10352. Misbranding of Leslie's, Arthur's, and Thomas' emmenagogue pills. U. S. * * * v. 5 Packages of Leslie's Emmenagogue Pills, et al. Default decrees ordering the destruction of the products. (F. & D. No. 13291. I. S. Nos. 9146-t, 9147-t, 9148-t. S. Nos. E-2646, E-2671, E-2672.)

On or about September 11, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 5 packages of Leslie's emmenagogue pills, 5 packages of Arthur's emmenagogue pills, and 5 packages of Thomas' emmenagogue pills, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Tampa (Ybor City), Fla., consigned by the Palestine Drug Co., St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the articles had been shipped from St. Louis, Mo., on or about June 10, 1920, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Florida, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that each consisted essentially of iron sulphate, aloes, and vegetable extract, coated with a mixture of sugar and calcium carbonate, colored pink.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged in substance in the libels for the reason that the labels appearing on the boxes containing the said articles bore the following statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects thereof, "* * * Emmenagogue Pills recommended for Ammenorrhea, Dysmenorrhea and other Menstrual Troubles. * * * Beginning Treatment * * * Before The Regular Monthly Period. * * * Continue * * * Until Relief Is Obtained," which were false and fraudulent in that the said articles would not produce the curative or therapeutic effects which purchasers were led to expect by the said statements, and which were applied to the said articles with a knowledge of their falsity for the purpose of defrauding purchasers thereof.

On March 3, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of the court were entered ordering that the products be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

10353. Adulteration and misbranding of Honey Boy cordial. U. S. * * * v. 36 Kegs of Honey Boy Cordial. Default decree ordering destruction of the product. (F. & D. No. 13673. I. S. Nos. 9138-t, 9139-t, 9140-t. S. No. E-2732.)

On or about September 13, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 36 kegs of Honey Boy cordial, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Miami, Fla., consigned by the Honey Boy Cordial Co., St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped from St. Louis, Mo., on or about March 25, 1920, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Florida, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Honey Boy Brand Non-Alcoholic Cordial * * * Manufactured by the Honey Boy Cordial Co., St. Louis, New Orleans." Ten kegs of the said article were further labeled, "Razzle Dazzle," and ten kegs thereof were further labeled, "Black Bird."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a glucose and saccharin solution had been mixed and packed with, and substituted wholly or in part for, the said article, and for the further reason that it contained an added poisonous or deleterious ingredient, saccharin, which might render it injurious to health.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the kegs in which the said article was inclosed contained a label which bore the following statement regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, to wit, "Honey Boy Non-Alcoholic Cordial," which was false and misleading. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of, and offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article.

On December 5, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of the court was entered ordering that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*