

and that the product should not be used or disposed of without having been inspected by a representative of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16071. Misbranding of Bowman's abortion remedy. U. S. v. 7 Boxes of Bowman's Abortion Remedy. Default decree of destruction entered. (F. & D. No. 20141. I. S. No. 23891-v. S. No. C-4751.)

On June 20, 1925, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri, 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 7 boxes of Bowman's abortion remedy, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Sedalia, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Erick Bowman Remedy Co., from Owatonna, Minn., on or about June 5, 1925, and had been transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of Missouri, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of brown sugar and a ground wheat product, with a small amount of phenolic body and possible traces of compounds of calcium and sulphur.

The article was labeled in part: (Inside of flap of carton) "Bowman's Abortion Remedy. This package contains one 9½-pound treatment of Bowman's Abortion Remedy. Read the directions carefully before administering."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the labels on the said boxes, packages, or cartons regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article contained therein 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 for it in the aforesaid statements.

On October 21, 1925, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment was entered finding the product misbranded and ordering that it be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16072. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. Leo W. Williams and Edmund M. Root (Hardwick Creamery). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 19335. I. S. Nos. 16847-v, 16770-v.)

On April 7, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Vermont, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Leo W. Williams and Edmund M. Root, copartners, trading as the Hardwick Creamery, Hardwick, Vt., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on or about July 9, 1924, from the State of Vermont into the State of Massachusetts, of quantities of butter which was adulterated and misbranded. A portion of the article was labeled in part: (Package) "Fancy Creamery Butter Pure Cream * * *. This Package Contains Eight Ounces of Butter." The remainder of the said article was labeled in part: (Crate) "H 60 Lbs. Net," (package) "5 Lbs. Net.," and was invoiced as butter.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that a product deficient in milk fat had been substituted for butter, which the article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a product which contained less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat, as prescribed by the act of March 4, 1923, which the said article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged with respect to a portion of the article for the reason that the statements "Creamery Butter Pure Cream" and "This Package Contains Eight Ounces of Butter," borne on the label, were false and misleading in that the said statements represented that the article consisted wholly of creamery butter and that each of the packages contained 8 ounces thereof, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it consisted wholly of creamery butter, and that each of said packages contained 8 ounces thereof, whereas it did not consist wholly of creamery butter but did consist of a product deficient in milk fat, and each of said packages did not contain 8 ounces of the article, but did contain a less amount. Misbranding was alleged with respect to the said portion for the further reason that the statement, to wit, "Butter," borne on the label, was false and misleading in that it represented that the