * * Standard of Strength—One Pint represents Squill * * * 8 troy ounces."

Misbranding of the tincture of aconite, fluidextract of digitalis, and fluidextract of squill compound was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Tinct. Aconite * * * U. S. P.", "Fluid * * * Extract Digitalis * * * Standard—1 Cc. representing 1 gram of the drug", "Fluid Extract Squill Compound * * * Standard of Strength—One Pint represents Squill * * * 8 troy ounces", were false and misleading. Misbranding of the fluidextract of aconite and fluidextract of digitalis was alleged for the reason that the following statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the articles, (fluidextract of aconite) "Properties A powerful nerve and arterial sedative; anti-pyretic, lowering temperature, reducing pulse * * * Dose of the Fluid Extract—½ to 2 minims (0.03 to 0.12 Cc.)", (fluidextract of digitalis) "Properties—Cardiac Tonic. Used in dropsy depending directly upon diseases of the heart. Useful in chronic bronchitis with profuse secretion, lessening pulmonary congestion and secretion. Uterine hemorrhage may be controlled by digitalis. * * * Dose of the Fluid Extract—½ to 2 minims (0.03 to 0.12 Cc.)", were false and fraudulent, since the articles in the dosages stated on the labels would not produce the effects claimed.

On January 8 and 11, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and it was ordered that the products be destroyed.

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

24115. Adulteration of epinephrine U. S. P. 1-1000. U. S. v. Nine 1-Ounce Vials of Epinephrine U. S. P. 1-1000. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 34567. Sample nos. 17948-B, 24211-B.)

This case involved a drug preparation labeled "Epinephrin U. S. P. 1-1000." Analysis showed that the article was inert when tested biologically by the method prescribed in the United States Pharmacopoeia for solution of epinephrine hydrochloride.

On December 17, 1934, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of nine 1-ounce vials of epinephrine U. S. P. 1-1000 at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 12, 1934, by the Wilson Laboratories, from Chicago, Ill., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, namely, "Epinephrin U. S. P. 1-1000."

On January 25, 1935, no claimant appearing, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed, leave being granted to the Wilson Laboratories to take two bottles as samples.

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

24116. Misbranding of Red Cross Pills. U. S. v. 80 Boxes and 57 Boxes of Red Cross Pills. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. nos. 34673, 34674. Sample nos. 25932-B, 25933-B.)

These cases involved interstate shipments of a drug preparation which was misbranded because of unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims on the labels.

On or about January 3, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of Rhode Island, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court libels praying seizure and condemnation of 137 boxes of Red Cross Pills at Providence, R. I., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 15, November 2, and November 28, 1934, by the Red Cross Chemical Co., Inc., from Fall River, Mass., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of ferrous carbonate, compounds of arsenic and manganese, potassium sulphate, and extracts of plant materials including strychnine and aloin.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements on the bottle label were statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article and were false and fraudulent: (Bottle) "Will Make Your Cheeks Red * * * Recommended in Anaemia, Irregular and Painful Menstruation, Kidney and Bladder Troubles, Indigestion * * * and all impurities of the Blood. [in foreign language] Recommended particularly in the painful cases of irregular menses; they enrich the blood and cure the constipation, the liver and the kidneys."

On January 22, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

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

24117. Adulteration and misbranding of compound Epsom salt tablets. U. S. v. 284 Bottles of Compound Epsom Salt Tablets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 34675. Sample no. 21146-B.)

This case involved a product labeled to convey the impression that it was essentially a preparation of Epsom salt. Analysis showed that it contained phenolphthalein and a laxative plant drug which would produce its principal physiological effects, the Epsom salt present being relatively unimportant.

On December 28, 1934, the United States attorney for the Northern 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 284 bottles of compound Epsom salt tablets at Binghamton, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 24, 1934, by the Marlo Products Co., from Cleveland, Ohio, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis showed that the tablets consisted essentially of phenolphthalein (0.6 grain per tablet), Epsom salt (2.37 grains per tablet), and a laxative plant drug, and were coated with sugar and calcium carbonate.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, namely, "Compound Epsom salt tablets."

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the label, "Compound Epsom salt tablets", was false and misleading, since the amount of Epsom salt contained in the article was so small that it would have no detectable physiological effect.

On February 28, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

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

24118. Misbranding of Mastin's Vitamon Tablets. U. S. v. 18 Dozen Packages of Mastin's Vitamon Tablets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35041. Sample no. 21172-B.)

This case involved a drug preparation which was misbranded because of unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims in the labeling.