

Health Service standard of 0.3 milligrams per liter (mg./l). One sample had 24 mg./l while the other had 2 mg./l. The iron concentration in the District of Columbia water does not exceed 0.1 and is usually in the range of 0.05. The sample containing the higher iron concentration had a turbidity value of 83 Jackson units (J.u.), reflecting the oxidized iron present. The other sample had a turbidity value of eight. The U.S. Public Health Service standard for turbidity is five, while the District of Columbia water usually had less than 1 J.u. The pH values were normal.

We purchased a number of cans from the same vendor. Three were tested for total solids, suspended solids, pH, turbidity, and iron. While the iron in all three samples exceeded the U.S. Public Health Service standard, one was obviously rust colored and had a concentration of 41 mg./l. The suspended and total solids concentrations were also much higher in this sample, as was the turbidity value.

These cans are No. 1 size and appear to be of standard tin-dipped steel construction. The two cans having high iron concentrations had significant rust spots where the tin coating had failed. I cannot account for the presence of zinc except to say that it does occur naturally in water supplies.

While I do not feel the water in these cans will be injurious to health (the iron standards is based on esthetics rather than toxicological significance), the quality is substandard. Certainly, there are no benefits to be derived from the consumption of this water as a substitute for the safe and palatable water available from the spigot.

Very truly yours,

ARNOLD SPEISER, P.E., *Chief.*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. They said this is substandard water. Yet it is sold and still has the Government marking, the contract number, specification number, and so forth.

Another item that was bought in the same surplus store here in Washington is an aerosol insecticide whose markings imply that it now has U.S. Government approval although it was filled 20 years ago.

We had it tested by the National Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce and they found variations in internal pressures which "would not be deemed acceptable under current filling practices" and mislabeling.

(The report from NBS follows:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1968.

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Chairman, Special Inquiry on Consumer Representation in the Federal Government, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROSENTHAL: At the telephone request of Mr. Warren Harrison of your staff, we have conducted certain studies on a "bug bomb" submitted to us by him. (In order that the studies might be appropriately comprehensive and completed in the very short time requested by Mr. Harrison, nine similar "bug bombs" were purchased from the same source, at no cost to the Government, and included in the test program.)

The bombs were tested (1) for net quantity of contents, (2) for container pressure, and (3) for effectiveness. They were also evaluated in general terms with respect to safety. Tests (2) and (3) were conducted at the Beltsville Chemical Laboratory, Pesticides Regulation Division, ARS, Department of Agriculture; the quantities of contents were determined both at Beltsville and at the National Bureau of Standards, and general safety characteristics were evaluated here.

As compared with a quantity declaration of 1 pound, each of the samples contained at least 1 pound—with the actual contents ranging from 1 pound to 1.13 pounds. (The sample submitted by Mr. Harrison contained 1.09 pounds.) The container pressures ranged from 61 to 76 pounds per-square-inch gage. Normal pressure of the Freon-12, the propellant used, is 70 pounds per square inch at 21° C. The wide variations in internal pressures could be caused by any of several