

Products, Inc., from Chicago, Ill., on or about January 15 and 22, 1941; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination of a sample of the article showed that it consisted of senna leaves (approximately 40 percent) with smaller proportions of other leaves, buds, seeds, stems and flowers including arnica flowers, uva ursi leaves, aniseed, and Cyanus flowers.

The article was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that its labeling failed to bear adequate directions for use, since directions contained in an accompanying booklet entitled "Food," that users drink Germania Herb Tea with meals as needed for a few weeks, were not appropriate for an article of its composition and therefore were not adequate. (2) In that statements in the aforesaid booklet and in a leaflet entitled "Insist on Genuine No. 14 Germania Herb Tea," representing that its use would give the consumer a normal, healthy, and beautiful figure; that it would be effective for the relief of many body aches and pains; that it would give regular elimination for a healthy stomach; that it would be efficacious in the treatment of stomach-heartburns, sour stomach, belching, vomiting, biliousness, dizzy spells, gas in the stomach and bowels, loss of appetite and restless nights; that by its use one could avoid constipation; that it would be efficacious in the treatment of rheumatic aches and pains; that its use would give the consumer a clear complexion, would stimulate functional kidney action, would aid in weight reduction, and would help promote elimination of wastes through the kidneys and gastro-intestinal organs, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes. (3) In that its label failed to bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient, since the statement on the label, "No. 14 Germania Herb Tea is Composed of T. V. Senna Leaves, Black Tea, Acacia Flowers, Cyanil Flowers, Pansy Herb, Uva Ursi Leaves, Arnica Flowers, Blackberry Leaves, Raspberry Leaves, Sweet Violet Leaves, Horse Tail, Elder Flowers, Woodruff Herb, Fennel Seed, Aniseeds and Camomile Flowers," did not indicate which of the plant materials mentioned are physiologically or therapeutically active.

On March 8, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

443. Misbranding of Gid. U. S. v. 105 Packages and 2,900 Envelopes (free samples) of Gid Granules No. 1 and 169 Packages of Gid Granules No. 2. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4854. Sample Nos. 36782-E, 36783-E.)

The labeling of the free samples of this product failed to bear adequate directions for use, the common or usual name of each of the active ingredients, the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor, and a statement of the quantity of contents. The labeling of the regular packages bore false and misleading statements regarding its ingredients and its therapeutic properties.

On June 2, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts filed a libel against the above-named products at Boston, Mass., alleging that they had been shipped by Eberly-Williams Manufacturing Co. from Chicago, Ill., on or about April 9 and 17, 1941; and charging that they were misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the articles showed that Gid Granules No. 1 consisted essentially of the mucilaginous part of psyllium seed, karaya gum, sodium bicarbonate in proportions varying from 1.2 percent to 8.2 percent, calcium carbonate in proportions varying from 0.79 percent to 9.2 percent, a phosphate, a sulfate, and sugar; and that Gid Granules No. 2 consisted essentially of the mucilaginous part of psyllium seed, karaya gum, yeast, and sugar.

The free samples of Gid Granules No. 1 were alleged to be misbranded for the reasons stated above. Gid Granules No. 1 were alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, (carton) "Calcium Carbonate . . . 9% Sodium Bicarbonate . . . 9%," was false and misleading since it did not contain the declared proportions of calcium carbonate and sodium bicarbonate; and in that the statement, (carton) "are scientifically prepared to be of effective value in the treatment of minor irritations and inflammations of the stomach and upper intestines, a protective demulcent * * * Dosage four grams (one teaspoonful) three or four times daily," was false and misleading since the article was not an appropriate and effective medicament for the conditions mentioned and it did not possess the properties claimed when used as stated. Gid Granules No. 2 were alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, (carton) "are scientifically prepared to be of effective value in the treatment of minor irritations and inflammations of the lower intestine and colon, and in spastic * * *

constipation," were false and misleading since the article did not constitute an adequate treatment for the conditions mentioned. Both articles were alleged to be misbranded in that statements in an accompanying circular entitled "A Message of Hope," representing that it would be efficacious for relief from the distressing symptoms in many cases of stomach troubles, indigestion, sore stomach, bad breath, gnawing pains, gas pains, dyspepsia, intestinal disorders, biliousness, headache, sleeplessness, intestinal stasis, auto-intoxication, colitis, colonic irritation, liver and gall deficiencies not due to infection; that *Gid* means gastro-intestinal demulcence; that it would be efficacious as an aid for gastro-intestinal lacerations, ulcers, lesions, stasis, constipation, and toxemia; that *Gid* would coat offensive particles of the intestinal contents and every square inch of stomach-intestinal wall with its protective demulcence; that it would tend to correct diarrhea, tuberculosis, and cancer of the gastric tract; that *Gid* No. 1 was especially adapted to neutralize the excess acidity of the jejunum and upper intestine; and that *Gid* No. 2 was particularly fitted for use in troubles located in the lower intestines, cecum, ascending and transverse colon, sigmoid, and rectum, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On July 8, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

444. Misbranding of Gly-Cas. U. S. v. 258 Cartons of Gly-Cas. Default decree of condemnation. Product destroyed. (F. D. C. No. 3647. Sample No. 8978-E.)

The labeling of this product, in addition to failure to bear the warning statement required in the labeling of laxative preparations, also bore false and misleading therapeutic and other claims, and it failed to indicate which of the ingredients was the active ingredient.

On January 17, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of South Dakota filed a libel against 258 cartons of *Gly-Cas* at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about November 25, 1940, by the *Gly-Cas* Medicine Co. from Muncie, Ind.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article, which was in capsule form, showed that each capsule contained approximately 4.3 grains of drugs from plant sources including aloe and a small proportion of glycerin.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the labeling failed to bear such adequate warnings against unsafe dosage or methods or duration of administration in such manner and form as are necessary for the protection of users in that it did not inform the purchaser that continual or frequent use of the article might result in dependence upon laxatives to move the bowels. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that representations in the labeling that its use would put one "in Step with Health"; that it would be efficacious in the treatment of those who suffer with muscular aches and pains, poor digestion, soured, gassy feeling after eating, bloated stomach; night risings, backaches; dizzy spells, headaches, nervousness or poor sleep kindred to faulty bowel elimination, frequent bladder action, loss of pep and energy, inability to work, and restlessness; and that it had proved effective in many cases where other medicines tried before had failed to give satisfactory results, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the statement in the circular "Contains No * * * Harmful Drugs," was false and misleading since the article was capable of causing harm; in that the statement that the article was a product of over 25 years of practical experience of a well-known pharmacist was false and misleading since it was essentially a preparation of aloe, a drug whose properties had been known for centuries; and in that its label failed to bear the common or usual name of the active ingredient in that the statement on the carton, "Compound of Cinnamon, Aloe, Glycerin and Licorice," did not indicate what was really its active ingredient.

On February 17, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered; and on February 25, 1941, the product was destroyed.

445. Misbranding of Grover Graham Remedy (and Graham's Pills). U. S. v. 33 12-Fluid-Ounce Packages and 42 6-Fluid-Ounce Packages of Grover Graham Remedy. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3915. Sample No. 34897-E.)

Each package of this product contained an envelope labeled "Graham's Pills." The labeling of Grover Graham Remedy and Graham's Pills failed to bear