disappear. Stomach sufferers, here we have a remedy that we guarantee will quickly make disappear stomach ulcers, overcomes indigestion, dyspepsia, belching, headaches, * * * bloating, bad tasting breath, * * * lack of appetite, gnawing empty feeling, lump in the stomach and other stomach symptoms. Reports show chronic and acute cases respond readily to this treatment. Seventy-five per cent of human ailments originate in the stomach. To neglect your stomach troubles is to court danger", falsely and fraudulently represented that the article would be effective in producing the effects claimed.

On June 5, 1936, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

26755. Adulteration and misbranding of epinephrine chloride solution. U. S. v. 2 Packages of Epinephrine Chloride. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 37704. Sample no. 67989–B.)

This article contained less epinephrine chloride than the quantity represented on the label.

On May 7, 1936, the United State attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of two packages, each containing 12 ampoules, of an article labeled "Epinephrine 1:1000", at Denver, Colo., alleging that it had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 12, 1934, from St. Louis, Mo., consigned by the Cole Chemical Co., 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 strength fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, namely, "Epinephrine 1:1000 * * * Each Ampule contains 1 CC. of a * * * 1:1000 Solution of Epinephrine Chloride."

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements on the package and on the cartons of the individual ampoules, "Epinephrine 1:1000 * * * Each Ampule contains 1 CC. of a * * * 1:1000 Solution of Epinephrine Chloride", were false and misleading.

On July 1, 1936, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

26756. Misbranding of rubbing alcohol compound and witch hazel. U. S. v. 119 Bottles of Rubbing Alcohol Compound and 67 Bottles of Witch Hazel. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. nos. 37740, 37741. Sample nos. 62668–B, 62691–B.)

The rubbing alcohol compound contained no ordinary (ethyl) alcohol, but consisted of isopropyl alcohol (the quantity or proportion of which was not declared on the label), and water; and the article designated as "Double Distilled Witch Hazel or Hamamelis N.F." bore false and fraudulent curative and therapeutic claims on its label.

On May 18, 1936, the United States attorney for the Western District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed a libel in the district court praying seizure and condemnation of 119 bottles of rubbing alcohol compound and 67 bottles of Double Distilled Witch Hazel or Hamamelis N.F. at Roanoke, Va., alleging that the articles had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about January 28, 1936, by Sheray, Inc., from New York, N. Y., and that they were misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The rubbing alcohol compound was alleged to be misbranded in that said description on the label was false and misleading, since it represented that the article consisted of ordinary (ethyl) alcohol, when in fact it consisted of a mixture of isopropyl alcohol, a byproduct of the petroleum-refining industry, and water. Said article was alleged to be misbranded further in that the label failed to bear a declaration of the quantity or proportion of isopropyl alcohol contained therein, since the statement "Isopropyl Alcohol 70 Proof", on the label, was meaningless.

The Double Distilled Witch Hazel or Hamamelis N.F. was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement appearing upon the label, "For the relief of * * * painful swellings, lame back, piles, sore throat, * * * rheumatism, * * * etc.", falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was capable of producing the curative or therapeutic effects claimed in said statement.

On July 16, 1936, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the products be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*