

condemnation of 124 boxes of Orange Blossom female suppositories at Burlington, Iowa, alleging that the article had been shipped by Dr. J. A. McGill & Co., Chicago, Ill., on or about April 15, 1922, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Iowa, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "For Diseases Peculiar To Women * * * Female Weakness * * * In cases of Pregnancy, the Suppositories may be safely used up to the fourth month * * * consequently relieving the patient of much suffering at child-birth. In cases of Change of Life, the Suppositories will relieve the organ of the morbid conditions * * * Nervous sick headache, backache, irritation of the stomach, spinal irritation, pain between the shoulders, distressing sensation in the back of the head, nape of the neck, and numbness and coldness of the extremities. In these cases the Suppositories will give relief by their action on the womb. * * * For * * * Inflammation, Congestion and Falling of the Womb, Anteversion, Retroversion and Prolapsus, Ulceration, Leucorrhoea, Profuse and Difficult Menstruation."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the suppositories consisted essentially of cocoa butter, petrolatum, boric acid, sodium sulphate, and a little flour.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the packages or labels bore certain statements, designs, and devices, regarding the curative and therapeutic effect of the said article, which were false and misleading in that the article contained no ingredients or substances which would relieve the female organs or morbid conditions thereof, or cure or relieve sick headache, backache, irritation of the stomach, spinal irritation, pain between the shoulders, distressing sensation in the back of the head and nape of the neck, and numbness and coldness of the extremities, or falling of the womb, anteversion, retroversion, or prolapsus, ulceration, leucorrhea, profuse and difficult menstruation.

On January 6, 1923, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11806. Misbranding of flour. U. S. v. 200 Sacks of Flour. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 16720. I. S. No. 7724-v. S. No. W-1186.)

On August 7, 1922, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 200 sacks of flour, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Crown Mills, Portland, Oreg., June 15, 1922, and transported from the State of Oregon into the State of Washington, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Crown * * * Best Patent Unbleached Flour Crown Mills Portland, Ore. 24½ Lbs. Crown Best Patent."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statement, "24½ [24½] Lbs.," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On August 31, 1922, the Crown Mills, Portland, Oreg., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$400, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11807. Misbranding and alleged adulteration of canned oysters. U. S. v. 22 Cases of Canned Oysters. Decree entered providing for release of product under bond to be relabeled. (F. & D. No. 16721. I. S. No. 7518-v. S. No. W-1187.)

On September 1, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Montana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 22 cases of canned oysters at Miles City, Mont., alleging that the