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The course of events that led to the establishment of the Federal Livestock and Meat Grading Service parallels the development of the livestock and meat industry of the nation.

Two hundred years ago, the slaughtering of livestock and the selling of the meat was almost exclusively a local enterprise. The so-called butcher bought his meat on the hoof. He slaughtered the animals and retailed the meat. He was packer, distributor, transporter, and retailer. Obviously the meat was passed over the block with no particular designation as to quality. As the meat business increased in volume and in importance, additional retail shops were established and some of them were consolidated. The enlargement of operations and the development of meat slaughtering techniques resulted in increases in the number of packing plants, thus making it unnecessary for the retailer to operate his own slaughtering plant. Instead he obtained his meat supplies from a source common to his competitors and to handlers of meat in other localities. The slaughterers of livestock moved toward the areas of animal production while meat wholesalers, and particularly retailers, tended to congregate around heavily populated areas of industrial development. Thus, the focal points of meat production and processing drifted further and further from that of consumption, the rate of the separation and distance between points being controlled by the development of transportation facilities, the development and expansion of livestock production, and the industrial development along the entire seaboard.

Increases in the distance between the producer and the consumer gave rise to the establishment of numerous service agencies to assist the retailer to obtain adequate supplies of the precise kinds and qualities of products to satisfy his customers. When the retailers could no longer examine the meat before they bought it, sellers began to use numerous descriptive terms for describing quality. Continued expansion of the livestock and meat industry attracted an ever increasing number of markets and handlers. Many of them used terms largely of their own choosing to describe quality, but such terms did not necessarily mean the same as those used by others engaged in similar business.

The practice was a form of a grading whereby each handler or each market had its own terminology and made its own interpretations of grades, but neither the terminology nor the interpretations may have been known or at least understood on other markets. This quickly gave rise to confusion of grades between markets and to the practice of chicanery and other types of market abuses -- all arising from the lack of understanding and application of a single standard.

Repeated attempts on the part of private groups, local markets, and others to adopt a uniform grading system were failures and served to crystallize public opinion as to the urgent necessity of having standards promulgated by an unbiased agency and having such standards applied in a uniform manner on a nation-wide basis.
The first attempt to develop a uniform standard for livestock and meats was undertaken in 1902 by the Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Illinois. The results of these studies provided the basis upon which the U. S. D. A. in 1916 set up tentative standards for the classes and grades of livestock and somewhat later for the preparation of Market Classes and Grades of Meat. In these standards were embodied the fundamental principles of animal and meat grading, first used in market news reporting work.

The Federal grading of meat was begun by the Department in 1923 as a special service to the U. S. Shipping Board in order to help it get beef of the desired quality for use on emergency fleet and other U. S. owned vessels. During the next two years the service was provided to other steamship companies, to railroads, and large hotels, then to Federal, State, and county hospitals and other governmental institutions, and still later it was extended to take care of requests from wholesale meat dealers, chain stores and others.

After the grading service was in effect for about two years a series of meetings were held for the purpose of obtaining criticisms, comments, and suggestions concerning the proposed standards. These meetings created widespread interest among producers and the meat trade interests, especially among producers handling high-grade cattle. Steps were taken by these producers to organize and support a general movement toward the adoption and extensive use of uniform official standards for both livestock and meat. The support of the leading cattle breeders and feeders in the important cattle producing states led to the formation of an organization known as the Better Beef Association for the specific purpose of sponsoring the grading and grade stamping of beef.

The Secretary of Agriculture made a commitment to the Association to have Department Officials supervise the grading and grade stamping of beef for one year provided a satisfactory agreement could be reached between producers and packers. Although the packers were not convinced that the standards would be satisfactory, they agreed to cooperate during the year of experimentation in order to determine the feasibility of the grading and grade stamping service.

