

the article was misbranded for the further reason that certain statements, included in the booklet accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented it as a treatment for lung and bronchial affections and effective as a remedy for any form of lung or bronchial trouble that has not passed the incipient stage, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On March 16, 1920, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

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

7589. Misbranding of O. D. C. X-Z-MA Remedy. U. S. * * * v. O. D. C. Co., a Corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 9246. I. S. No. 2178-p.)

On January 15, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, 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 O. D. C. Co., a corporation, Boston, Mass., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about November 6, 1917, from the State of Massachusetts into the State of Rhode Island, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "O. D. C. X-Z-MA Remedy," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of a mixture of 1.16 per cent of metallic mercury, approximately 10 per cent of a pine oil, probably turpentine, and a base composed of petrolatum, paraffin, and possibly wool fat.

It was alleged in substance that the article was misbranded for the reason that certain statements, appearing on the labels of the carton containing, and tube enclosing the article, falsely and fraudulently represented it as a cure for eczema and kindred diseases of the skin, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

It was alleged in substance that the article was misbranded for the further reason that certain statements, included in the circular accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented it as a cure for eczema and kindred diseases of the skin, as a cure for dandruff, and effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for psoriasis, and as a cure for acne and pimples, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On April 20, 1920, the defendant company entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

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

7590. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Giuseppe Crisafulli and Stefano Crisafulli (Crisafulli Bros.). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 9793. I. S. No. 13725-r.)

On October 27, 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, copartners, trading as Crisafulli Bros., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, on June 26, or August 7, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Connecticut, of a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Finest Quality Table Oil La Migliore Brand Corn Salad Oil compounded with Extra Fine Olive Oil."

Analysis of a sample of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the product consisted almost entirely of corn oil, and that the 1-gallon cans were short volume.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, corn 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 large part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article in the 1-gallon cans was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Finest Quality Table Oil," "Extra Fine Olive Oil," "Net Contents One Gallon," together with the design and device of olive branches bearing olives, not corrected by the statement in inconspicuous type, "Corn salad oil compound with * * *," 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 olive oil, and that each of said cans contained 1 gallon net 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 olive oil, and that each of said cans contained 1 gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not olive oil, but was a mixture composed in large part of corn oil, and each of said cans did not contain 1 gallon net of the article, but contained a less amount. 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.

Misbranding of the article in the $\frac{1}{2}$ -gallon cans was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Finest Quality Table Oil," "Extra Fine Olive Oil," together with the design and device of olive branches bearing olives, not corrected by the statement in inconspicuous type, "Corn salad oil compound with * * *," 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 olive oil, 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 olive oil, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was a mixture composed in large part of corn oil.

On November 26, 1919, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

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

7591. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Anastasios L. Mihalaplos (A. L. Mihalaplos & Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 9195. I. S. No 2685-p.)

On November 15, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Anastasios L. Mihalaplos, trading as A. L. Mihalaplos & Co., Boston, Mass., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about December 5, 1917, from the State of Massachusetts into the State of Maine, of a quantity of olive oil which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part, "Kilkis ΕΑΛΙΟΝ ΠΝΗΣΙΟΝ Brand Pure Olive Oil Net Contents $\frac{1}{4}$ Gal."

Analysis of a sample of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the product consisted of cottonseed oil, with a small proportion of olive oil, and was short volume.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a 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.