

as a powerful intestinal and respiratory antiseptic; and effective as treatment, remedy, and cure for mange on dogs.

On September 24, 1935, the defendant entered a plea of guilty and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

25821. Adulteration and misbranding of nitrous oxide. U. S. v. 15 Cylinders of Nitrous Oxide. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction of the contents of the cylinders. (F. & D. no. 35745. Sample no. 30390-B.)

This product contained a larger percentage of gases uncondensed at the temperature of liquid air than was permitted by the United States Pharmacopoeial standard.

On July 8, 1935, the United States attorney for the Eastern 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 15 cylinders of nitrous oxide at Brooklyn, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 27, 1934, by Wall Chemicals, Inc., Detroit, Mich., from that place to Brooklyn, N. Y., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Cylinder) "Nitrous Oxide."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said pharmacopoeia.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "Nitrous Oxide", was false and misleading.

On February 25, 1936, no claimant having appeared, a default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction of the contents of the cylinders was entered.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

25822. Adulteration and misbranding of Compressed T. T. Nitroglycerine, Tinct. Aconite, Coated Tablets Strychnine Sulphate, and Compressed Tablets Phenobarbital. U. S. v. Frost, Stephens Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$150. (F. & D. no. 35884. Sample nos. 28687-B, 28688-B, 29629-B, 29678-B.)

These articles were inferior to their professed standard; the labels of some bore erroneous statements regarding the quantities of their active ingredients, and the labels of others were misleading with respect to their potency.

On October 28, 1935, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Frost, Stephens Co., a corporation, Elmira, N. Y., alleging shipments by it in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended, in the period from January 1, 1935, to April 5, 1935, from Elmira, N. Y., to Troy and Rome, Pa., of quantities of Compressed T. T. Nitroglycerine, Tinct. Aconite, Coated Tablets Strychnine Sulphate, and Compressed Tablets Phenobarbital. The articles were labeled in part: (Bottle) "Compressed T. T. Nitroglycerine Each T. T. contains Nitroglycerine 1-100 gr."; (bottle) "Tinct. Aconite 3½ min Frost, Stephens Co. Elmira, New York"; (bottle) "Coated Tablets Strychnine Sulphate 1-60 Grain Poison"; (bottle) "Compressed Tablets Phenobarbital ½ Gr."

Analyses showed that the Compressed T. T. Nitroglycerine contained 24.0 percent of nitroglycerin in excess of the declaration; that the Tinct. Aconite was practically devoid of aconite activity; that the Coated Tablets Strychnine Sulphate contained 26.0 percent of strychnine sulphate in excess of the declaration; that the Compressed Tablets Phenobarbital contained an average excess of 11.5 percent of phenobarbital.

The Compressed T. T. Nitroglycerine Tablets were alleged to be adulterated in that their strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which they were sold, in that each of the tablets was represented to contain one one-hundredth of a grain of nitroglycerin; whereas each tablet contained more than one one-hundredth of a grain, to wit, not less than 0.0122 grain of nitroglycerin.

The Tinct. Aconite was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in that each tablet was represented to have a potency equivalent to 3½ minims of tincture of aconite, when in fact it had little, if any, potency derived from tincture of aconite.