At the end of the year a conference was called by the Secretary of the National Live Stock and Meat Board at which time definite plans were formulated for the development of the service and the date determined for inaugurating it. Accordingly, the beef grading and stamping service was officially inaugurated May 2, 1927. At this point we wish to mention the staunch support given to the service by the National Live Stock and Meat Board and particularly its manager who was largely responsible for launching the initial trials and who, as a result of his confidence in its success, arranged for the Board to support the program financially until such time as the revenues became sufficient to make the service self-supporting. The program expanded very rapidly with the result that the financial outlay by the Board was markedly small.

Soon after the grading service started, difficulties began to arise. This was anticipated, however, since unanimous approval was not obtained for the conduct of the service, although all pledged to support it. Certain members of the trade were reported as discouraging the use of Government graded meat. It was claimed that some were increasing the price on graded carcasses from one to three cents per pound above the price of similar grades not officially grade marked, and in some instances of reporting to retailers that Government graded meat was not available. Since meat could not be graded
except on request, it is obvious that packers could control the available supply. Furthermore, some of the leading national packers expanded their own grading systems and within three months after the beginning of the Federal meat grading service, many were applying their own private brands to carcasses. Although this action retarded the early development of the Federal service, it may be construed as recognition of the fact that Government grading of beef was practical and feasible and considered to be a meritorious service.

When the grading service was begun it was agreed that only Prime and Choice beef would be grade stamped. Before the end of the first year, however, the demand for graded meat had developed to the extent that the grade Good was being stamped and within five years the grading program was further extended to identify meat from steers, heifers, and cows in the grading system.

The grading program made a very substantial growth during the first five years of its operation despite numerous handicaps. Much educational work was performed by organizations favorable to the program to acquaint potential users of graded meat with the benefits to be derived from it. This phase of the program was largely planned and directed by the Better Beef Association and the National Live Stock and Meat Board. The distribution of information by these two organizations under the leadership of the Department of Agriculture created an increased consumer demand for grade labeled, high-quality beef. The result was that many opponents among the wholesale trade joined the supporters of the service in making graded beef available to consumers, thus admitting that the grading program was fundamentally sound and practical.

Further success of the program may depend on (1) the development of a standard for grade, in the application of which the human element plays a minor role and (2) the establishment of an objective measure of the factors that determine grade so that they may be readily understood by retailers and consumers.

The standards for grade as now prepared are criticized by certain representatives of the trade. Some of the criticisms may be justified and if so, should be corrected in a subsequent revisions of the standards. Some of the criticisms may be a deliberate attempt to discredit the service. In such instances operators would be reluctant to recognize and use Federal grades for fear that Government grades will injure the prestige of their private brand names. In other instances, there is evidence that a well-established grade standard is not welcomed.

The fact that standards have been adopted does not mean that the job of classifying and grading livestock and meats is completed. As their application is extended to the extreme range of the grades, weaknesses in the specifications appear. Mandatory grading under O.P.A. regulations during the war period was a most critical test of the standards for live animals and particularly the standards for meat because every carcass had to be tagged as to its exact position in the grade scale.

The experience obtained as result of compulsory grading forcefully manifested some of the inadequacies of the subjective measures descriptive of the mid-point within a grade. We were able to use the standards only after training men through repeated demonstrations of the minimum requirements of different combinations of grade factors of various weights. There is little or no occasion for concern about differences of opinion regarding meat eligible for the middle of a grade because slight variations in interpretation fail to change the grade designation. However, in case of the carcasses or cuts that meet the minimum
requirements of a grade, a slight deviation in the interpretation of grade factors could result in a change of grade -- a matter oftentimes of extreme importance. There is urgent need, therefore, for objective devices for measuring quality, thus reducing the reliance placed on the human element in determining grade.

