

Milk Sanitation Honor Roll for 1951-53

Seventy communities have been added to the Public Health Service milk sanitation "honor roll" and 42 communities on the previous list have been dropped. This revision covers the period from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1953, and includes a total of 261 cities and 62 counties.

Communities on the "honor roll" have complied substantially with the various items of sanitation contained in the Milk Ordinance and Code recommended by the United States Public Health Service. The State milk sanitation authorities concerned report this compliance to the Public Health Service. The rating of 90 percent or more, which is necessary for inclusion on the list, is computed from the weighted average of the percentages of compliance. Separate lists are compiled for communities in which all market milk sold is pasteurized, and for those in which both raw milk and pasteurized milk is sold.

The recommended milk ordinance, on which the milk sanitation ratings are based, is now in effect through voluntary adoption in 400 counties and 1,558 municipalities. The ordinance also serves as the basis for the regulations of 34 States and 2 Territories. In 11 States and the 2 Territories it is in effect statewide.

The ratings do not represent a complete measure of safety, but they do indicate how closely a community's milk supply conforms with the standards for grade A milk as stated in the recommended ordinance. High-grade pasteurized milk is safer than high-grade raw milk because of the added protection of pasteurization. The second list, therefore, shows the percentage of pasteurized milk sold in a community which also permits the sale of raw milk.

Although semiannual publication of the list is intended to encourage

This compilation is from the Division of Sanitation of the Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service. The previous listing was published in Public Health Reports, April 1953, pp. 445-448. The rating method was described in Public Health Reports 53: 1386 (1938), Reprint No. 1970.

communities operating under the recommended ordinance to attain and maintain a high level of enforcement of its provisions, no comparison is intended with communities operating under other milk ordinances. Some communities might be deserving of inclusion, but they cannot be listed because no arrangements have been made for determination of their ratings by the State milk sanitation authority concerned. In other cases, the ratings which were submitted have lapsed because they were more than 2 years old. Still other communities, some of which may have high-grade milk supplies, have indicated no desire for rating or inclusion on this list.

The rules for inclusion of a community on the "honor roll" are:

1. All ratings must be determined by the State milk sanitation authority in accordance with the Public Health Service rating method, which is based upon the grade A pasteurized milk and the grade A raw milk requirements of the Public Health Service milk ordinance. (A departure from the method described consists of computing the pasteurized milk rating by weighting the pasteurization plant rating twice that of the raw milk intended for pasteurization.)

2. No community will be included

in the list unless both its pasteurized milk and its retail raw milk ratings are 90 percent or more. Communities in which only raw milk is sold will be included if the retail raw milk rating is 90 percent or more.

3. The rating used will be the latest submitted to the Public Health Service, but no rating will be used which is more than 2 years old. (In order to promote continuous rigid enforcement rather than occasional "clean-up campaigns," it is suggested that when the rating of a community on the list falls below 90 percent, no resurvey be made for at least 6 months. This will result in the removal of the community from the subsequent semiannual list.)

4. No community will be included on the list whose milk supply is not under an established program of official routine inspection and laboratory control provided by itself, the county, a milk control district, or the State. (In the absence of such an official program there can be no assurance that only milk from sources rating 90 percent or more will be used continuously.)

5. The Public Health Service will make occasional check surveys of cities for which ratings of 90 percent or more have been reported by the State. (If the check rating is less than 90 percent, but not less than 85, the city will be removed from the 90-percent list after 6 months unless a resurvey submitted by the State during this probationary period shows a rating of 90 percent or more. If the check rating is less than 85 percent, the city will be removed from the list immediately. If the check rating is 90 percent or more, the city will be retained on the list for 2 years from the date of the check survey, unless a subsequent rating during this period warrants its removal.)

