

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "Ether \* \* \* U. S. P.", was false and misleading when applied to an article that contained aldehyde.

On March 19, 1937, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and it was ordered that the product be delivered to a certain United States Veterans' Hospital, for use in removing adhesive plaster.

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**27242. Misbranding of citrate of magnesia. U. S. v. 23 Dozen Bottles of Citrate Magnesia. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 39068. Sample no. 26587-C.)**

This product differed from its standard as prescribed in the United States Pharmacopoeia in that 10 cubic centimeters of it contained citric acid equivalent to not more than 25.35 cubic centimeters of half-normal hydrochloric acid. The bottle contained less than the volume declared on the label.

On or about February 16, 1937, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 23 dozen bottles of citrate of magnesia at Hackensack, N. J., alleging that it had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 1, 1936, and January 20, 1937, by the Certified Magnesia Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y., and that it was misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, "Citrate Magnesia \* \* \* U. S. P.", borne on the bottle labels, and "Certified Magnesia U. S. P.", borne on the bottle cap, were false and misleading in that they represented that it was a drug named in the United States Pharmacopoeia; whereas it contained less citric acid than is required in such drug by the pharmacopoeia.

The article was alleged to be misbranded further in that the statements, "Net Contents About 11½ Ounces", borne on the label, and "Cont. Approx. 11 Fl. Oz.", borne on the bottle cap, were false and misleading in that they represented that the bottles each contained 11 fluid ounces or more; whereas in fact the bottles each contained less than 11 fluid ounces of the article.

On March 19, 1937, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**27243. Adulteration and misbranding of absorbent cotton. U. S. v. 37 Pounds of Absorbent Cotton. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 39080. Sample no. 16973-C.)**

This product was represented on the label as having been sterilized, when it was not sterile but was contaminated with viable micro-organisms.

On or about February 15, 1937, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 37 pounds of absorbent cotton, in 1-ounce and 2-ounce packages, at Newark, N. J., alleging that it had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 24, 1936, by the Deane Plaster Co., from Yonkers, N. Y., and that it was adulterated and misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, namely, "Absorbent Cotton Sterilized", in that it was not sterile but was contaminated with viable micro-organisms including gas-producing organisms.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "Sterilized", was false and misleading when applied to an article that was not sterile but was contaminated with viable organisms including gas-producing organisms.

On March 19, 1937, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**27244. Misbranding of Summus. U. S. v. 34 Bottles of Summus. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 39082. Sample no. 20362-C.)**

The label of this product bore false and fraudulent curative or therapeutic claims.

On February 15, 1937, the United States attorney for the District of Rhode Island, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the dis-