grams Phosphorus—38 Milligrams," and "Four tablets three times daily will supply, with normal food intake, full adult requirements of Calcium & Phosphorus," were false and misleading since the article contained approximately 6 milligrams of calcium and 5 milligrams of phosphorus; four tablets three times daily would not supply full adult requirements of calcium and phosphorus; and the article would not supply, when taken in accordance with the directions on the package, a significant amount of either calcium or phosphorus.

The soybean lecithin was labeled in part: "4 Grains Soybean Lecithin in 3 Minimum Soybean Oil with 150 U. S. P. Units Vitamin D, from Irradiated Ergosterol." The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, "The ideal nerve and brain food," which appeared in the accompanying booklet entitled "Nutritional Food Guide" and the accompanying order blank, was false and misleading since the article was not an ideal nerve and brain food.

The wheat germ oil was alleged to be misbranded in that the accompanying booklet entitled "Nutritional Food Guide" contained the following false and misleading statements: "Muscles * * * Lack of 'E'—Weakness; partial paralysis," and "Results of Mild Deficiency * * * 'E' Sterility disturbance during pregnancy, impaired mentality." The article would not be effective in the prevention of the diseases, conditions, and symptoms stated and implied.

The Improved B Complex Food Supplement was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements in the accompanying booklets entitled "Adolphus Messenger of Health, Success and Happiness" and "Nutritional Food Guide" were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious in the prevention of indigestion, poor appetite, fatigue, lack of energy and pep, loss of weight, nervousness, inability to concentrate, difficulty in relaxing, dry scalp skin, slow heart beat, disease of the muscular substance of the heart, poor lactation, poor appetite, poor flow of digestive juices, constipation, tendency to peptic ulcers, bone marrow degeneration, loss of muscular tone, soreness and pain, spasms, general weakness, nervousness, neuritis, and gastric and intestinal disturbances; and that it would be efficacious in the promotion of perfect coordination, growth, healthy eyes, and normal skin and morale. The article would not be efficacious for such purposes.

The Adolphus Brand Mineral Capsules were alleged to be misbranded in that the statement in an accompanying order blank, "Adolphus Mineral Capsules * * * containing all the principal minerals needed in the human body," was false and misleading since the article, when taken in accordance with the directions in the labeing, would not supply all of the principal minerals needed in the human body, and since the amounts of calcium and phosphorus, two of the principal minerals needed, which would be supplied by the article when taken in accordance with the directions, were but a small fraction of the amounts needed.

The Adolphus Brand Tar Shampoo was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the order blank, "Adolphus Tar Shampoo For * * * dandruff, and falling hair," was false and misleading since the article was not an adequate remedy for dandruff and falling hair.

The articles, with the exceptions of the tar shampoo and the Broom Herb Laxative, were alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in notices of judgment on foods, No. 7924.

On April 14, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

1358. Misbranding of Udga Tablets. U. S. v. 62 Boxes, 3 Bottles, and 6 Bottles of Udga Tablets. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. No. 6912. Sample No. 86830-E.)

On February 27, 1942, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against 62 boxes, each containing 20 tablets, 3 bottles, each containing 100 tablets, and 6 bottles, each containing 50 tablets, of the above-named product at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped from St. Paul, Minn., by Udga, Inc., on or about January 8, 1942.

Analysis showed that the article contained, per tablet, 6.88 grains of bismuth subcarbonate, 10.23 grains of magnesium oxide, 7.29 grains of sodium bicarbonate, 0.2 grain of Rochelle salt, and a small proportion of saccharine. The statement of active ingredients was in small, inconspicuous type.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements on its label and in an accompanying circular were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious for the relief of excessive gastric hyperacidity as manifested by sour stomach, heartburn, acid dyspepsia, excessive gas, belching, and flatulence; and that it would be efficacious

for the relief of persons suffering from stomach ailments caused by improper diet, irregular eating habits, consuming too many acid-producing foods, or overeating. The article would not be efficacious for such conditions.

The article was alleged to be misbranded further (1) in that the statement of active ingredients, "contain: Bismuth Subcarbonate; Magnesium Oxide; Sodium Bicarbonate; Saccharine; Rochelle Salt," appearing on the box label of the article, was not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness as to render it likely to be read under customary conditions of purchase and use; (2) in that its labeling failed to bear adequate directions for use since the directions did not provide a limitation as to duration of use; and (3) in that its labeling did not bear a warning that the article should not be used when abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, or other symptoms of appendicitis were present, and that frequent or continued use might result in dependence on laxatives.

On April 4, 1945, Udga, Inc., claimant, having admitted the facts in the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

1359. Adulteration and misbranding of Pso-Ridisal. U. S. v. 38 Packages and 83 Gross of Pso-Ridisal. Consent decrees of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. Nos. 6679, 11683. Sample Nos. 86401–E, 66407–F, 66408–F, 66443–F.)

On or about January 17 and 28, 1944, the United States attorneys for the Northern District of Illinois and the Western District of Missouri filed libels against 38 packages of Pso-Ridisal at Chicago, Ill., and 83 gross of the same product at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped from Royal Oak, Mich., by the Nu-Basic Products Co., between the approximate dates of November 19, 1941, and December 15, 1943. The libels against the Missouri and Illinois lots were amended on or about February 14 and 23, 1944, respectively.

Analysis of samples disclosed that the article consisted essentially of sulfanilamide, mineral oil, glycerin, small proportions of carbolic acid, and soap and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements appearing in the labeling of each lot regarding the efficacy of the article in the treatment of psoriasis, and certain additional statements in the labeling of the Missouri lot regarding the efficacy of the article in the treatment of skin diseases, including athlete's foot, dandruff, eczema, acne, diaper rash, and industrial dermatitis, were false and misleading since the article would not be efficacious in the treatment of the conditions mentioned.

The article was alleged to be misbranded further in that its labeling failed to bear adequate warnings, since the article contained sulfanilamide and its labeling failed to warn that its use should be discontinued if a new skin rash appeared or if the skin condition under treatment became worse.

The article in the Illinois lot was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength differed from that which it was represented to possess since its labeling represented that each fluid ounce contained ⅜ grain of sulfanilamide, whereas each fluid ounce contained 6.7 grains of sulfanilamide.

On June 30, 1942, the Nu-Basic Products Co. having appeared as claimant for the Illinois lot and having requested that the case be removed for trial to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan on the ground that that district was in reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, the court, after due consideration, entered an order denying the claimant's request for a change of venue. Thereafter, the Nu-Basic Products Co. appeared as claimant in the case of the Missouri lot and, pursuant to a motion filed by the claimant, an order was entered on April 11, 1944, providing for the removal of the case to the Northern District of Illinois. On April 12 and 26, 1944, the claimant having admitted the facts of the libels, judgments of condemnation were entered in each case and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

1360. Misbranding of Sulfa-Seb and Sulfa-Ped. U. S. v. 50¾ Dozen Bottles of Sulfa-Seb and 17¾ Dozen Bottles of Sulfa-Ped. Tried to the court. Judgment for the Government. Decree ordering the condemnation and destruction of the labeling and the release of the product to the claimant. (F. D. C. No. 11075. Sample Nos. 3933–F, 3934–F.)

On or about November 10, 1943, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri filed a libel against 50¾ dozen bottles of Sulfa-Seb and 17¾ dozen bottles of Sulfa-Ped at Kansas City, Mo. On February 14, 1944, an amended libel was filed. It was alleged that the articles had been shipped on