

\* \* \* act on the circulatory system of the uterus thereby relieving painful, irregular and scanty menstruation, and assist in re-establishing or restoring, the menstrual or monthly periods. \* \* \* strengthen and build up the uterine functions," (circular) "a great relief against those general complaints the Female Sex is subject to; they help increase the vital quality of the blood; assist to bring nature into its proper channel \* \* \* for irregular, painful, scanty or suppressed menstruations \* \* \* should be taken \* \* \* to assist nature with \* \* \* disorders \* \* \* during the change of life period \* \* \* Continue \* \* \* the treatment until they give relief \* \* \* great relief from Pains or Headache \* \* \* for suppressed Menstruation \* \* \* continue their use until relieved \* \* \* take \* \* \* until the menstrual flow commences again," were false and fraudulent in that the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed.

On June 9, 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, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12670. Adulteration and misbranding of prepared mustard. U. S. v. 79 Cases and 212 Cases of Prepared Mustard. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 18799. I. S. Nos. 20064-v, 20065-v. S. No. W-1521.)**

On July 2, 1924, 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 291 cases of prepared mustard, at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by Morehouse Mustard Mills, from Oakland, Calif., February 27, 1924, and transported from the State of California into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. A portion of the article was labeled in part: (Jar) "Salad Mustard \* \* \* Morehouse Oakland. Los Angeles, Seattle;" (case) "Best Prepared Mustard." The remainder of the article was labeled in part: (Jar) "Prepared Old English Style Morehouse Mustard \* \* \* Mustard Seed, Vinegar, Spices, Salt and Turmeric Morehouse Mustard Mills Los Angeles Oakland;" (case) "Best Prepared Mustard."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that mustard bran had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the statements, "Salad Mustard," "Best Prepared Mustard," "Mustard," with respect to a portion of the article, and the statements, "Mustard Seed, Vinegar, Spices, Salt and Turmeric," "Best Prepared Mustard," with respect to the remainder thereof, borne on the labels, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On August 26, 1924, the Morehouse Mustard Mills having appeared as claimant for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, upon the finding of the court that the product was adulterated or misbranded, a decree of condemnation 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 \$600, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be relabeled under the supervision of this department.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12671. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 1,301 Cases of Canned Salmon. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be salvaged. (F. & D. No. 18901. I. S. No. 7751-v. S. No. W-1544.)**

On August 7, 1924, 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 1,301 cases of canned salmon, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Pioneer Sea Food Co., from Cordova, Alaska, June 30, 1924, and transported from the Territory of Alaska into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On August 26, 1924, Pioneer Sea Foods, Inc., 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 \$1,500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the bad portion be separated from the good portion and the bad portion destroyed.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12672. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. 372 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond.** (F. & D. No. 18854. I. S. No. 22265-v. S. No. E-4894.)

On July 25, 1924, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, 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 372 sacks of cottonseed meal, consigned on or about January 14, 1924, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by the New Bern Cotton Oil & Fertilizer Co., from New Bern, N. C., and transported from the State of North Carolina into the State of Maryland, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Prime Cottonseed Meal \* \* \* Guaranteed Analysis Protein (Minimum) 38.62% \* \* \* Crude Fibre (Maximum) 10.00%."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Guaranteed Analysis Protein (Minimum) 38.62% \* \* \* Crude Fibre (Maximum) 10.00%," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, in that the said statement represented that the article contained a minimum protein content of 38.62 per cent and a maximum crude fiber content of 10.00 per cent, whereas it contained a less amount of protein and a greater amount of crude fiber than declared.

On August 8, 1924, G. A. Hax & Co., Baltimore, Md., having appeared as claimant, 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 \$1,712, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be correctly relabeled.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12673. Adulteration and misbranding of feed barley. U. S. v. 70 Sacks of Feed Barley. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be relabeled.** (F. & D. No. 18706. I. S. No. 22256-v. S. No. E-4850.)

On May 23, 1924, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, 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 70 sacks of feed barley, consigned on or about April 25, 1924, remaining in the original unbroken packages at College Park, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by Wm. S. Hoge & Bro., from Washington, D. C., and transported from the District of Columbia into the State of Maryland, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Ground Mixed Feed Barley" and "Feed Barley."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, a mixture of wheat, oats, and weed seeds, and containing less than 50 per cent of barley, had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the designations "Ground Mixed Feed Barley" and "Feed Barley," appearing on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive names of other articles, namely, ground mixed feed barley and feed barley.