The present standards are descriptive specifications of the average representatives within each of the several grades. In grading, three primary factors are carefully considered. They are conformation or shape, finish or degree of fatness, and quality. To these factors some packers, wholesalers, and retailers include differences in consumers' likes and dislikes, age, weight, and sex in developing private standards. There is ample justification for confusion when consumer-buyers attempt to purchase for different retailers who are different brand names to signify the same quality. Without dependable identification supported by available standards, there is no way the consumer can associate the quality with a grade or brand designation. The consumer can buy by grade only if the seller grades the meat or has the quality identified by a dependable label brand, specifications for which are understood by the purchaser. It would appear, therefore, that meat graded according to a nation-wide standard consistently and uniformly applied and labeled will afford consumers the opportunity of making selections on basis of familiar labels, hence a distinct advantage to the industry through increased repeat sales, resulting from greater consumer confidence in grade labels.

The grade of meat is determined almost exclusively by the exterior physical characteristics of the flesh but such limited considerations are not always dependable for denoting the eating properties of the meat. Many are aware of the importance of aging in the development of flavor and tenderness but few can determine by examination whether or not the meat has been properly and adequately subjected to that process.

The importance of marbling as compared to exterior fat as a consideration of finish in determining grade needs careful study. Incidentally, marbling is a characteristic that can be quantitatively measured and charted by grade according to weight and age. The influence of age in animals on grade has never been satisfactorily determined. The degree to which ripening of meat will compensate for age is another factor that needs study. Other characteristics inherent in meat or developed after the meat is processed may have a profound influence on the nutritive qualities, as well as on the eatability of the meat. None of these factors are considered in grading the meat except insofar as they may be associated with certain physical characteristics that are apparent and enter into the determination of the appropriate grade.

Standards are only yardsticks for equitably dividing the normal quality range of a specified kind of livestock or meat into segments having similar specific uses, as an aid to satisfactory sale and purchase. In order to be practical and useful standards must be reasonably specific and uniformly interpreted. The development of objective measures in interpreting the standards therefore should receive increasing attention.

There are, at the present time, livestock standards for grades of cattle, calf and veal, lambs and mutton, and meat standards for grades of beef, veal and calf, lamb and mutton. Standards for hogs and pork carcasses are in the process of development. The Federal standards as now promulgated outline specifications for the middle of the grade. They indicate the quality
range within a grade, and provide for compensatory adjustments in the major
grade factors to account for age, size, or imbalances between the grade factors
themselves.

As long as only a few representatives from a specified grade were of-
officially identified, there was no problem as to the proper interpretation or
application of the standard. But when all animals or carcasses within a class
must be designated as to their proper grade in accordance with the standards,
then the problem of interpretation became most keenly apparent.

Specifications describing animals or meat in the middle of the grade
provide very little assistance in making determinations on borderline or so-
called liner specimens. The question naturally arises: Is the specimen in or
out of a particular grade? This defect of the existing standards would render
them usable if it were not for the possibility of more or less arbitrarily
establishing the limitation or boundaries of each grade. In reality when the
grader has no guide for setting his range except for what has been told and
demonstrated to him by his superior.

Another criticism in the standards for grade is the indefiniteness of
the specifications. They are written in descriptive language replete with
adjectives defining the characteristics to be considered, none of which can be
pinned to a concrete meaning except by the grader who makes the determination.
The lack of an objective measure is often cause for arguments and differences
of opinions between the owner of the meat and the grader.

Consumers evaluate the excellence of meat on the basis and in the
order of (1) tenderness, (2) juiciness and flavor, and (3) ratio of muscular
portion to bone and fat contained in the cut or the serving. The grader must
weigh these characteristics desired by consumers in terms of grade factors
such as quality, finish, and conformation, and other exterior characteristics.
The possibility of transposing consumer concept of excellence into meat grade
factors whereby they will have interchangeable meaning needs to be worked out.
The basis on which our present standards are set up are considered logical and
sound. But we do need more concrete evidence to support the validity of the
grade factors and of their relative importance in determining grade. Those
responsible for the promulgation of grade standards are intensely interested in
knowing all the different ways that quality is manifested in meat and how it
can be dependably identified by visual examination of meat. There is urgent
need for tangible justification for differentiation between soft and firm
muscular and fatty tissue, for deviations in color, for compensations in appli-
cation of grade factors due to size and many other points. The answer must
come from research in which the characteristics can be qualitatively and
quantitatively associated with grade factors. This type of information can be
the basis for determining the proper division between grades and for establish-
ing the minimum requirements of the grades.

