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

represented ⅙ grain of arsenic chloride; whereas its strength differed from and its purity and quality fell below that which it purported or was presented to possess. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement in the labeling that each fluid ounce represented ⅙ grain of arsenic chloride, was false and misleading. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that representations in the labeling that it was an alterative in the treatment of latent syphilis, was a stimulant to the glandular system, and was very effective in anemia, was false and misleading.

Analysis of the Bromophorbia showed that it contained less than 16 grains of sodium iodide, namely, 8.5 grains per fluid ounce. It was alleged to be adulterated in that its labeling represented that each fluid ounce represented 16 grains of sodium iodide; whereas its strength differed from and its purity and quality fell below that which it purported or was represented to possess. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label that each fluid ounce represented 16 grains of sodium iodide, was false and misleading. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the statement in the labeling that it was formerly known as Asthmabrom was false and misleading.

Analysis of the Compound Mixture of Glycyrrhiza showed that it contained a very material proportion of sediment which occupied approximately 22 percent of the volume of the mixture. It was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be or was represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia but its quality and purity fell below the standard set forth in that compendium and the difference in quality and purity was not plainly stated on the label.

Analysis of the Chill Tonic showed that it contained less than 8 grains of quinine sulfate, namely, 7.03 grains of quinine sulfate per fluid ounce. It was alleged to be adulterated in that its labeling represented that each fluid ounce contained 8 grains of quinine sulfate; whereas its strength differed from and its purity and quality fell below such representation. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation in the labeling that each fluid ounce contained 8 grains of quinine sulfate was false and misleading. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that representations in the labeling that it was a chill tonic, was an antimalarial, and that it should be administered in a dosage of 1 to 2 teaspoonfuls well diluted every 3 hours until laxative action resulted, then 3 times daily, were false and misleading, since the article was not efficacious for the purposes recommended.

Analysis of the Laxatonic Cold Tablets showed that each tablet contained less than ½ grain of quinine sulfate, namely, 0.42 grain of quinine sulfate. It was alleged to be adulterated in that it was represented in its labeling as containing ½ grain of quinine sulfate per tablet; whereas its strength differed from and its purity and quality fell below such representation. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation in the labeling that each tablet contained ½ grain of quinine sulfate was false and misleading.

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its name was false and misleading since it was not a laxative tonic as indicated by its name.

Analysis of the nitroglycerin compound tablets showed that they contained less than 1/100 grain, namely, 0.008 (1/125 grain) of nitroglycerin. The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its labeling represented that each tablet contained 1/100 grain of nitroglycerin, whereas its strength differed from and its purity and quality fell below such representation. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation in the labeling that each tablet contained 1/100 grain of nitroglycerin was false and misleading.

Analysis of the iron, arsenic, and strychnine tablets showed that the product consisted essentially of small proportions of iron, arsenous acid, and strychnine sulfate. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation in the labeling regarding its efficacy in neuralgia and general debility was false and misleading since the article was not efficacious for such purpose.

Examination showed that the Strychnine Sulfate Tablets contained not less than 129 percent of the labeled amount of strychnine sulfate. It was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be or was represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in the National Formulary, but its strength differed from and its quality and purity fell below the standard set forth in that compendium, and its difference in strength, quality, and purity was not plainly stated on the label. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation on the label that each tablet contained 1/20 grain of strychnine sulfate, was false and misleading since each tablet contained more than 1/20 grain of strychnine sulfate.

Analysis of the Three Iodides Tablets showed that the article consisted essentially of small proportions of mercuric iodide, arsenic iodide, and iron iodide. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representations in the labeling that it was a hematinic, hepatic stimulant, and general tonic, were false and misleading since it was not efficacious for the purposes recommended.

Analysis of the Aiken Tonic Tablets showed that each tablet contained less than 1 grain of quinine sulfate, namely, 0.73 grain of quinine sulfate, and less than 1/50 grain of arsenous acid, namely, 0.017 grain of arsenous acid. The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its labeling represented that each tablet contained 1 grain of quinine sulfate and 1/50 grain of arsenous acid; whereas its strength differed from and its purity and quality fell below such representations. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation in the labeling that each tablet contained 1 grain of quinine sulfate and 1/50 grain of arsenous acid, was false and misleading. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the representation in the labeling that it was efficacious as a general tonic in all forms of anemia, was false and misleading since it was not efficacious for such purposes.

Analysis of the Blaud and Sumbul Compound Tablets showed that each tablet contained less than 1/50 grain, namely, 0.015 grain of arsenous acid. The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its labeling represented that each tablet contained 1/50 grain of arsenous acid; whereas its strength differed from and its purity and quality fell below such representation. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation in the labeling that each tablet contained 1/50 grain of arsenous acid was false and misleading. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its name was false and misleading since the article contained active ingredients other than Blaud's mass and sumbul.

Analysis of the Ferruginous Tonic Tablets showed that each tablet contained less than 1/50 grain of arsenous acid, namely 0.014 grain of arsenous acid. The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its labeling represented that each tablet contained 1/50 grain of arsenous acid; whereas its strength differed from and its purity and quality fell below such representation. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation in the labeling that each tablet contained 1/50 grain of arsenous acid was false and misleading. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the name was false and misleading since the article contained ingredients possessing tonic properties besides iron.

Analysis of the Blaud and Manganese Compound Tablets showed that the article consisted essentially of iron, manganese, arsenic, strychnine, zinc, aloin, and damiana. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the name was false and misleading since the tablets contained active ingredients other than Blaud's mass and manganese compound. One shipment of the article was alleged to be misbranded further in that the representations in the labeling regarding its efficacy in anemia, chlorosis, and debility, whether from impoverished blood or chronic malaria, were false and misleading since the article was not efficacious for such purposes.

Analysis of the Cactus Compound Tablets showed that the tablets contained less than 1/100 grain, namely, 1/200 grain of nitroglycerin, each. The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its labeling represented that each tablet contained 1/100 grain of nitroglycerin; whereas its strength differed from and its purity and quality fell below such representation. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation in the labeling that each tablet contained 1/100 grain of nitroglycerin was false and misleading. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the name was false and misleading since it contained active ingredients other than cactus.

Analysis of the Cathartic Compound Tablets showed that they contained less than 1 grain of calomel, namely, 0.6 grain of calomel each. The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its labeling represented that each tablet contained 1 grain of calomel; whereas its strength differed from and its purity and quality fell below such representation. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the representation in the labeling that each tablet contained 1 grain of calomel was false and misleading. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that representations in the labeling regarding its efficacy in bilious fever, hepatitis and jaundice, were false and misleading since it was not efficacious for the purposes recommended.

On January 11, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.