

less than 36 per cent of protein, to wit, approximately 33.1 or 35.3 per cent of protein, as the case might be.

Adulteration of the cottonseed meal was alleged for the reason that cottonseed hulls had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for "Good 7% Cottonseed Meal," to wit, 7 per cent ammonia cottonseed meal, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was a product composed in part of cottonseed hulls which contained less than 7 per cent of ammonia, prepared in imitation of "Good 7% Cottonseed Meal," and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, "Good 7% Cottonseed Meal." Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason 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 September 11, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

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

6969. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Socrates Moscahlades and Styliamos Moscahlades, copartners (Moscahlades Brothers). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 9477. I. S. No. 2665-p.)

On March 12, 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 Socrates Moscahlades and Styliamos Moscahlades, copartners, trading as Moscahlades Brothers, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about November 12, 1917, from the State of New York into the State of Massachusetts, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Gloria Virgin Pure Olive Oil," which was misbranded.

Examination of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the average net contents of 3 cans to be 1 pint 14.77 fluid ounces.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, " $\frac{1}{4}$ Gall.," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it, was false and misleading in that it represented that said cans contained not less than $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that said cans contained not less than $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon of the article, whereas, in fact and in truth, said cans did contain less than $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon of the article. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason 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 26, 1919, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

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

6970. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Nicholas S. Monahos. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$75. (F. & D. No. 9479. I. S. No. 1357-p.)

On March 5, 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 Nicholas S. Monahos, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on January 12, 1918, from the State

of New York into the State of Connecticut, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Prodotti Italiani Olio di Oliva Pure Olive Oil," which was adulterated and misbranded.

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

Average net contents of 2 cans__	3 quarts 1 pint 11.70 fluid ounces.
Average shortage (fluid ounces)_____	4.30
Average shortage (per cent)_____	3.36
Test for cottonseed oil: Strongly positive.	

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for pure olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Prodotti Italiani Olio di Oliva Pure Olive Oil Sopraffino Italia Brand Lucca Toscana Italia, Net Contents 1 Gallon," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was pure olive oil, that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the province of Tuscany, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of the said cans contained 1 full gallon of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was pure olive oil, that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the province of Tuscany, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained 1 full gallon of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not pure olive oil, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil, and was not a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the province of Tuscany, in the kingdom of Italy, but was a domestic product, to wit, a product produced in the United States of America, and each of said cans did not contain 1 full gallon of the article, but contained a less amount; and for the further reason that it was falsely branded as to the country in which it was manufactured and produced in that it was a product manufactured and produced in whole or in part in the United States of America, and was branded as manufactured and produced in the kingdom of Italy; and for the further reason that it 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; and for the further reason that by the statements on the label it purported to be a foreign product, when not so. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason 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 19, 1919, 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.*

6971. Misbranding of dairy feed. U. S. * * * v. John Wade, John Joseph Wade, Thomas M. Wade, Mark F. Wade, and Eugene Wade (John Wade & Sons). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 9482. I. S. No. 7426-p.)

On February 3, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Tennessee, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against