Pending the time when adequate fundamental information is available
attention must be directed toward establishing the minimum requirement of the
present subjective grade standard.

Two possibilities appear to have practical significance. One is by
photographically demonstrating the interpretation of the descriptive speci-
fications. We have done this on grades of carcase beef. The second possibility
is through the development of objective specifications as a yardstick for de-
termining limitations of grades or the tolerable range of factors within grades.
Obviously some species of livestock and meat derived therefrom cannot be graded from a practical standpoint by the application of any quantitative measure presently known. However, some adjustments in present concepts as to factors that determine grade might well open up this procedure for developing a more precise method for grading through the use of objective specifications thereby reducing the human element in determining the grade.

In presenting some of our problems concerning the preparation of grade standards it is implied that all meat should be graded. However, standards applied on a nation-wide basis are in keeping with the progressive development of the livestock and meat industry.

CHAIRMAN BRATZLER: Thank you, Mr. Beard. I am sure that was very much worth while. The discussion of this presentation will be led by W. Allen Cowan of the University of Massachusetts.

PROF. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am sure that we all enjoyed that very interesting talk on problems and developments on meat grading. Mr. Beard has certainly posed some questions for us as research men, questions with regard to developing objective measures, physical measures if you like, that will be accurate and will eliminate some of these human differences that do occur in grading and classifying different carcasses. He has posed the problem to us, as research men, of finding an indication on the hoof that will follow through and be a true indication of carcass value and how carcasses are going to cut out.

It is all wrapped up in this subject that he has been covering. That leads me to believe that certainly a great deal more research is needed along these lines. Before I open this for discussion, I would like to say a word or two about my own personal ideas or conclusions as far as meat grading is concerned. First of all, I would like to say that I have been very much confused. Every packer has his different label. They vary considerably as far as degrees of excellence are concerned, and it is rather hard to follow all of the different grading systems that seem to be in existence. I do not know how it must be for the consumer, but it must be an even greater problem for him.

I have thought for a considerable period of time that some system of standard grading of meats was necessary and this has surely been stimulating this afternoon, at least so far as I am concerned. I believe it is also true so far as the consumers are concerned. It has also got me to thinking about some of these associated or related problems, such things as yard sorting and grading of livestock on the hoof, and even about this business of rail grading that we have heard something about from the Canadian people and from the work that has been done at Hormel.

I am sure that you all have a lot of questions that you would like to direct to Mr. Beard. The meeting is now open for the question period.

PROF. MACKINTOSH: The question I am going to ask, I am quite sure is in the minds of a number of others, namely, under what conditions would these slides be available to us for instructional purposes? Are they procurable?
MR. BEARD: Yes.

PROF. MACKINTOSH: Good.

MR. BEARD: Sooner or later. (Laughter)

PROF. MACKINTOSH: How much later?

MR. BEARD: I have the promise that I would have a full set of these slides. There will be 56 in a series. They are going to be on a ribbon strip at a nominal cost, and by nominal, I mean less than $20.00. You can cut them and mount them just like we have them in these, if you wish. They will not come mounted. They will come in ribbon strip, and you can run them through your machine, or you can fix them up in mountings like these. This will represent 120 pictures we have had an opportunity to see. We have only one book made, one complete series, illustrating the minimum requirements for all grades.

If you think that taking colored pictures is just a Saturday afternoon job, try doing some of it, getting all the lights just right to show the shadow that will depict the variations in the shape of the carcass and then taking that picture and getting it developed to come out to the exact shade you want.

