

decay may follow, ending in rapid and hopeless tooth destruction and chronic pyorrhoea. Early treatment with Gum-Rub will prevent this unfortunate sequel.
* * * Bear in mind that gum diseases are not a temporary or overnight condition, but the result of having neglected minor afflictions over a long period of time. Usually gum diseases reach a semi-serious or serious stage before the patient commences treatment. Thus, treatment with Gum-Rub should not be discontinued because gums show a superficial improvement, due to the quick action of Gum Rub, but the treatment with Gum Rub should be continued until your dentist pronounces your gums as having returned to a normal and healthy condition. Thereafter, treatment once a day should be continued as a prevention against recurrence of the disease."

On April 20, 1931, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18322. Misbranding of fluid extract of ginger. U. S. v. 1 Barrel of Liquid Medicine. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 25905. I. S. No. 13109. S. No. 4175.)

Examination of a product, labeled "Liquid Medicine," from the shipment herein described having shown that it was an extract of ginger containing a large proportion of alcohol, and that the label failed to declare the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained in the article, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Southern District of California.

On February 13, 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 1 barrel of the so-called liquid medicine, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by Jordan Bros., New York, N. Y., on or about January 30, 1931, and had been transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that it contained alcohol and the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained in the said article was not stated on the label.

On March 21, 1931, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18323. Adulteration and misbranding of fluid extract of ginger. U. S. v. 5 Barrels of Liquid Medicine. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 25904. I. S. No. 13108. S. No. 4174.)

Examination of the so-called liquid medicine from the shipment herein described having shown that it had been invoiced as fluid extract of ginger, U. S. P., whereas it was not a pharmacopoeial product, also that the label failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained in the article, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the facts to the United States attorney for the Southern District of California.

On February 13, 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 5 barrels of the said liquid medicine, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by Jordan Bros., New York, N. Y., on or about January 29, 1931, and had been transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. On April 13, 1931, the libel was amended to include adulteration charges and a further misbranding charge.

It was alleged in the libel as amended that the article was adulterated in that it failed to meet the pharmacopoeial requirements for ginger extract (fluid extract), and for the further reason that it fell below the professed standard under which it was sold.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article contained alcohol, and the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained therein was not stated on the label. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of and was offered for sale under the name of another article.