estrogenic substance)" were false and misleading since they represented, suggested, and created the impression that the article contained a hormone and that it would exert a beneficial hormone-like or beneficial estrogenic effect upon the body when used according to the directions "Apply gently ½ heaping teaspoonful at bedtime. Leave on overnight." The article did not contain a hormone and would not produce a beneficial hormone-like or beneficial estrogenic effect when used as directed.

DISPOSITION: April 14, 1947. No claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

2176. Misbranding of Theradophilus Culture. U. S. v. 14 Cases and 6 Bottles * * *. (F. D. C. No. 20555. Sample No. 59441–H.)

LIBEL FILED: July 24, 1946, Western District of Washington.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about February 14 and 19 and April 23 and 27, 1946, by Therapy, Limited, from Pasadena, Calif.

PRODUCT: 14 cases, each containing 24 bottles, and 6 bottles of *Theradophilus Culture* and a number of booklets entitled "Therapy Supplementary Foods" at Seattle, Wash. Examination showed that the article contained not more than 1 million viable acidophilus organisms per cubic centimeter.

LABEL, IN PART: "Theradophilus A Culture of Bacillus Acidophilus in Soya Bean Medium Contents 8 Fl. Oz. * * * Directions: Take one tablespoonful in half a glass of water at least half an hour before breakfast and again at bedtime. For infants: One teaspoonful in milk, once a day."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the directions on the bottle label were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article when taken as directed would supply a significant amount of acidophilus organisms, whereas it would not supply a significant amount of such organisms when taken as directed; and, further, certain statements in the booklet accompanying the article were false and misleading. These statements represented and suggested that the article would be effective for controlling conditions in the intestines, be conducive to longevity, and be effective to accomplish great improvement in health, whereas it would not be effective for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: September 18, 1946. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

2177. Misbranding of Acidofilac. U. S. v. 81 Bottles * * * and a number of circulars. (F. D. C. No. 21679. Sample No. 59465–H.)

LIBEL FILED: November 26, 1946, Western District of Washington.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about October 1, 1946, by the Radiance Products Company, from Los Angeles, Calif.

PRODUCT: 81 pint bottles of *Acidofilac* and a number of circulars entitled "Fight The Invisible Foe in Your Intestine" at Seattle, Wash. Examination showed that the product contained two strains of viable lactobacilli.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements appearing in the labeling of the article were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the use of *Acidofilac* would be effective to control and overcome unfriendly bacteria, kill the putrefactive bacteria in the intestines and prolong life, and affect the general health. The use of *Acidofilac* would not be effective for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: February 11, 1947. No claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product and circulars were ordered destroyed.

2178. Misbranding of Prostall. U. S. v. 22 Bottles * * *. (F. D. C. No. 22616. Sample No. 63119–H.)

LIBEL FILED: March 11, 1947, Northern District of California.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about February 3, 1947, by Douglas Laboratories, from Boston, Mass.

PRODUCT: 22 100-capsule bottles of *Prostall* at San Francisco, Calif.. Analysis showed that the product consisted essentially of glutamic acid.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statements "Prostall 'stalls off pain,' relieves the symptoms of prostate hypertrophy (pros-