was adulterated and misbranded. It was labeled in part: "Russian Oil U. S. P. Mineral Oil * * * General Drug & Oil Co., Inc., Boston, Mass."

It was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be and was represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in an official compendium and its strength differed from, or its quality or purity fell below, the standard set forth in such compendium.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representations in the labeling that it was "Genuine Pure Russian Oil U. S. P. Mineral Oil" were false and misleading.

On May 2, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

159. Adulteration and misbranding of quinine sulfate. U. S. v. 132 Bottles of Quinine Sulfate. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 1313. Sample No. 84280–D.)

This product contained moisture in excess of the amount specified by the United States Pharmacopoeia. The containers were deceptive since their contents occupied only about 89 percent of the capacity of the bottles. Most of the bottles examined contained less than the amount indicated by the label.

On or about January 15, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Arkansas filed a libel against 132 bottles of quinine sulfate at Fort Smith, Ark., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on September 18, 1939, by the Frank Tea & Spice Distributing Co. from Cincinnati, Ohio; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be and was represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia and its strength differed from and its quality fell below the standard set forth in the said pharmacopoeia since the moisture content was 8.9 percent; whereas the pharmacopoeia specifies that quinine sulfate shall contain not more than 5 percent moisture.

Misbranding was alleged in that representations appearing in the labeling that the article was U. S. P. X. quinine sulfate and contained about 15 percent water of crystallization and complied with tests laid down in the U. S. Pharmacopoeia for quinine sulfate, were false and misleading. The article was alleged to be misbranded further in that the statement "No. ⅛," borne on the wrapper and carton, meant that the bottles contained ⅛ ounce, and was false and misleading since it was incorrect. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the containers were so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

On March 25, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

160. Adulteration and misbranding of peroxide of hydrogen. U. S. v. 708 Bottles of Peroxide of Hydrogen. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 838. Sample No. 74042–D.)

This product contained not more than 1.87 grams of H_2O_2 per 100 cc.; whereas the pharmacopoeia requires that solution of hydrogen peroxide shall contain not less than 2.5 grams of H_2O_2 per 100 cc. It contained about double the amount of preservative (in this case acetanilid) specified in the pharmacopoeia and about double the amount declared on the label. Its labeling bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy in the treatment of boils, sores, and abscesses.

On or about October 30, 1939, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut filed a libel against 708 bottles of peroxide of hydrogen at New London, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 28, 1939, by the Sunlight Chemical Corporation from Phillipsdale, R. I.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.

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 and its quality and purity fell below the standard set forth therein for solution of hydrogen peroxide. It was alleged to be adulterated further in that its strength differed from and its quality fell below that which it purported or was represented to possess in that it was represented to contain 3 percent of H_2O_2 but contained a smaller amount.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it contained 3/16 grain of acetanilid per fluid ounce and was efficacious in the treatment of boils, sores, and abscesses, were false and misleading since it contained slightly less than ½ grain of acetanilid per fluid ounce and was not a competent treatment for boils, sores, and abscesses.