

"Tablets Morphine Sulph., 1-8 gr.;" "Tablets Atropine Sulph. 1-100 gr.;" "Tablets Nitroglycerin 1-100 gr.;" "Tablets Strych. Sulph. 1-100 gr." The articles were further labeled, "The Maltbie Chemical Co. Newark, N. J."

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of samples of the articles showed that: The morphine sulphate tablets labeled " $\frac{1}{2}$ gr." contained $\frac{4}{9}$ grain of morphine sulphate per tablet and those labeled " $\frac{1}{8}$ gr." contained $\frac{1}{10}$ grain of morphine sulphate per tablet; the atropine sulphate tablets, labeled " $\frac{1}{100}$ gr.," contained $\frac{1}{125}$ grain of atropine sulphate per tablet; the nitroglycerin tablets, labeled " $\frac{1}{100}$ gr." contained $\frac{1}{147}$ grain of nitroglycerin each; and the strychnine sulphate tablets, labeled " $\frac{1}{100}$ gr.," contained $\frac{1}{138}$ grain of strychnine sulphate each.

Adulteration of the articles was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that their strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which they were sold, in that the labels represented the said tablets to contain $\frac{1}{2}$ grain of morphine sulphate, $\frac{1}{8}$ grain of morphine sulphate, $\frac{1}{100}$ grain of atropine sulphate, $\frac{1}{100}$ grain of nitroglycerin, or $\frac{1}{100}$ grain of strychnine sulphate, as the case might be, whereas each of said tablets contained less of the product than represented on the label thereof.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Tablets Morphine Sulphate 1-2 gr.," "Tablets Morphine Sulph. 1-8 gr.," "Tablets Atropine Sulph. 1-100 gr.," "Tablets Nitroglycerin 1-100 gr." and "Tablets Strych. Sulph. 1-100 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.

On September 28, 1925, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

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

14038. Adulteration and misbranding of milk chocolate bars. U. S. v. Norma Chocolate Co., Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 15426. I. S. No. 7833-t.)

On May 31, 1922, 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 of the United States for said district an information against the Norma Chocolate Co., Inc., a corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about May 10, 1920, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of milk chocolate bars which were adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Regal Milk Chocolate Bars Manufactured By Norma Chocolate Co., Inc. Brooklyn, N. Y."

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of a sample of the article showed that it had been made with skim milk.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, skim milk, had been substituted in part for milk chocolate, to wit, a product composed in part of whole milk, which the said article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Milk Chocolate," borne on the boxes containing the article, was false and misleading, in that the said statement represented that the article consisted wholly of milk chocolate, to wit, a product composed in part of whole milk, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it consisted wholly of milk chocolate, to wit, a product composed in part of whole milk, whereas it did not so consist but did consist of a product composed in part of skim milk. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, milk chocolate.

On January 6, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

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