

\$5,000, conditioned in part that it should not be sold or disposed of until relabeled to show the correct contents.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**16092. Adulteration and misbranding of ampuls of Endoquin (quinine hydrochloride), Endoferarsan with glycerophosphates (iron arsenic and glycerophosphates), Endoferarsan (iron and arsenic), and emetine hydrochloride. U. S. v. Intravenous Products Co. of America (Inc.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200. (F. & D. No. 22577, I. S. Nos. 14831-x, 16037-x, 16038-x, 16039-x.)**

On October 15, 1928, 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 of the United States for said district an information against the Intravenous Products Co. of America (Inc.), a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey, on or about February 26, 1927, of a quantity of Endoquin (quinine hydrochloride), on or about May 29, 1926, of a quantity of Endoferarsan with glycerophosphates (iron arsenic and glycerophosphates), on or about August 20, 1926, of quantities of Endoferarsan (iron and arsenic), and emetine hydrochloride, which said products were adulterated and misbranded. The articles were contained in ampuls, labeled in part respectively: "Endoquin (Quinine Hydrochloride)," "Endoferarsan with Glycerophosphates (Iron Arsenic and Glycerophosphates)," "Endoferarsan (Iron and Arsenic)," "Emetine Hydrochloride," and "Intravenous Products Company of America, Inc., New York," and bore the further statements as hereinafter set forth.

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 in that 5 mils of the Endoquin (quinine hydrochloride) was represented to contain 0.5 gram (7½ grains) of quinine hydrochloride, whereas 5 mils of the said Endoquin contained not more than 0.3661 gram (5.65 grains) of quinine hydrochloride; 5 mils of the Endoferarsan with glycerophosphates was represented to contain 0.065 gram (1 grain) of ferric dimethylarsenate, whereas 5 mils of the said Endoferarsan with glycerophosphates contained not more than 0.0333 gram (0.51 grain) of ferric dimethylarsenate; 5 mils of the Endoferarsan was represented to contain 0.065 gram (1 grain) of ferric dimethylarsenate and 0.2 gram (3 grains) of sodium dimethylarsenate, which represents an equivalent of 0.1234 gram (1.9 grains) total arsenic trioxide, whereas 5 mils of said Endoferarsan contained less ferric dimethylarsenate and sodium dimethylarsenate than represented, namely, not more than the equivalent of 0.0208 gram (0.32 grain) of total arsenic trioxide; and 5 mils of the emetine hydrochloride was represented to contain 32 milligrams (one-half grain) of emetine hydrochloride, whereas 5 mils of said emetine hydrochloride contained not more than 0.0194 gram (0.3 grain) of emetine hydrochloride.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Five mils represent Quinine Hydrochloride 0.5 gram (7½ grains)," with respect to the Endoquin, "Five mils represent Ferric Dimethylarsenate 0.065 gram (1 grain)," with respect to the Endoferarsan with glycerophosphates, "Five mils represent Ferric Dimethylarsenate 0.065 gram (1 grain), Sodium Dimethylarsenate 0.2 gram (3 grains)," with respect to the Endoferarsan, and "Five mils represent 32 milligrams (½ gr.) of Emetine Hydrochloride," with respect to the emetine hydrochloride, borne on the labels attached to the ampuls containing the respective articles, were false and misleading in that the said statements represented that the articles contained the said ingredients in the proportions declared on the labels, whereas they did not, but contained the said ingredients in a less amount than so declared.

On November 14, 1928, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$200.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**16093. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. 29 Cartons, et al., of Olive Oil. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 22076. I. S. Nos. 16770-x, 16771-x, 16773-x. S. No. 119.)**

On October 3, 1927, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel, and subsequently an amendment