

it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was olive oil and contained $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, the article was not olive oil, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil, and each can did not contain $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon of the article, but a less amount. Further misbranding was alleged in that the article was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil prepared in imitation of olive oil, and was sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, olive oil. Further misbranding was alleged in that it was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that the article was olive oil, and that each can contained $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not olive oil, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil, and each can contained less than $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon. Further misbranding was alleged in that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On March 17, 1920, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$75.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7629. Adulteration and misbranding of feed meal. U. S. * * * v. Shellabarger Elevator Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 10771. I. S. No. 10676-r.)

On December 15, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Shellabarger Elevator, Co., a corporation, Decatur, Ill., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about June 7, 1918, from the State of Illinois into the State of Indiana, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Feed Meal," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

	Per cent.
Ether extract (crude fat)-----	2.62
Crude protein-----	8.69

Article consists principally of a product from yellow and white corn with the addition of what appeared to be ground screenings, consisting of pieces of wheat, oats, kafir, weed seeds, and chaff.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, screenings, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality, and had been substituted in part for feed meal compounded from corn feed meal, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Not less than 3.0 per cent of crude fat, 9.0 per cent of crude protein" and "Compounded from the following ingredients: Corn Feed Meal," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article contained not less than 3 per cent of crude fat and 9 per cent of crude protein and was compounded from corn feed meal, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it contained not less than 3 per cent of crude fat and 9 per cent of crude protein and was compounded from corn feed meal, whereas, in truth and in fact, it contained less than 3 per cent of crude fat and less than 9 per cent of crude protein and was not compounded from corn feed meal, but was a mixture consisting of corn feed meal and screenings; and

for the further reason that it was a mixture consisting of corn feed meal and screenings and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, feed meal compounded from corn feed meal.

On January 19, 1920, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7630. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Giuseppe Crisafulli and Stefano Crisafulli (Crisafulli Bros.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 11035. I. S. Nos. 12708-r, 12716-r, 15267-r.)

On October 15, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Giuseppe Crisafulli and Stefano Crisafulli, trading as Crisafulli Bros., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on September 25, 1918, June 25, 1918, and August 2, 1918, from the State of New York into the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Maryland, of quantities of alleged olive oil which was adulterated and misbranded. The article in the shipments on September 25, and August 2, 1918, was labeled in part, "Finest Quality Table Oil La Migliore Brand Insuperabile Corn Salad Oil Compound with Extra Fine Olive Oil," and in the shipment on June 25, 1918, in part, "Finest Quality Table Oil La Migliore Brand Insuperabile Cotton Salad Oil Compound with Extra Fine Olive Oil."

Analyses of samples of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the shipments on August 2, and September 25, consisted of corn oil. In the shipment on June 25, the $\frac{1}{2}$ -gallon cans consisted of corn oil, and the $\frac{1}{4}$ -gallon and 1-gallon cans consisted of corn oil and cottonseed oil, and all of the cans were short volume.

Adulteration of the article in the shipment on September 25, 1918, and August 2, 1918, was alleged in the information for the reason that corn oil had been substituted in part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Adulteration of the article in the shipment on June 25, 1918, was alleged for the reason that in a part of said article a certain substance, to wit, corn oil, and in the remainder of said article certain other substances, to wit, cottonseed and corn oil, had been substituted in part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article in the shipment on September 25, 1918, was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Olive Oil," in conspicuous type, and the statement "Corn Salad Oil" in small and inconspicuous type, together with the designs and devices of an olive tree and olive branch appearing on the label, were false and misleading in that they represented to purchasers that the article was olive oil, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchasers into the belief that it was olive oil, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not olive oil, and for the further reason that it was an imitation of another article, to wit, olive oil, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article.

Misbranding of the article in the shipment on June 25, 1918, was alleged for the reason that the statement appearing on the label in prominent type, to wit, "Extra Fine Olive Oil," and the statement concerning the article appearing on the label in inconspicuous type, to wit, "Cotton salad oil compound," together with the design and device of an olive tree and branch, were false and misleading in that they represented to purchasers that the article was olive oil, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mis-