May I take a minute here, Mr. Chairman, to tell you about that. We were just as critical as possible to be sure that the color was just right on those cattle. We would not even trust our own eye. We had a color panel submitted to us by the Munsell people. This chart was hung beside every carcass. It had red color and the fat color in it - just what we wanted - three or four shades of it. Then when we got the picture, we took this chart and set it alongside the picture, and if the chart and picture matched-- the color of the eye were identical - okay -- but if they did not match, we could not accept the eye color either. That is how critical we were. We were not risking our judgment, and we were also avoiding a controversy between us and a photographer as to whether or not he had produced a faithful reproduction of that picture.

So these are faithful reproductions as near as humanly possible. We have some even better ones. These are all tailor-made; they are hand-made. We have learned no way by which you can have a volume business on it. They are just individually handled. We hope that these slides will give you something that you can show your classes that is representative of the different grades.

These are not designed for other than semi-technical and technical use. They may not be what you want. You may prefer the middle of the grade, in which case we will have to go around the horn again and come in with the middle sections of these grades and give you the same thing in the middle rather than at the limits, the lower limits, but I showed them to you only to illustrate possibilities of using colored photography in doing this.

We could have had these made for half the price, but what would we have had? -- nothing convincing. So we made them as near perfect as any science can make them today. They have all been in on this -- the Ansco people and all the rest of them -- and they will tell you this is an outstanding piece, the best piece of work that has ever been performed. I am not taking any credit; the photographer did it.

PROF. MACKINTOSH: When will those be available, do you think?
MR. BEARD: Well, I will get around to that. We are getting a roll made, and once that roll is made, we are going to turn it over to the Ansco people for reproduction. You can buy the films from them. They told us it would be between $12.00 and $15.00 if they had any volume at all on the sale of that filmstrip.

We are producing the negatives and they are going to produce the filmstrip for you.

PROF. ZIEGLER: Will you notify the respective colleges when these are available?

MR. BEARD: If you request me, I will do that.

PROF. MACKINTOSH: You are hereby requested, please.

MR. BEARD: I will send out a circular memorandum to all of you when the filmstrip is available, and give you the name of the company.

The book is going to be prohibitive. The best price we can get on that book is about $450.00. It is a wonderful piece of work, but it is too technical, for the purpose for which you men would use it. The filmstrip is a substitute for it, and that is the reason we are working on it. The book is for our supervisors at the present time.

PROFESSOR COWAN: Any other questions?

PROF. HAZALEUS: Mr. Beard, is there any kind of a pamphlet that will go with this?

MR. BEARD: Yes, we will have a prospectus at no extra cost to go with it to explain each picture.

PROF. COWAN: Anybody else?

VOICE: Mr. Beard, do you still have the grades broken down into high, good and low, or is it just regular grades?

MR. BEARD: Well, we have prime, choice, good, etc., and there is a range, and that presumes that there are some in there that are different from others. You have that range established. Here is the top and here is the bottom, and in between these two fall all of the eligibles for that particular grade.

If this represents the top, there are certain characteristics which are a little less than the one up here, which puts it down, and they fade out and go down, eventually we draw an imaginary line; then they go into the next bracket. So you obviously have your top and your bottom, and you have your typicals, which have the combination of the characters where we think they ought to be, the way the standards intended them to be. Then they fade out. Then you begin to adjust these factors, compensating and juggling them around until you get to a place where you cannot juggle them any more. Then they drop into the next section. So there you have your top and your bottom. We do not mark them tops and bottoms, but we recognize there is that spread and therefore it is a matter of adjusting and compensating for those factors which are responsible for some of them being a little higher in the grade than the others.
Does that answer your question?

VOICE: Yes, it does. The different pictures are different weights within the grades?

MR. BEARD: That is right, we showed you the different weights to show you how you compensate with them in order to take into account the influence of age on the grade, which is not spelled out very well in the standard, as you well know.

PROF. COWAN: Any other questions?

PROF. BLUMER: Mr. Beard, some of your men, I think, have been using those photographs. What are their comments on the value of the photograph?