Communities Awarded Milk Sanitation Ratings of 90 Percent or More, July 1951-June 1953

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED

Community	Date of rating	Community	Date of rating	Community	Date of rating
<i>Alabama</i>		<i>Indiana—Continued</i>		<i>Mississippi</i>	
Auburn.....	9-19-1951	Evansville.....	10-...1951	Aberdeen.....	10-26-1951
Birmingham-Jefferson County.....	7-26-1952	Fort Wayne.....	10-...1952	Amory.....	10-25-1951
Gadsden-Etowah County.....	8- 8-1952	Indianapolis.....	10-31-1952	Belmont.....	7-12-1951
Montgomery.....	5-22-1952	Kokomo.....	2-11-1953	Booneville.....	9-28-1951
Opelika.....	6-19-1952	Madison.....	7-...1952	Brookhaven.....	3-11-1952
<i>Arkansas</i>		Marion and Gas City..	12-...1952	Canton.....	10- 1-1952
Fort Smith.....	10-18-1952	Mount Vernon.....	1-16-1953	Clarksdale.....	9-25-1952
<i>Colorado</i>		Muncie.....	1-28-1953	Cleveland.....	9- 3-1952
Denver City and County.....	11-27-1952	New Castle.....	2-...1953	Columbia.....	7-17-1952
Grand Junction.....	4-25-1952	Peru.....	8-27-1952	Columbus.....	8-13-1951
Pueblo.....	8-...1951	Richmond.....	5-15-1953	Eupora.....	3-28-1952
Weld County.....	4-11-1952	Rushville.....	8-...1951	Greenville.....	8-25-1952
<i>Florida</i>		Shelbyville.....	8-...1952	Greenwood.....	4-15-1952
Pinellas County.....	1-29-1953	South Bend.....	8-14-1951	Grenada.....	1-22-1952
<i>Georgia</i>		Valparaiso.....	7-31-1952	Iuka.....	7-12-1951
Albany.....	5-28-1953	<i>Iowa</i>		Kosciusko.....	1-31-1952
Athens.....	4-16-1953	Des Moines.....	7-...1951	Louisville.....	10- 4-1951
Atlanta.....	11-21-1951	Dubuque.....	11-14-1952	Macon.....	6-12-1952
Cairo.....	12-18-1952	Marshalltown.....	1-29-1953	McComb.....	10-25-1951
Camilla.....	11-18-1952	Mason City.....	10- 3-1953	Meridian.....	6-18-1952
Columbus.....	2-23-1953	<i>Kansas</i>		Morton.....	6-17-1952
La Grange.....	3-18-1953	Dodge City.....	4-20-1953	Natchez.....	12-17-1952
Quitman.....	4- 9-1953	Hillsboro.....	11- 7-1952	New Albany.....	1- 7-1952
Savannah.....	8-15-1952	<i>Kentucky</i>		Ruleville.....	4-13-1952
Tifton.....	6-18-1953	Bowling Green.....	4-17-1952	Starkville.....	11-27-1951
Valdosta.....	3-13-1952	Calloway County.....	2-15-1952	State College.....	11-27-1951
Waycross.....	10-23-1951	Campbell County- Newport.....	11-28-1951	Tupelo.....	4- 8-1953
<i>Illinois</i>		Central City and Muhlenberg County	4- 1-1952	Vicksburg.....	6-13-1952
Chicago.....	8- 1-1951	Christian County.....	12-20-1951	Winona.....	1-24-1952
<i>Indiana</i>		Fulton County.....	7-23-1952	<i>Missouri</i>	
Bedford-Orleans.....	10-...1952	Louisville and Jeffer- son County.....	5-23-1952	Cape Girardeau.....	3-15-1952
Berne.....	3-...1953	Owensboro and Daviess County.....	8- 6-1952	Jackson.....	3-15-1952
Bloomington.....	11-26-1952	Owenton and Owen County.....	4- 2-1953	Kansas City.....	12-...1952
Bluffton.....	3- 6-1953	Pendleton County.....	4- 2-1953	Lebanon.....	2-13-1953
Cooperative Grade A Milk Program.....	9-...1952	Warren County.....	4-17-1952	North Kansas City...	12-...1952
Holland		Williamstown and Grant County.....	4- 2-1953	Springfield.....	2-13-1953
Huntingburg		<i>Louisiana</i>		Warrensburg.....	12-...1952
Jasper		New Orleans.....	12- 6-1951	<i>Nebraska</i>	
Crawfordsville.....	2-28-1953	St. Martin Parish.....	5-23-1952	Grand Island.....	9-18-1952
Elkhart.....	11-...1952	Vermilion Parish.....	9- 9-1951	<i>Nevada</i>	
				Yerington.....	12- 5-1951
				<i>North Carolina</i>	
				Alleghany County....	9-10-1952
				Charlotte.....	1-11-1952
				Craven County.....	11-21-1952

Communities Awarded Milk Sanitation Ratings of 90 Percent or More, July 1951-June 1953—Con.

