

ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, conditioned in part that it be salvaged under the supervision of this department.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**14717. Misbranding of Bowman's abortion remedy. U. S. v. 11 Packages of Bowman's Abortion Remedy. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 20546. I. S. No. 5246-x. S. No. E-5515.)**

On November 2, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 11 packages of Bowman's abortion remedy, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Shelburne Falls, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Erick Bowman Remedy Co., from Owatonna, Minn., October 9, 1925, and transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of Massachusetts, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Bowman's Abortion Remedy."

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of a mixture of brown sugar and wheat shorts, with traces of calcium and sulphur compounds and a phenolic substance.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statements "Bowman's Abortion Remedy" and "This package contains one 9½-pound treatment of Bowman's Abortion Remedy. Read the directions carefully before administering," regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the said article, were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On November 1, 1926, 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.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**14718. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. v. Barrett & Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$30. (F. & D. No. 16245. I. S. Nos. 3465-t, 3561-t.)**

On October 3, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Barrett & Co., a corporation, Minneapolis, Minn., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on or about August 18, 1920, from the State of Minnesota into the State of North Dakota, and on or about August 26, 1920, from the State of Minnesota into the State of Wisconsin, of quantities of maize sugar vinegar which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Barrett & Company Minneapolis, Minn. Maize Sugar Fermented Vinegar."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, distilled vinegar artificially colored, had been substituted in whole or in part for maize sugar fermented vinegar, which the article purported to be; for the further reason that it was an article inferior to maize sugar fermented vinegar, to wit, a product composed in whole or in part of distilled vinegar; for the further reason that it was artificially colored with caramel so as to simulate the appearance of maize sugar fermented vinegar, and in a manner whereby its inferiority to maize sugar fermented vinegar was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Maize Sugar Fermented Vinegar," borne on the barrels containing the article, was false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the article was maize sugar fermented vinegar and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was maize sugar fermented vinegar, whereas it was not but was a product composed in whole or in part of distilled vinegar artificially colored. 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 October 22, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$30.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*