

with Gauztex. If a wound is large and bleeding freely, * * * If sterile gauze is not available, bandage directly over the wound with Gauztex to * * * protect it. Gauztex protects the wound thoroughly * * * promoting more rapid healing * * * wind Gauztex on to the finger. Cover wound with two or more turns * * * for finger-tip injuries, * * * How many times the children come to Mother with skinned knees and elbows * * * cuts, burns and scratches! How much better they like to have you use Gauztex * * * Gauztex is sterilized—safe to use."

On June 13, 1938, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

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

29010. Misbranding of hydrogen peroxide. U. S. v. 60 Bottles of U. S. P. Hydrogen Peroxide. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 42035. Sample No. 9558-D.)

This product contained a greater amount of acetanilid than declared on the label. It was labeled to represent that it was of United States Pharmacopoeial standard but it differed from that standard since it contained an excess of preservative (acetanilid). It was also short of the declared volume.

On March 24, 1938, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 60 bottles of hydrogen peroxide at Johnstown, Pa.; alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about January 26, 1938, from Boston, Mass., by General Drug & Oil Co., Inc.; and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "U. S. P. * * * Hydrogen Peroxide * * * With $\frac{1}{8}$ Grain Acetanilid to Fluid Ounce," was false and misleading since it represented that the article contained three-sixteenths of a grain of acetanilid per fluid ounce; whereas it contained a greater amount. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the statement "U. S. P. * * * Hydrogen Peroxide" was false and misleading since it represented that the article was solution of hydrogen peroxide U. S. P.; whereas it was not solution of hydrogen peroxide U. S. P. since it differed from the standard of strength as determined by the test laid down in the United States Pharmacopoeia, and the said statement led to one to believe that it was of such standard. Misbranding was alleged further in that the statement on the label, "Contents 4 Fl. Oz.," was false and misleading since the bottles contained less than 4 fluid ounces.

On June 21, 1938, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

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

29011. Adulteration and misbranding of ether. U. S. v. 40 Cans of Ether. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 41856. Sample No. 16834-D.)

This product was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, but differed from the pharmacopoeial standard in that benzaldehyde was found in samples examined.

On March 2, 1938, the United States attorney for the Northern District of West Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 40 cans of ether at Clarksburg, W. Va., consigned by Merck & Co.; alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 28, 1937, from New York, N. Y.; and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, "Ether," and it differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in the said pharmacopoeia and its own standard was not stated on the label.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "Ether * * * U. S. P.," was false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the consumer when applied to an article containing benzaldehyde.

On June 6, 1938, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

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