

that you can get entirely rid of it in a few days, or even a month. The more stubborn your case of skin trouble may be, and the more treatments it has resisted, the more anxious I am for you to use Clear-Tone. * * * let it prove to you that it has merit and will clear up the worst forms of itching and disfiguring skin troubles * * *. If Clear-Tone stops the itching and irritation, and you are gradually improving, the sensible thing to do is to continue the treatment until all symptoms of the trouble have entirely disappeared. One bottle will not give you permanent relief unless you have a very mild case, so just as soon as you see you are improving, get another bottle of Clear-Tone."

On September 12, 1928, 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.*

16061. Adulteration and misbranding of cocoa. U. S. v. 25 Barrels of Cocoa. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 22967. I. S. No. 035. S. No. 1030.)

On August 8, 1928, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 25 barrels of cocoa, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped from Portland, Oreg., June 30, 1928, and transported from the State of Oregon into the State of California, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Barrel) "Smith Lynden Co., San Francisco, Calif. Cunard Cocoa Co.," and was invoiced "Pure Bulk Cocoa."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance, cocoa shells, had been mixed and packed with and substituted in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the designation on the invoice, "Pure Cocoa," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On August 16, 1928, the Smith Lynden Co., San Francisco, Calif., and the Cunard Cocoa Co., Chicago, Ill., having appeared as claimants for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the Smith Lynden Co., upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, conditioned in part that it be made to conform with the provisions of the Federal food and drugs act under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16062. Misbranding (alleged adulteration) of butter. U. S. v. 34 Cubes of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23034. I. S. No. 056. S. No. 1019.)

On July 16, 1928, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 34 cubes of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Fergus County Creamery (Inc.) Lewiston, Mont., July 2, 1928, and transported from the State of Montana into the State of California, 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 substance deficient in butterfat had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article, and in that a valuable constituent, namely, butterfat, had been in part abstracted.

On July 21, 1928, the Fergus County Creamery (Inc.), Lewiston, Mont., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment was entered finding the product misbranded and ordering its condemnation and forfeiture, and it was further ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,200, conditioned in part that it be made to conform with the Federal food and drugs act under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*