

the supervision of this department, and it was further provided in the decree that the claimant file a bond in the sum of \$100, to insure disposition of the product in accordance with law.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14181. Adulteration and misbranding of ground mace. U. S. v. 28 Pounds of Ground Mace. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 20382. I. S. No. 6917-x. S. No. E-5476.)

On or about August 25, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 28 pounds of ground mace, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Bridgeport, Conn., alleging that the article had been delivered for shipment by the Knickerbocker Mills Co., New York, N. Y., on or about June 22, 1925, for transportation from the State of New York into the State of Connecticut, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Pure Ground Mace."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that substances, added cornmeal and nutmeg, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the label, to wit, "Pure Ground Mace," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further reason that it was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

During the month of January, 1926, 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.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14182. Adulteration and misbranding of morphine sulphate tablets, codeine sulphate tablets, strychnine sulphate tablets, tincture nux vomica, fluidextract ipecac, tincture cinchona, and fluidextract nux vomica. U. S. v. Daggett & Miller Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$22. (F. & D. No. 19714. I. S. Nos. 13681-v, 13683-v, 13972-v, 14337-v, 14397-v, 14398-v, 14399-v, 16964-v, 16966-v, 24405-v, 24406-v.)

On March 9, 1926, the United States attorney for the District of Rhode Island, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Daggett & Miller Co., a corporation, Providence, R. I., alleging shipment by said company, in various consignments, between the dates of July 25, 1924, and May 12, 1925, from the State of Rhode Island into the State of New Jersey, of quantities of morphine sulphate tablets, codeine sulphate tablets, and strychnine sulphate tablets, from the State of Rhode Island into the State of Massachusetts, of quantities of tincture nux vomica, fluidextract ipecac, tincture cinchona, fluidextract nux vomica, and codeine sulphate tablets, and from the State of Rhode Island into the State of Maine, of a quantity of codeine sulphate tablets and strychnine sulphate tablets which articles were adulterated and misbranded. The articles were labeled in part: "300 Morphine Sulphate * * * $\frac{1}{8}$ Gr."; "Codeine Sulphate $\frac{1}{4}$ Gr."; "Strychnine Sulphate * * * $\frac{1}{60}$ Gr."; "Strychnine Sulphate * * * $\frac{1}{40}$ Gr."; "Fluid Extract Nux Vomica (Strychnos Nux Vomica) U. S. P. 1900 Assayed And Standardized"; "Poison Tinct. Nux Vomica U. S. P."; "Fluid Extract Ipecac * * * U. S. P. 1900"; "Tincture Of Cinchona"; and were further labeled: "Daggett & Miller Co. Providence, R. I."

Adulteration of the morphine sulphate tablets, codeine sulphate tablets, and strychnine sulphate tablets was alleged in the information for the reason that their strength and purity fell below the professed standard under which they were sold, in that the labels represented that the said tablets contained $\frac{1}{8}$ grain of morphine sulphate, $\frac{1}{4}$ grain of codeine sulphate, $\frac{1}{60}$ grain of strychnine sulphate, or $\frac{1}{40}$ grain of strychnine sulphate, as the case might be, whereas each of said tablets contained less of the product than so represented.

Misbranding of the said tablets was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Morphine Sulphate * * * $\frac{1}{8}$ Gr.," "Codeine Sulphate $\frac{1}{4}$ Gr.," "Strychnine Sulphate * * * $\frac{1}{60}$ Gr.," or "Strychnine Sulphate * * * $\frac{1}{40}$ gr.," as the case might be, borne on the labels of the respective

products, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that each of the said tablets contained the amount of the product declared on the label thereof, whereas the said tablets contained less than so declared.

Adulteration of the tincture nux vomica and the tincture cinchona was alleged for the reason that they were sold under and by names recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia and differed from the standard of strength as determined by the tests laid down in said pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation of the articles, in that the tincture of nux vomica yielded not less than 0.277 gram of the alkaloids of nux vomica per 100 mls, whereas said pharmacopœia provides that 100 mls of tincture of nux vomica shall yield not more than 0.263 gram of the alkaloids of nux vomica; and the tincture of cinchona yielded not more than 0.446 gram of the alkaloids of cinchona per 100 mls, whereas said pharmacopœia provides that tincture of cinchona shall yield not less than 0.8 gram of the alkaloids of cinchona per 100 mls; and the standard of strength of the said articles was not declared on the containers thereof.

Misbranding of the tincture nux vomica and the tincture cinchona was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Tinct. Nux Vomica U. S. P." and "Tincture Of Cinchona," borne on the labels, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the articles were tincture of nux vomica or tincture of cinchona, as the case might be, as defined in the United States Pharmacopœia, whereas they were not.

Adulteration of the fluidextract ipecac and the fluidextract nux vomica was alleged for the reason that their strength fell below the professed standard under which they were sold, in that they were sold under the standard provided for said articles in the 1900 revision of the United States Pharmacopœia, and did not conform thereto, in that said pharmacopœia provides that 100 cubic centimeters of fluidextract ipecac shall contain 1.5 grams of the alkaloids from ipecac, whereas the said fluidextract ipecac contained not more than 0.61 gram of the alkaloids of ipecac per 100 cubic centimeters, and that the fluidextract nux vomica shall contain but 1 gram of strychnine per 100 cubic centimeters, whereas the said fluidextract nux vomica contained more than so provided, the two shipments of fluidextract nux vomica containing 1.282 grams and 1.295 grams, respectively, of strychnine per 100 cubic centimeters.

Misbranding of the said fluidextract ipecac and fluidextract nux vomica was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Fluid Extract Ipecac (Cephaelis Ipecacuanha) U. S. P. 1900 Assayed And Standardized * * * Guaranteed under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906 No. 2463" and "Fluid Extract Nux Vomica (Strychnos Nux Vomica) U. S. P. 1900 Assayed And Standardized * * * Guaranteed under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906, No. 2463," borne on the labels, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the articles were fluidextract ipecac or fluidextract nux vomica, as the case might be, as defined in the 1900 revision of the pharmacopœia, and that the Government had guaranteed said articles to be in compliance with the food and drugs act, whereas the said articles were not fluidextract ipecac or fluidextract nux vomica as so defined, and the Government had not guaranteed them to be in compliance with the said act.

On April 1, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$22.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14183. Misbranding of Bowman's abortion remedy. U. S. v. 6 Boxes of Bowman's Abortion Remedy. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 20466. I. S. No. 1220-x. S. No. C-4826.)

On September 28, 1925, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 6 boxes of Bowman's abortion remedy, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Two Rivers, Wis., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Erick Bowman Remedy Co., from Owatonna, Minn., on or about September 15, 1925, and transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of Wisconsin, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Box) "Bowman's Abortion Remedy—Directions for use of Bowman's Abortion Remedy."