

loids of nux vomica per 100 mils of the article, the amount prescribed in the pharmacopœia, and each cubic centimeter did not contain 1 gram of nux vomica, but did contain a less amount.

Misbranding of the tincture cinchona was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Tinct. Cinchona," borne on the bottle labels, was false and misleading, in that the said statement represented that the article was tincture of cinchona as defined in the United States Pharmacopœia, whereas it was not, in that it yielded less than 0.8 gram of the alkaloids of cinchona per 100 mils of the article, the amount prescribed in the said pharmacopœia. Misbranding of the said tincture cinchona was alleged for the further reason that the bottle containing the article failed to bear a statement on its label of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained therein.

Misbranding of the tincture opium was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Tinct. Opium, U. S. (Laudanum)" and "Opium, 48 gr. to fl. oz.," borne on the bottle labels, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the article was tincture of opium (laudanum) as defined in the United States Pharmacopœia, and that each fluid ounce of the article contained 48 grains of granulated opium (the kind of opium specified by the said pharmacopœia for the preparation of tincture of opium), whereas the said article was not tincture of opium (laudanum) as defined in the said pharmacopœia, in that it yielded less than 0.95 gram of anhydrous morphine per 100 mils of said article, the amount prescribed in the said pharmacopœia, and each fluid ounce of said article did not contain 48 grains of said opium, but did contain a less amount.

Misbranding of the fluid extract jaborandi was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Fluid Extract Jaborandi," a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia as a synonym for fluid extract of pilocarpus, borne on the bottle labels, was false and misleading, in that the said statement represented that the article was fluid extract of pilocarpus as defined in said pharmacopœia, whereas the article was not fluid extract of pilocarpus as so defined, in that the said pharmacopœia provided that 100 mils of fluid extract of pilocarpus should yield not more than 0.65 gram of the alkaloids of pilocarpus, whereas the said article yielded more than 0.65 gram of the alkaloids of pilocarpus per 100 mils of the article. Misbranding of the fluid extract jaborandi was alleged for the further reason that the bottle failed to bear a statement on its label of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained therein.

On December 29, 1925, a plea of nolo contendere to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$180.

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

14005. Misbranding of tomatoes. U. S. v. Sterling Wholesale Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 18585. I. S. Nos. 8507-v, 8509-v.)

On November 23, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Utah, 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 Sterling Wholesale Co., a corporation, Ogden, Utah, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, in two consignments, namely, on or about August 20 and 25, 1923, respectively, from the State of Utah into the State of Colorado, of quantities of tomatoes in boxes which were misbranded.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On November 23, 1925, 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.*

14006. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 75 Tubs, et al., of Butter. Decrees of condemnation and forfeiture entered. Product released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 20369, 20425, 20453, 20454, 20455. I. S. Nos. 1912-x, 1913-x, 1914-x, 2004-x, 2005-x, 2006-x. S. Nos. C-4801, C-4804, C-4819.)

On or about August 3 and 13 and September 2, 1925, respectively, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Tennessee, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 1,400 tubs of