

under which they were sold, in that each of said tablets was represented to contain 1/4 grain of morphine sulphate, 1/8 grain of cocaine hydrochloride, 1/8 grain of codeine sulphate, 1/50 grain of nitroglycerin, 1/50 grain or 1/60 grain of strychnine sulphate, 1/100 grain of atropine sulphate, or 1/8 grain of pilocarpine hydrochlorate, as the case might be, whereas each of said tablets contained less of the product than declared, the alleged 1/4 grain morphine sulphate tablets containing not more than 0.216 grain of morphine sulphate each; the alleged 1/8 grain cocaine hydrochloride tablets containing not more than 0.078 grain of cocaine hydrochloride each; the alleged 1/8 grain codeine sulphate tablets containing not more than 0.108 grain of codeine sulphate each; the alleged 1/50 grain nitroglycerin tablets containing not more than 0.0108 grain of nitroglycerin each; the alleged 1/50 grain and the 1/60 grain strychnine sulphate tablets containing not more than 0.01647 grain, and 0.01251 grain, respectively, of strychnine sulphate each; the alleged 1/100 grain atropine sulphate tablets containing less than 1/100 grain of atropine sulphate and the alleged 1/8 grain of pilocarpine hydrochlorate tablets containing not more than 0.082 grain of pilocarpine hydrochlorate each.

Adulteration of the cinchona bark fluidextract, nux vomica powdered extract, and ipecac fluidextract, was alleged for the reason that they were sold under and by names recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia and differed from the standard of strength, quality and purity as determined by the tests laid down in said pharmacopoeia, official at the time of investigation, in that the said cinchona bark fluidextract yielded not more than 3.33 grams of the alkaloids of cinchona per 100 mls, whereas the pharmacopoeia provided that it should yield not less than 4 grams of the alkaloids of cinchona per 100 mls; the said nux vomica powdered extract yielded not more than 10.9 per cent of the alkaloids of nux vomica, whereas the pharmacopoeia provided that nux vomica powdered extract should yield not less than 15.2 per cent of the alkaloids of nux vomica; and the said ipecac fluidextract yielded not more than 0.84 gram of the ether-soluble alkaloids of ipecac per 100 mls, whereas the pharmacopoeia provided that ipecac fluidextract should yield not less than 1.8 grams of the ether-soluble alkaloids of ipecac per 100 mls. Adulteration of the cinchona bark fluidextract was alleged for the further reason that it fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in that the statement, to wit, "Standard—4½% total Alkaloids," borne on the label, represented that it yielded 4½ per cent of total alkaloids, whereas it yielded a less amount, to wit, approximately 3½ per cent of total alkaloids.

Misbranding of the said tablets was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Tablets \* \* \* Morphine Sulphate 1/4 Gr.," "Tablets Cocaine Hydrochloride 1-8 Gr.," "Tablets Codeine Sulphate 1-8 gr.," "Tablets Nitroglycerin 1-50 gr.," "Tablets Strychnine Sulphate 1/50 Gr.," "Tablets Strychnine Sulphate 1-60 Gr.," "Tablets Atropine Sulphate 1-100 gr.," and "Tablets Pilocarpine Hydrochlorate 1-8 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 said tablets contained the amount of the product declared on the label thereof, whereas the said tablets contained less than so declared.

Misbranding of the said cinchona bark fluidextract, nux vomica powdered extract, and ipecac fluidextract, was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Fluidextract, Cinchona U. S. P. Standard—4½ total Alkaloids," "Powdered Extract Nux Vomica U. S. P." and "Fluidextract Ipecac, U. S. P.," borne on the labels, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the articles conformed to the standard laid down in the United States Pharmacopoeia, and that the cinchona bark fluidextract yielded 4½ per cent of total alkaloids, whereas the articles did not conform to the standard laid down in said pharmacopoeia, and the said cinchona bark fluidextract yielded less than 4½ per cent of total alkaloids.

On June 10, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14496. Misbranding of crab meat. U. S. v. William B. Skinner (W. B. Skinner & Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 18762. I. S. No. 7325-v.)

On February 19, 1925, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against William B. Skinner, trading as W. B. Skinner & Co., Biloxi, Miss., alleging

shipment by said defendant, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on or about February 21, 1924, from the State of Mississippi into the State of Alabama, of a quantity of crab meat which was misbranded. The article was contained in 31 unlabeled cans and was shipped in a tub labeled in part: "From W. B. Skinner & Co. \* \* \* Biloxi, Miss. Tubs 31# Crab Meat."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was food in package form, to wit, food in unlabeled cans, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the statement, to wit, "31# Crab Meat," borne on the tag attached to the tub containing the said cans, was false and misleading, in that the said statement represented that the tub contained 31 pounds of crab meat and that each of the cans contained 1 pound net of crab meat, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that the said tub contained 31 pounds of crab meat and that each can contained 1 pound net of crab meat, whereas the tub did not contain 31 pounds of crab meat, and the said cans did not each contain 1 pound net of crab meat but did contain a less amount.

On June 8, 1926, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**14497. Adulteration of canned sardines. U. S. v. 7 Cases, et al., of Sardines. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 19403. I. S. Nos. 13852-v, 13853-v. S. No. E-5057.)**

On December 23, 1924, the United States attorney for the District of New Hampshire, 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 16 cases and 146 cans of sardines, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Nashua, N. H., consigned by the Bayshore Sardine Co., Columbia, Me., alleging that the article had been shipped from Columbia, Me., in part June 16, 1924, and in part October 9, 1924, and transported from the State of Maine into the State of New Hampshire, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Seiner Brand" (or "B. & S. Brand") "American Sardines \* \* \* Packed By Bayshore Sardine Co. Addison Me."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed or putrid animal substance.

On June 3, 1925, 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.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**14498. Adulteration of rice. U. S. v. 189 Bags of Rice. Product ordered released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20584. I. S. No. 4817-x. S. No. E-5562.)**

On November 7, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, 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 189 bags of rice, at Mayaguez, P. R., alleging that the article had been shipped by Adolph Pfeffer & Co., Beaumont, Tex., on or about July 9, 1925, and transported from the State of Texas into the Territory of Porto Rico, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed or putrid vegetable substance.

On December 14, 1925, Jose Gonzales Clemente & Co., Mayaguez, P. R., having appeared as claimant for the property, judgment was entered, sustaining the allegations of the libel, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$750, conditioned in part that it be denatured so as to make it fit only for animal feed, said bond being further conditioned upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the expense of supervising the cleaning of the rice.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*