

of coffee says "DSSC" on it, which means Defense Subsistence Supply Center, "roasted and ground coffee," and on it it says, "Procured under U.S. Government specifications by Defense Subsistence Supply Center, Chicago, Ill." This can was manufactured in 1962. A lady in my district bought this the week of August 18, 1967, for 99 cents. It's a 2 pound can. A week ago Saturday, a woman, by the name of Blaine Antonelli, bought a similar can on March 23 in Lockport, N.Y., for the same 99 cents. And she sent me the cash register tape.

Now, in 1962, when the Defense Supply Agency rejected this coffee, they gave as a reason that it was bitter, that "The coffee in some cans was stale due to low vacuum or leakage. There was a variation in grind color, dust and particles were found," et cetera.

There were 626,371 pounds of this coffee which were disposed of by the Defense Supply Agency through six commercial channels, and apparently it is still on the shelves in Lockport, N.Y.

Now, would you recommend—

Mr. WYDLER. It's a slow mover.

(Laughter.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Would you recommend that in a case such as this, in the interest of the public health and safety, that if a coffee or a product is rejected that it ought to say on here "Rejected by U.S. Government" instead of saying procured under U.S. Government specifications?

Dr. GODDARD. No, I wouldn't recommend that. I think, that if it doesn't meet the specifications that are required to be met under the standards, then it shouldn't be in the marketplace. If it meets those specifications, but failed to meet the military specifications, I think then we are dealing with another problem.

Why did it fail the military specifications?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I read the reasons why.

Dr. GODDARD. I understand that, but I'm talking in general. There may, as we both have agreed earlier, be appropriate reasons for the military to reject it, and yet it is suitable for civilian consumption.

I think it would be just as misleading to require labeling that says "Rejected by the military" when it is comparable to other products in the civilian marketplace.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Why not direct yourself to something like coffee? A cup of coffee is a cup of coffee.

Dr. GODDARD. No, it isn't. I'm sorry.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. You're right. That's why this was rejected. From what I read to you, what did the Government do wrong, if anything, in permitting this to be sold into the open consumer market with this kind of label on it?

Dr. GODDARD. Mr. Goodrich will answer that.

Mr. GOODRICH. Would you mind reading the reason for rejection again?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, Mr. Goodrich. "The Coffee in some cans was stale due to low vacuum or leakage. There was a variation in grind color, dust, and particles were found," et cetera. They said other things about the taste. It was bitter and harsh and had too much robusta.

Mr. GOODRICH. If a product of that kind has an off flavor or off odor, it may be classified under the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as unfit for food. It's adulterated and should be taken off the market.