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED

Community	Date of rating	Community	Date of rating	Community	Date of rating
<i>North Carolina—Continued</i>		<i>Tennessee—Continued</i>		<i>Texas—Continued</i>	
Cumberland County	2-15-1952	Kingsport	10-23-1951	Texarkana	7- 2-1952
Davie County	10- 1-1952	Knoxville	8-22-1951	Texas City	1-20-1953
Durham County	7-18-1952	Lebanon	8- 1 1952	Tyler	2-10-1953
Edgecombe County (excluding Rocky Mount)	7-16-1952	Lewisburg	6-12-1952	Victoria	7-24-1952
Forsyth County	7-16-1952	Loudon	4- 3-1952	Waxahachie	9-30-1952
Guilford County	8- 6-1952	Manchester	10-17-1952	Weslaco	8-24-1951
Henderson County	2- 5-1952	Morristown	9-25-1951	Wichita Falls	3-20-1953
Iredell County	10-25-1952	Nashville and David- son County.	11- 5-1951		
Jackson County	1-17-1952	Newbern	10-23-1952	<i>Utah</i>	
Lincoln County	3-19-1952	Newport	9-18-1951	Logan	5-14-1952
Mars Hill	1- 4-1952	Rogersville	4-21-1952	Ogden	12-11-1951
Mitchell County	8-10-1951	Shelbyville	6-11-1952	Salt Lake City	4-29-1952
New Hanover County	6-10-1952	Sweetwater	9-16-1952		
Orange County	7- 3-1952	Tullahoma	10-17-1952	<i>Virginia</i>	
Person County	3-17-1953	Winchester	10-17-1952	Abingdon	10-19-1951
Pitt County	1-27-1953			Blacksburg	8- 7-1952
Swain County	1-17-1952	<i>Texas</i>		Bristol	10-19-1951
Transylvania County	2- 5-1952	Bryan	6-28-1952	Front Royal	8-29-1951
Yadkin County	10- 1-1952	College Station	6-28-1952	Luray	8-29-1951
Yancey County	8-10-1951	Commerce	9- 2-1952	Narrows	8- 8-1952
		Corpus Christi	9-27-1952	Norfolk	9- 5-1952
<i>South Dakota</i>		Corsicana	8- 6-1952	Pearisburg	8- 8-1952
Sioux Falls	10-25-1952	Dallas	1- 8-1953	Pulaski	8- 7-1952
Vermillion	6-12-1952	El Paso	10-21-1952	Radford	8- 7-1952
		Galveston	12-11-1951	Richmond	5-21-1952
<i>Tennessee</i>		Gladewater	7-26-1952	Roanoke	9-19-1952
Athens	7-16-1952	Harlingen	8- 4-1951	Staunton	11- 7-1952
Bristol	10-19-1951	Houston	6-11-1952	Suffolk	9-26-1952
Chattanooga	11-13-1952	Kerrville	7-31-1952	Waynesboro	8- 3-1951
Clarksville	1-30-1953	Kilgore	7-26-1952		
Cleveland	10- 1-1952	La Feria	8- 2-1951	<i>Washington</i>	
Clinton	11-28-1951	Lufkin	10- 8-1951	Cowlitz County	10-12-1951
Columbia	5-22-1952	McKinney	2-17-1953	Spokane	9-25-1952
Cookeville	11-14-1951	Mercedes	8-21-1951	Whitman County	6-19-1952
Covington	10-22-1952	Mineral Wells	2-11-1953		
Cowan	10-17-1952	Mission	8-24-1951	<i>Wisconsin</i>	
Dandridge	9-17-1951	Mt. Pleasant	9-24-1952	Beaver Dam	2-27-1953
Decherd	10-17-1952	Nacogdoches	9-20-1952	Burlington	3-26-1953
Dyersburg	10-23-1952	Orange	1- 6-1952	Delavan	3-26-1953
Erwin	10-15-1951	Pharr	8-22-1951	Eau Claire	3- 5-1953
Franklin	6- 6-1952	Port Arthur	10-17-1951	Elkhorn	3-26-1953
Greeneville	4-17-1952	San Antonio	11-20-1951	Fontana	3-26-1953
Jefferson City	9-25-1951	San Benito	8- 1-1951	Lake Geneva	3-26-1953
Johnson City	8-27-1952	San Juan	8-23-1951	Madison	10- 5-1951
		Sweetwater	2- 4-1953	Ripon	2-27-1953
				Waupun	2-27-1953
				Williams Bay	3-26-1953

Communities Awarded Milk Sanitation Ratings of 90 Percent or More, July 1951—June 1953—Con.

