

bacterial standard plate counts, total coliform counts and the presence of E. coli in excess of that permitted by the military specification. Because of the conditions of storage and use the military specification is highly restrictive in order to provide maximum protection and minimum risk in the area of health protection. This item and the next three items I will discuss were produced in a U.S. plant under U.S. Department of Agriculture wholesomeness control.

And this item contained a USDA approved stamp on it.

(b) The beef with spiced sauce failed the laboratory analysis for maximum fat content. Again this is a military requirement aimed towards balancing nutrition value versus storage and shipping costs. This is strictly a military and not FDA standard.

(c) The swiss steak components of beef were rejected because of excessive fat, bone and cartilage. Also, the thickness and weight of the individual steak did not conform to the specification. The rejection was based on the same reasoning applied to the beef with spiced sauce. In addition, we have a portion control requirement for uniformity of size and thickness of each serving.

(d) The canned hams were rejected because the cans contained excessive gelatin and juices. To balance nutrition value versus storage and shipping costs the specification states that the liquid juices, gelatin and rendered fat, by weight, shall not exceed 14 percent of the contents of the can.

(e) The salad dressing was initially rejected because the component oil failed the laboratory "cold test." The cold test is used to determine the completeness of the refining processes that have been applied to the vegetable oil component and is related to the storage stability of the salad dressing. This has no effect on palatability or wholesomeness in short-term storage and the item met FDA standards.

Furthermore, after the rejection, the contractor requested a waiver to permit the acceptance of the nonconforming product. The waiver was granted and the warranty period was extended from 90 to 150 days.

We accepted these items.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. On that item there was a second batch rejected because of a peroxide content.

General LEE. We are not aware of this. I am not aware of that.

(f) The last item, trousers, men's, cotton—450 pairs—was rejected because of misaligned pockets, stitch run-offs, and irreparable machine damage—needle chews, tears and cuts.

The contractor tried to sell the pants to the public but was successful in selling only a few. He sold the remaining pants to Ferrers Surplus General Merchandising Co., Pacific and Market Streets, San Diego, Calif.

In accordance with the terms of the contract the Government information was obliterated from all pants sold.

I would like to correct our printed statement at this point.

The statement says the labels were removed from all the pants sold. The initial information we were given by the contractor indicated that he did remove all the labels. Subsequent investigation has indicated that only on the 10 pairs of pants that were concerned to the lot that our inspector condemned did he remove those labels.