

Analysis of a sample showed that the article consisted essentially of boric acid (36.2 percent) zinc sulphate, aluminum sulphate, ammonium chloride, and small proportions of methyl salicylate, phenol, and menthol.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "For treating wounds, cuts * * * ulcers; Use a teaspoonful of Sannette to a quart of warm water", was a statement regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, and was false and fraudulent.

On September 5, 1934, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

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

23276. Misbranding of Prestolas. U. S. v. 22 Packages of Prestolas. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 33153. Sample no. 6334-B.)

Examination of the drug product involved in this case showed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling.

On August 1, 1934, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 22 packages of Prestolas at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about May 29, 1934, by the Union Capsule Co., from Bloomfield, N. J., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that it consisted essentially of capsules containing volatile oils, including pennyroyal oil, and savin oil (42 percent), and a fixed oil.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statements on the carton label, "For Treatment of Amenorrhœa, Dysmenorrhœa, or Painful and Irregular Menstruation", were false and fraudulent.

On August 24, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

23277. Misbranding of Epsotabs. U. S. v. 37 Dozen Packages, et al., of Epsotabs The Laxative. Decrees of condemnation. Portion of product released under bond to be relabeled. Remainder destroyed. (F. & D. nos. 33172, 33253. Sample nos. 2713-B, 4677-B.)

These cases involved shipments of a product labeled "Epsotabs", a designation conveying the impression that it was an Epsom salt preparation. Analysis showed the presence of phenolphthalein in one lot and phenolphthalein and aloin in the other lot, which drugs would be responsible for its principal therapeutic effect, Epsom salt being present in amounts which would have no appreciable laxative effect.

On August 6, 1934, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, holding a district court, a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 43 dozen packages of Epsotabs at Washington, D. C. On August 18, 1934, a libel was filed against 236 packages of Epsotabs at Columbus, Ohio. It was alleged in the libels that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, by the Dill Co., from Norristown, Pa., in part on or about January 11, 1934, into the State of Ohio, and in part on or about July 20, 1934, into the District of Columbia, and that it was misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample from each shipment showed that the article consisted of coated tablets containing in each approximately 1½ grains of phenolphthalein, and magnesium sulphate equivalent to 4.9 grains (or 4.6 grains) of Epsom salt; the product in one shipment also contained aloin.

The libels charged that the article was misbranded in that the statement, "Epsotabs, The Laxative", borne on the label, was false and misleading, since it created the impression that the article was essentially a preparation of Epsom salt; whereas its content of Epsom salt was practically negligible, and its physiological effects, in one lot, were due to its content of phenolphthalein, a synthetic laxative drug derived from coal tar, and, in the other lot, to its content of phenolphthalein and aloin.