BOTH RAW AND PASTEURIZED MARKET MILK

Community and percent of milk pasteurized	Date of rating	Community and percent of milk pasteurized	Date of rating	Community and percent of milk pasteurized	Date of rating
<i>Alabama</i>		<i>Louisiana</i>		<i>Tennessee</i>	
Clanton, 87.2.....	5-12-1952	Iberia Parish, 94.4....	6-1952	Alcoa, 99.5.....	9-17-1952
Huntsville, 98.....	8-10-1951	Shreveport, 99.9.....	8-1952	Elizabethton, 93.6....	11-25-1953
Lanett, 97.8.....	11-6-1952			Harriman, 90.6.....	7-26-1951
		<i>Mississippi</i>		Maryville, 99.5.....	9-17-1952
<i>Arkansas</i>		Gulfport, 98.....	4-30-1952	McMinnville, 95.3....	5-7-1952
Little Rock, 99.3....	4-20-1953	Hattiesburg, 96.....	7-31-1952	Murfreesboro, 98.7....	7-6-1951
		Jackson, 98.6.....	9-11-1952	Ripley, 96.9.....	10-22-1952
<i>Florida</i>		Laurel, 93.6.....	8-13-1952		
Dade County, 99.99...	1-8-1953	West Point, 97.6.....	7-18-1951	<i>Texas</i>	
				Austin, 97.3.....	10-24-1951
<i>Georgia</i>		<i>Montana</i>		Beaumont, 99.9.....	8-15-1952
Brunswick-Glynn		Missoula, 99.4.....	9-1952	Brenham, 94.9.....	7-26-1951
County, 96.....	11-6-1952			Brownsville, 92.7....	8-1-1951
Carrollton, 94.2....	3-14-1952	<i>North Carolina</i>		Childress, 87.....	2-4-1953
Cartersville, 97.....	12-11-1952	Ashe County, 78.7....	9-9-1952	Cleburne, 95.5.....	7-31-1952
Cedartown, 98.3....	3-11-1952	Cabarrus County, 80.3.	1-15-1952	Edinburg, 93.8.....	8-28-1951
Gainesville-Hall		Caldwell County, 88.7.	10-29-1951	Fort Worth, 99.97....	2-12-1952
County, 93.1.....	3-21-1952	Halifax County, 83.4..	4-10-1952	Gilmer, 94.4.....	1-29-1952
Newnan, 94.7.....	6-5-1952	Kings Mountain, 83.8.	8-18-1952	Greenville, 98.....	9-27-1952
Pelham, 88.8.....	11-18-1952	Lenoir County, 78.4...	1-30-1953	Henderson, 94.....	1-31-1952
Thomaston, 81.7....	4-30-1952	Macon County, 91.5...	11-7-1952	Laredo, 80.....	9-18-1952
Winder, 97.9.....	1-23-1953	Polk County, 87.5....	6-18-1952	Longview, 99.4.....	7-26-1952
		Robeson County, 96.6..	2-15-1952	Lubbock, 99.....	8-25-1952
<i>Indiana</i>		Shelby, 74.4.....	6-6-1952	Marshall, 87.2.....	10-3-1952
Michigan City, 98.1...	7-1951	Wake County, 99.3...	3-4-1953	McAllen, 99.....	8-22-1951
		Wilkes County, 90.6...	9-20-1951	Palestine, 88.8.....	1-15-1952
<i>Kansas</i>				Paris, 92.3.....	9-26-1951
Pittsburg, 98.....	11-7-1952	<i>Oklahoma</i>		Sherman, 93.3.....	11-6-1951
		Elk City, 99.....	4-17-1953		
<i>Kentucky</i>		Stillwater, 98.....	4-29-1953	<i>Virginia</i>	
Lexington and Fayette				Harrisonburg, 96....	11-12-1952
County, 97.....	4-28-1952	<i>Oregon</i>			
Princeton and Caldwell		Salem, 99.7.....	7-15-1952	<i>Washington</i>	
County, 94.7.....	6-1953			Tacoma, 99.7.....	8-13-1952
Somerset, 91.....	2-1953	<i>South Carolina</i>			
		Spartanburg and Spar-		<i>West Virginia</i>	
		tanburg County, 91.3.	10-31-1951	Clay County, 88.....	9-16-1952

