

Issued May 17, 1912.

United States Department of Agriculture,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

NOTICE OF JUDGMENT NO. 1390.

(Given pursuant to section 4 of the Food and Drugs Act.)

ADULTERATION AND MISBRANDING OF PEROXIDE OF HYDROGEN.

At a stated term of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California begun on the second Monday in July, 1911, the grand jurors of the United States for said district, upon presentation by the United States Attorney, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, returned an indictment to said court against Langley & Michaels Co., a corporation, alleging shipment by it, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about July 14, 1910, from the State of California into the State of Washington of four cases of peroxide of hydrogen which was adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: "One Pound Peroxide of Hydrogen, U. S. P., 10 Volumes (3%) solution, Special for Medicinal Use. Each fluid ounce contains 12/100 grain acetanilide antiseptic, disinfectant and germicide. For internal and external use. Inodorous and harmless. * * * Guaranteed by Langley & Michaels Co., under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906. Serial Number 5146. Manufactured by Langley & Michaels Co., Pharmaceutical Specialties, San Francisco."

Analysis of a sample of said product, made by the Bureau of Chemistry of the United States Department of Agriculture, showed the following results: Per cent hydrogen dioxide (U. S. P.), 2.12; solids (grams per 20 cc as per U. S. P.), 0.044; acetanilide (grains per fluid ounce), 0.125; free acid (U. S. P.), much in excess (25 cc sample requiring 6.8 cc N/10 KOH to neutralize); free sulphuric acid, present; sulphates as K_2SO_4 (total SO_4), 0.07 per cent; arsenic (parts per million), 10; product was not water white but had faint straw color. Adulteration was alleged for the reason that the product was a drug and sold under and by a name recognized in the United

States Pharmacopœia, to wit, peroxide of hydrogen, but differed from the standard of strength, quality, or purity as determined by the test laid down in the said United States Pharmacopœia, which defines hydrogen peroxide to be a slightly acid aqueous solution of hydrogen dioxide ($\text{H}_2\text{O}_2=33.76$), which should contain, when freshly prepared, about 3 per cent, by weight, of absolute hydrogen dioxide, corresponding to about 10 volumes of available oxygen. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the label was false and misleading, in that it represented the product as being in accordance with the standard of strength, quality, and purity as prescribed in the United States Pharmacopœia, when in fact it was deficient in hydrogen dioxide, and contained an excess of total solids and acid as shown by the aforesaid analysis.

On November 10, 1911, the defendant corporation pleaded guilty to the indictment and was fined \$100.

JAMES WILSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 5, 1912.*

1390

