pigs; effective as a treatment following vaccination to put stock hogs in good shape; and effective as a treatment for necro and flu.

On January 23, 1934, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of $200 and costs.

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

21808. Adulteration and misbranding of National Antacid Powder, codeine sulphate tablets, and cinchophen tablets. U. S. v. National Drug Co. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $75. (F. & D. no. 30301. Sample nos. 7552–A, 8198–A, 13096–A, 15782–A.)

This case was based on interstate shipments of codeine sulphate tablets and cinchophen tablets that contained less codeine sulphate and cinchophen, respectively, than was declared on the labels; and of Antacid Powder that contained a smaller proportion of bismuth subcarbonate than was declared on the label.

On November 24, 1933, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the National Drug Co., a corporation, Philadelphia, Pa., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about March 31, 1932, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New Jersey, of a quantity of codeine sulphate tablets; on or about May 3 and May 17, 1932, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of South Carolina and the District of Columbia, respectively, of quantities of Antacid Powder; and on or about August 15, 1932, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New York, of a quantity of cinchophen tablets, which were adulterated and misbranded. The articles were labeled in part: "National Antacid Powder Bismuth Subcarbonate 1 part, Sodium Bicarbonate 2 parts, Calcium Carbonate (precip.) 2 parts, Magnesium Oxide Light 2 parts Manufactured and Guaranteed By the National Drug Co. Philadelphia, Pa."; "Tablet Triturates Codeine Sulphate * * * 1/8 Grain in each tablet"; "Compressed Tablets Cincophen * * * 5 Grains."

Analyses of samples of the National Antacid Powder by this Department showed that one sample contained 13 percent less bismuth subcarbonate and another sample 18 percent less than was represented on the label; that the codeine sulphate tablets contained 12 percent less codeine sulphate than represented by the label; and that the cinchophen tablets contained 12 percent less cinchophen than was represented by the label.

It was alleged in the information that the articles were adulterated in that their strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which they were sold, since the label of the Antacid Powder represented that bismuth subcarbonate was one-seventh of the article, whereas bismuth subcarbonate was less than one-seventh of the article; each of the codeine sulphate tablets was represented to contain 1/8 grain of codeine sulphate, whereas each of the tablets contained not more than 0.112 grain (1/7 grain) of codeine sulphate; and each of the cinchophen tablets was represented to contain 5 grains of cinchophen, whereas each tablet contained less than 5 grains of cinchophen, namely, not more than 4.38 grains of cinchophen.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Bismuth Subcarbonate 1 part", with respect to the Antacid Powder, "Codeine Sulphate * * * 1/8 Grain in each tablet", with respect to the codeine sulphate tablets; and "Tablets Cincophen * * * 5 Grains", with respect to the cinchophen tablets, were false and misleading.

On January 22, 1934, a plea of nolo contendere was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $75.

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

21809. Misbranding of Feminex. U. S. v. 44 Large and 94 Small Packages of Feminex. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 30463. S. no. 23412–A.)

Examination of the drug preparation, Feminex Tablets, disclosed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling. It was also claimed in the labeling that the article would have no bad after-effects and that it was safe, whereas it contained drugs which might have bad after-effects and which might be dangerous. The article also contained acetphenetidin and the label failed to declare that acetphenetidin is a derivitive of acetanilid.

On May 16, 1933, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the