NOTE: In these communities the pasteurized market milk shows a 90-percent or more compliance with the grade A pasteurized milk requirements, and the raw market milk shows a 90-percent or more compli-

ance with the grade A raw milk requirements of the Milk Ordinance and Code recommended by the United States Public Health Service.

Note particularly the percentage of the milk pasteurized in the va-

rious communities listed. This percentage is an important factor to consider in estimating the safety of a city's milk supply. All milk should be pasteurized, either commercially or at home, before it is consumed.

The Genera of the Homobasidiomycetes

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Division of Mycology and Disease Survey, Special Publication No. 3. 1953. By William Bridge Cooke. Limited edition, available on request to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Beltsville, Md. 100 pages.

This current listing of the genera of higher fungi gives 1,521 generic names of the polypores and overlapping groups and is intended as a reference for persons working with the higher fungi. Listed are the wood rotting fungi, such as dry rot; mushrooms and toadstools, including soil fungi and mycorrhiza formers whose fruit bodies may be poisonous or edible; and some plant pathogens. The compilation, arranged alphabetically, brings together for the first time widely scattered information found in private files, in technical publications, in published reviews, and in other relatively inaccessible places. The gastromycetes are not included in the compilation.

William Bridge Cooke is the compiler of the list. He is now a mycologist with the Environmental Health Center of the Public Health Service at Cincinnati and formerly a research associate in mycology at the State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash.

Individual Water Supply Systems

Public Health Service Publication No. 24. Revised 1950. Reissued 1953. 61 pages; illustrated. 25 cents.

Because of the accelerated rate of housing construction and the subsequently aggravated environmental health problems, especially in rural communities, the Joint Committee on Rural Sanitation has prepared these recommendations to establish a uni-

form approach for various Federal agencies concerned with the sanitation of individual water supplies.

Limited to the sanitation aspects of small water supplies used by one or possibly several families and by rural schools, recreational areas, and camps, the recommendations are applicable to newly developed supplies, alterations or extensions to existing supplies to eliminate sanitary defects, and maintenance of special vigilance on all questionable conditions until adequate corrections have been made.

The recommendations cover basic requirements, water-supply development of ground waters and surface waters, water purification, and pumping, distribution, and storage. Appendixes include recommended procedures for cement grouting of wells and for disinfection of wells. A bibliography on individual water supply systems is also given.

Typical Architectural Program for a General Hospital

Public Health Service Publication No. 322. 1953. 23 pages. A limited number of individual copies are available on request to the Division of Hospital Facilities, Public Health Service, Washington 25, D. C.

This publication is intended to serve as a guide in the development of architectural programs for the design and construction of hospital buildings. Such programs should be prepared through the cooperative efforts of the hospital board, administrator and staff, hospital consultant, and others concerned, and contain, in reasonable detail, the information which is vital to the architect before starting the drawings.

By presenting the type of information required in a usable format, this

pamphlet will, it is hoped, stimulate the preparation of adequate architectural programs, the scarcity of which has proved to be a considerable handicap to good hospital planning.

Outpatient Departments For 50-, 100-, and 200-Bed General Hospitals

Public Health Service Publication No. 318. 1953. 14 pages; illustrated. Available on request to the Division of Hospital Facilities, Public Health Service, Washington 25, D. C.

This brochure is a compilation of material from Elements of the General Hospital and other publications of the Division of Hospital Facilities. It is intended to serve as a ready reference until more detailed studies relating to outpatient facilities are completed.

The brochure describes the requirements and functional design relationships of the various component sections of the outpatient department of the 50-, 100-, and 200-bed general hospital. Floor plans and discussion regarding waiting-room areas, information, appointment, medical records, social service, examination and treatment rooms, drug dispensary, and a dental suite are presented.

The Child With a Cleft Palate

Children's Bureau Folder No. 37. 1953. 13 pages; illustrated. 10 cents.

