

sold, in that each of the tablets was represented to contain 1/100 grain of nitroglycerin; whereas in fact each of the tablets contained less than 1/100 grain of nitroglycerin. Said article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Tablets Nitroglycerin 1/100 grain", borne on the bottle label, was false and misleading in that it represented that each of the tablets contained 1/100 grain of nitroglycerin; whereas in fact each of the tablets contained less than 1/100 grain of nitroglycerin.

The fluidextract of hyoscyamus was alleged to be adulterated in that it was sold under and by 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, in that the article yielded less than 0.055 gram of the alkaloids of hyoscyamus per 100 cubic centimeters; whereas said pharmacopoeia provided that fluidextract of hyoscyamus should yield not less than 0.055 gram of alkaloids of hyoscyamus per 100 cubic centimeters, and the standard of strength, quality, and purity of the article was not declared in the container thereof. Said article was alleged to be adulterated further in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in that it was represented that the article was fluidextract of hyoscyamus which conformed to the standard laid down in the United States Pharmacopoeia; whereas in fact the article was not fluidextract of hyoscyamus which conformed to the standard laid down in said pharmacopoeia. Said article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, "Fluid Extract Hyoscyamus U. S. P. * * * Standard 0.055 * * * grams mydriatic alkaloids per 100 C. C.", borne on the bottle label, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was fluidextract of hyoscyamus which conformed to the standard laid down in the United States Pharmacopoeia, and that 100 cubic centimeters of the article yielded not less than 0.055 gram of the alkaloids of hyoscyamus; whereas in fact the article was not fluidextract of hyoscyamus which conformed to the standard laid down in the United States Pharmacopoeia, and 100 cubic centimeters of the article did not yield 0.055 gram of the alkaloids of hyoscyamus.

The fluidextract of nux vomica was alleged to be adulterated in that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the National Formulary and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said formulary, in that the article yielded less than 2.37 grams of the alkaloids of nux vomica per 100 cubic centimeters; whereas said formulary provided that fluidextract of nux vomica should not yield less than 2.37 grams of the alkaloids of nux vomica per 100 cubic centimeters, and the standard of strength, quality, and purity of the article was not declared on the container thereof. Said article was alleged to be adulterated further in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in that it was represented that the article was fluidextract of nux vomica that conformed to the standard laid down in the National Formulary; whereas in fact the article was not fluidextract of nux vomica which conformed to the standard laid down in said formulary. Said article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, "Fluid Extract Nux Vomica National Formulary Standard 2.37 to 2.63 grams of total Alkaloids per 100 C. C.", borne on the bottle labels, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was fluidextract of nux vomica that conformed to the standard laid down in the National Formulary, and that 100 cubic centimeters of the article yielded not less than 2.37 grams of the alkaloids of nux vomica; whereas in fact the article was not fluidextract of nux vomica that conformed to the standard laid down in said formulary, and 100 cubic centimeters yielded less than 2.37 grams of the alkaloids of nux vomica per 100 cubic centimeters.

On November 30, 1936, the defendant entered a plea of guilty, and on February 1, 1937, the court imposed a fine of \$4,800, suspended payment of the fine, and placed the defendant on probation for 5 years.

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

26781. Adulteration and misbranding of spirit of nitroglycerin. U. S. v. Parke, Davis & Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$1. (F. & D. no. 37956. Sample nos. 34219-B, 58018-B.)

This product differed from the standard for spirit of nitroglycerin prescribed in the United States Pharmacopoeia in that it contained nitroglycerin in a proportion greater than that prescribed by said standard.

On October 15, 1936, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Parke, Davis & Co., a corporation, Detroit, Mich., charging shipment by said corporation in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about July 25 and 27, 1935, from the State of Michigan into the State of Illinois of quantities of spirit of nitroglycerin that was adulterated and misbranded.

It was alleged to be adulterated in that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity for spirit of nitroglycerin as determined by the test laid down in said pharmacopoeia, in that it contained more than 1.1 percent of nitroglycerin, to wit, not less than 1.5 percent, and its own standard of strength, quality, and purity was not declared on the containers.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, "Spirit of Nitroglycerin (Spirit of Glycerl Trinitrate, U. S. P.) * * * An alcoholic solution of Nitroglycerin * * * containing 1 percent by weight of the substance", borne on the bottle labels, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was spirit of nitroglycerin that conformed to the standard laid down in the United States Pharmacopoeia; whereas in fact the article was not spirit of nitroglycerin that conformed to the standard laid down in said pharmacopoeia, and it contained more than 1 percent by weight of nitroglycerin.

On November 25, 1936, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant corporation, and on January 7, 1937, the court imposed a fine of \$1.

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

26782. Adulteration and misbranding of solution of Sal-Ar-Sodide, caffeine sodio-benzoate, and sodium cacodylate. U. S. v. Haarlem Research Laboratories, Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. no. 36943. Sample nos. 33548-B, 38170-B, 38172-B.)

This case involved drugs that fell below the professed standard and quality under which they were sold.

On July 28, 1936, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Haarlem Research Laboratories, Inc., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act on or about May 1, 1934, from the State of New York into the State of Tennessee of a quantity of solution of Sal-Ar-Sodide ampoules, and on or about June 3, 1935, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania of quantities of caffeine sodio-benzoate ampoules and sodium cacodylate ampoules that were adulterated and misbranded. The articles were labeled in part variously: (Ampoule) "Sterile Solution of Sal-Ar-Sodide * * * Sodium Dimethylarsenate 3 grs. Haarlem Research Laboratories, Inc., New York"; (carton) "(2 cc * * * Caffeine Sodio-Benzoate 7½ grs."; (carton) "1 cc * * * Sodium Cacodylate 7 grs."

They were alleged to be adulterated in that their strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which they were sold in the following respects: The solution of Sal-Ar-Sodide was represented to contain in each 20 cubic centimeters 3 grains of sodium dimethylarsenate; whereas each 20 cubic centimeters contained less than 3 grains, namely, not more than 2 grains of sodium dimethylarsenate; the caffeine sodio-benzoate ampoules were represented to contain in each 2 cubic centimeters 7½ grains of caffeine sodio-benzoate; whereas each 2 cubic centimeters contained less than 7½ grains, namely, not more than 3.56 grains of caffeine sodio-benzoate; the sodium cacodylate ampoules were represented to contain in each cubic centimeter 7 grains of sodium cacodylate; whereas each cubic centimeter contained less than 7 grains, namely, not more than 4.48 grains of sodium cacodylate.

The articles were alleged to be misbranded in that the statements (ampoule), "Solution of Sal-Ar-Sodide 20 cc. * * * Sodium Dimethylarsenate 3 grs.", (carton) "2 cc. * * * Caffeine Sodio-Benzoate 7½ grs.", and (carton) "1 cc. * * * Sodium Cacodylate 7 grs.", were false and misleading since 20 cubic centimeters of the solution of Sal-Ar-Sodide contained less than 3 grains, namely, not more than 2 grains of sodium dimethylarsenate; 2 cubic centimeters of the caffeine sodio-benzoate contained less than 7½ grains, namely, not more than 3.56 grains of caffeine sodio-benzoate; and 1 cubic