

4344. Adulteration and misbranding of sorghum. U. S. v. The Castleman-Blakemore Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 5772. I. S. No. 10479-e.)

On February 19, 1915, the United States attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, 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 Castleman-Blakemore Co., a corporation, Louisville, Ky., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about August 22, 1912, from the State of Kentucky into the State of Texas, of a quantity of sorghum which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled: (On can) "Old Mill Brand Pure Country Sorghum. From the Old Fashion Country Mill to the Breakfast Table. Packed by Torbitt & Castleman Branch of Jones Bros. Castleman & Blakemore Incorporated Louisville, Ky." (On shipping package) "12 5s Old Mill Brand Pure Country Sorghum. Packed by Torbitt & Castleman Branch, Louisville, Ky."

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

Sucrose (Clerget) (per cent)-----	27.9
Glucose (factor 163) (per cent)-----	19.6
Polarization, direct 20° C. (°V)-----	+53.0
Polarization, invert 20° C. (°V)-----	+16.0
Polarization, 87° C. (°V)-----	+32.0
Reducing sugars, as invert, before inversion (per cent)---	31.15
Reducing sugars, as invert, after inversion (per cent)---	62.23
Lead number (Winton)-----	11.72
Ash (per cent)-----	3.28
Water (per cent)-----	23.2

Article is not a genuine sorghum but a sorghum containing at least 10 per cent added glucose.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that another substance, to wit, commercial glucose, had been substituted in part for pure country sorghum, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement "Pure Country Sorghum" borne on the label was false and misleading, in that it purported and represented said article to be a genuine sorghum, and deceived and misled the purchaser into the belief that it was a genuine sorghum, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not a genuine sorghum, but was a mixture of commercial glucose and sorghum.

On October 11, 1915, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

CARL VROOMAN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*