One baby in every 1,000 is born with a cleft palate. That baby now has a better chance of overcoming this handicap than has been true in the past because of increased understanding of the problem and better means and increased skill in the treatment of the cleft palate.

This Children's Bureau publication, another in a series of pamphlets designed to help parents who have a child with a handicapping condition, outlines different ways of

publications

treating cleft palate, tells what special care is needed, underlines the importance of early speech training, and tells where parents can go for help in their community.

Emphasis is placed on the fact that cleft palate is not a hopeless handicap and that thousands of men and women born with a cleft palate have become business leaders or hold responsible, well-paying professional jobs. With understanding and proper guidance any child with a cleft palate has every chance to develop into a useful, happy, and successful adult.

Health Status and Services, January 1952. Economic Base Study, Arkansas-White-Red River Basins

Public Health Service Publication No. 313. Health, Housing, Education and Recreation Series, part VI, section 1. 1953. By Rollo H. Britten and Maryland Y. Pennell. 101 pages; tables, maps. Available on request to the Division of Engineering Resources, Public Health Service, Washington 25, D. C.

Authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1950, the Arkansas-White-Red River Basin Interagency Committee determined that a comprehensive economic base survey should be made to serve as a guide for the future development of this river basin area. Intended to establish the developed and undeveloped natural resources in the area, the survey is divided into 10 parts: population; labor force and employment; income; chief patterns of economic activity; natural resources; health, housing, education, and recreation; opportunities for development; economic history of the area; special reports series; and future economic development and programs for achievement. Various Federal agencies were assigned to

prepare the several parts of the report, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare being responsible for the survey of health, housing, and recreation.

This publication contains statistics on the sickness and mortality rates, and the adequacy of medical and related services and facilities for the eight State sections and for various geographic subdivisions of the area included in the Arkansas-White-Red River Basin. The survey reveals that mortality rates from all causes are the highest for the New Mexico and Louisiana State sections and lowest for Kansas, the Texas Panhandle, and western Oklahoma. Mortality rates for tuberculosis are highest for Arkansas, Missouri, and New Mexico. The basin presents a few areas of high infant mortality, especially in the New Mexico and Colorado State section; maternal mortality rates are high in Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, and eastern Oklahoma. The areas of greatest incidence of typhoid fever are mostly in the eastern and southern parts of the basin.

Health manpower is at a low level in the basin. It is about two-thirds that of the country as a whole for each of four types of personnel—physicians, dentists, nurses, and sanitary engineers. The number of general hospital beds in relation to the population is less in this area than in the country as a whole—2.9 per 1,000 persons in the basin, 3.6 in the United States. Only half of the counties have full-time local health units, but 72 percent of the basin population is served.

In terms of healthfulness of the area and the facilities available for the maintenance of health, as discussed in the report, the outstanding areas of the basin are Kansas, the Texas Panhandle, Colorado, and the western and central parts of Oklahoma.

Handbook on Sanitation of Vessel Watering Points

Public Health Service Publication No. 274. 1953. 12 pages; illustrated. Available on request to the Division of Sanitation, Public Health Service, Washington 25, D. C.

Important in the health protection of passengers and crew members aboard vessels is the provision of safe water for drinking and culinary purposes. This handbook is intended to serve as a guide for those who are charged with the design, construction, or operation of facilities on wharves and piers for loading potable water on vessels, and for the personnel of the Public Health Service and State and local agencies concerned with the supervision of vessel-watering points.

The standards set forth in this handbook are concerned with the protection of water during the course of delivery from an approved source to the filling connections of the vessel's potable-water storage tank. They cover the water-distribution system, protection against backflow from vessel to shore, protection on board ship and at the pier, hydrants, watering hoses, appurtenances, and water boats. Photographs and line drawings illustrate satisfactory installation of watering facilities.

The handbook also includes pertinent sections of the Interstate Quarantine Regulations, a brief description of the interrelationships of vessel companies, State health departments, and the Public Health Service, relative to methods of approving water supplies and watering points. It contains a copy of the PHS form, Report on Vessel Watering Point Sanitation.

Publications for which prices are quoted are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Orders should be accompanied by cash, check, or money order and should fully identify the publication (including its Public Health Service publication number). Single copies of most Public Health Service publications can be obtained without charge from the Public Inquiries Branch, Public Health Service, Washington 25, D. C.
