

the relief * * * Indigestion, Gastro-Intestinal Disorders and the many wretched conditions and symptoms that invariably accompany Constipation, * * * In Stubborn, Long-Standing Cases, * * * until the bowels become regular and normal * * * For the Vast Majority of Cases of Constipation, Thus Relieving Much Indigestion, Chronic Appendicitis and Mucous Colitis Due Thereto. Cereal Meal stimulates to action the glands along the bowel and increases bowel peristalsis (worm-like movement of bowel). It furnishes body to the stool which does not get hard and dry. Nerve force and blood supply become normalized, allowing nature to resume her perfect work. Many people suffer with chronic appendicitis and do not know it * * * A diet * * * as Cereal Meal does, relieving the bowel of fecal masses and irritative gases, will in most cases relieve the trouble. The coarse grain in Cereal Meal increases the secretory powers of the stomach and intestinal glands and decreases fermentation and gas formation, thus relieving many forms of indigestion. Mucous Colitis is a catarrhal condition of the large intestine. * * * Cereal Meal cleans out the mucus, clears the bowel and aids the mucous membrane of the colon to return to normal. Cereal Meal * * * nourishes the tissues, aids glandular action, stimulates the nerve endings and gives strength. * * * Constipation Often Cause of Children's Disease;" (circular) "Eat Your Way to Health."

On June 27, 1931, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18623. Adulteration and misbranding of canned grapefruit juice and canned orange juice. U. S. v. 75 Cases of Canned Grapefruit Juice, et al. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Products released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 26133, 26156, 26159. I. S. Nos. 12399, 22078, 22079. S. Nos. 4426, 4466, 4467.)

Examination of samples of canned grapefruit juice and canned orange juice from the shipments herein described showed that the articles contained added sugar, also that the cans contained less than the volume declared on the labels.

On March 27 and March 31, 1931, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid libels praying seizure and condemnation of 75 cases of canned grapefruit juice, and 175 cases of canned orange juice, remaining in the original unbroken packages in part at Seattle, Wash., and in part at Tacoma, Wash., alleging that the articles had been shipped by the Orlando Canning Co., from Orlando, Fla., in part on or about February 20, 1931, and in part on or about March 10, 1931, and had been transported from the State of Florida into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The articles were labeled in part, respectively: (Cans) "Heart of Florida Brand Fancy Florida Grapefruit Juice Contents 11 Fl. oz. or 312 Grams Packed by Orlando Canning Co., Inc., Orlando, Fla.;" and "Heart of Florida Brand Pure Florida Orange Juice Contents 10½ Fl. Oz., or 297 Grams, Packed by Orlando Canning Co., Inc., Orlando, Florida."

Adulteration was alleged in the libel filed with respect to the grapefruit juice for the reason that grapefruit juice with added sugar had been substituted in part for the article. Adulteration of the orange juice was alleged for the reason that orange juice with added sugar had been substituted for the article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Grapefruit Juice," "Contents 11 Fl. oz. or 312 Grams," "Pure * * * Orange Juice," and "Contents 10½ Fl. Oz." borne on the can labels, were false and misleading and deceived and misled purchasers when applied to grapefruit juice and orange juice which contained added sugar, and which were short volume. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the articles were food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the packages, since the statements made were incorrect; and for the further reason that the articles were offered for sale under the distinctive names of other articles.

On April 7 and April 15, 1931, the Preston R. Myrick Co., Seattle, Wash., and the Orlando Canning Co. (Inc.), Orlando, Fla., having appeared as claimants for respective portions of the products, and said claimants having admitted the allegations of the libels and consented to the entry of decrees, judgments of

condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the products be released to the said claimants upon payment of costs and the execution of bonds totaling \$600, conditioned in part that they be relabeled under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18624. Adulteration and misbranding of Fruto punch concentrate. U. S. v. Startup Candy Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$180. (F. & D. No. 25696. I. S. Nos. 018547, 018548, 018549.)

Examination of the beverage materials herein described showed that the articles were highly concentrated citric acid solutions artificially colored and sweetened, containing a negligible amount of fruit juice.

On April 15, 1931, the United States attorney for the District of Utah, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against the Startup Candy Co., a corporation, Provo, Utah, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about March 28, 1930, from the State of Utah into the State of Idaho, of a quantity of Fruto punch concentrate which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Bottles) "Magnolia Brand * * * Fruto Double Strength Punch Concentrate Cherry [or "Orange" or "Grape"] Enriched with True Fruit Products. * * * Startup Candy Co., Provo, Utah."

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that a substance, a sweetened and highly concentrated citric acid solution, artificially colored and artificially flavored, and containing but a slight and negligible concentrate or other true fruit products, had been substituted in part for a quantity, if any, of cherry (or orange or grape, as the case might be) fruit concentrate made from cherry, orange, or grape fruit, which the article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that artificial color and flavor had been mixed with the article in a manner whereby inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements "Fruto * * * Cherry [or "Orange" or "Grape"] Concentrate Double Strength, * * * Enriched with True Fruit products," borne on the labels, were false and misleading in that the said statements represented that the article was a concentrate made from cherry, orange, or grape fruit and was enriched with true fruit products; 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 a concentrate made from the said fruits and was enriched with true fruit products, and was double strength fruit concentrate; whereas the article was not a concentrate made from cherry, orange, or grape fruit, it was not enriched with true fruit products and was not double strength fruit concentrate, but was a sweetened and highly concentrated citric acid solution, artificially colored and artificially flavored, and containing a negligible quantity, if any, of cherry, orange, or grape fruit products, or other true fruit products. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of another article, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, cherry, orange, or grape fruit concentrate.

On May 25, 1931, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$180.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18625. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 9 Tubs of Butter. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product delivered to charitable institutions. (F. & D. No. 28745. I. S. No. 30148. S. No. 4553.)

Samples of butter from the shipment herein described having been found to contain less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat, the standard prescribed by Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York.

On April 27, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of nine tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Niobrara Cooperative Creamery, Lusk, Wyo., on or about April 8, 1931, and had been transported from the State of Wyoming into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a product containing less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted