

Go straight to nature for the cure, to the forest, the field and the meadow. Curative mysteries are hidden there, many of which are contained in this prescription."

On March 30, 1938, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

28694. Misbranding of French Pessaire Womb Supporter. U. S. v. 67 Packages of French Pessaire Womb Supporter (and 2 similar seizure actions). Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 41773, 41830, 41831. Sample Nos. 2562-D, 2563-D, 3025-D, 8366-D.)

The labeling of this product bore false and fraudulent curative or therapeutic claims and other misrepresentations.

On February 21, March 2, and March 3, 1938, the United States attorneys for the Northern District of California, the Northern District of Illinois, and the Western District of Missouri, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in their respective district courts 3 libels praying seizure and condemnation of 246 packages of French Pessaire Womb Supporters in various lots at San Francisco, Calif.; Chicago, Ill.; and Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 29, 1937, and January 4 and 24, and February 4, 1938, by Robert J. Pierce, Inc., from New York, N. Y., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements in the labeling were false and misleading since the article was not what it was represented to be: (Carton) "Womb Supporter * * *"; (circular) "Womb Supporter * * * The French Womb Supporter is constructed on a common sense principle, and strictly in accordance with the anatomy of the female organization * * * is not injurious in any way, * * * no apprehension of its going too far or doing the slightest harm need be felt."

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the following statements in the circular regarding its curative or therapeutic effects were false and fraudulent: "A Blessing To Womankind * * * It affords a convenient and prompt means of cure to those afflicted with prolapsus (falling of the womb), leucorrhoea (whites), and in the ready cure of the ulceration of the mouth and neck of the womb, so commonly the living torment of delicate women. In treatment of cancer of the womb, it is a most admirable instrument. The ordinary treatment of female diseases by injections is uncertain, slow, tedious, disgusting and expensive. In the use of local medication, by the means of the Womb Supporter, the cure is directly applied to the seat of the disease, and can be retained any length of time with ease, comfort and success. By this valuable means, old chronic female affections, seldom curable by former modes of treatment, now yield readily."

On March 17, April 21, and May 24, 1938, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

28695. Misbranding of hydrogen peroxide. U. S. v. 132, 51, and 122 Bottles of Hydrogen Peroxide. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 41464. Sample Nos. 55257-C, 55298-C.)

This product was misbranded because it contained acetanilid in excess of the amount declared; its label falsely indicated that it conformed to the tests laid down in the United States Pharmacopoeia for hydrogen peroxide, and it was short of the declared volume.

On January 18, 1938, the United States attorney for the District of Rhode Island, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 305 bottles of hydrogen peroxide at Providence, R. I., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 15, 1937, from Boston, Mass., by General Oil & Drug Co., Inc., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "U. S. P. * * * Hydrogen Peroxide * * * with 3/16 grain acetanilide to fluid ounce," was false and misleading when applied to an article that contained more than 3/16 grain of acetanilid per each fluid ounce; in that the statement on the label, "* * * U. S. P. * * * Hydrogen Peroxide," was false and misleading in that the article was not solution of hydrogen perox-