MR. BEARD: They were worse than the packers. I do not know whether they were honest in that or whether they were just fearful of the repercussions if they expressed any interest in them. But you have to learn to read pictures. You all know that.

You heard considerable discussion about these microscopic pictures photographed. You had to learn to interpret the materials, and the same thing is true here. But I can take this book and go in a cooler with any one of you, and I can settle almost all the arguments. Give me the weakest one in this group, and I will settle the arguments and let him decide for himself where the cut-off is.

We have illustrations by those different weight ranges so he can interpret between them, and he will be surprised how well he can line them up with that book.

PROF. BLUMER: Does it not show the contrast between the fat and the lean a little more clearly on the photograph than in actuality?

MR. BEARD: You mean in the marbling?

PROF. BLUMER: Yes.

MR. BEARD: The one error in this filmstrip is that the cut is a little large in proportion to the other things. We attempted to put that up in normal size. In our book we have it at normal size, but when put on the screen, it is out of proportion; it is too big, and therefore it does look to you quite prominent, but look at it in terms of its relationship to the rest, then it comes into its proper perspective.

PROF. COWAN: Any other questions for Mr. Beard?

I have just one. You have set it up very nicely. Where do we go from here?

MR. BEARD: I have told you my problem. I say "my problem" because I am the chore boy to get these out. I told you what I need. I told you why I have had so much trouble, Descriptive standards are no longer appropriate. They do not fit; they are not refined enough, when I have to reach clear from the top to the bottom of the grade. If I could play it around the middle, they would be all right, but we are not doing it that way any more. We are drifting farther and farther away from that.
What I need now is to get these objective standards established so we know where that line is more definitely, where we can define the limitations of the characteristics, whether bound up in conformation, finish or quality. We need these definite limitations so that we will all understand and agree as to where they belong.

I will use the pictures until you do that. When we get over to hogs, I do not need the pictures, because there is an animal that I can measure out. I am working pretty well with a yardstick, but I do not know of any way you can yardstick these cattle, lambs or veal to assist you in determining the grade standard or specifications.

PROF. COWAN: If there are no other questions, I will turn the meeting back to Chairman Bratzler.

CHAIRMAN BRATZLER: Thank you, Mr. Cowan.

I think before we turn the meeting back to the General Chairman, we would like to express our appreciation not only to the General Chairman, Mr. Tomhave, but also to Mr. Pollock and to all the members of the National Live Stock and Meat Board who have given us this very worthwhile conference. Shall we give them all a rising vote of thanks?

... The audience arose and applauded...

CHAIRMAN BRATZLER: I will now turn the meeting back to you, Mr. Tomhave.

... Mr. Tomhave resumes the Chair...

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: Thank you, Professor Bratzler.

The last topic on the regular program is the "Discussion and General Summary of the Conference" by the Chairman.

We have had a very interesting and stimulating two day session, which I am sure has been thoroughly enjoyed by everyone in attendance. You have had a varied program consisting of reports, papers and discussions on meat and meat problems. You have had outstanding papers dealing with meat research, teaching, processing and the frozen meat problems. The evening program, at which representatives of the meat packing industry were the speakers, was not only interesting but highly informative.

The success of the Second Reciprocal Meat Conference has been due to the co-operative effort of all the members. The program committee came to Chicago in January, worked diligently for two days and set up a very stimulating program which included the subjects that you specifically requested after the conference last year. The Section Chairmen and the Discussion leaders have served ably in conducting the program to its final conclusion. The most important and valuable contribution to the success of the conference however was the outstanding papers, carefully prepared by members of the conference.

In the discussions during the past two days you have frequently emphasized the necessity of doing an increasing amount of research in order
to get at the fundamentals dealing with the various problems in the study and teaching of meats. You have also discussed the present curriculum and the problems with which you will be confronted during the next ten or twenty years.

All of you know that instruction and research in meats, in the colleges, is of comparatively recent origin, consequently you have before you a long and bright future. It would seem that you have just started to scratch the surface in the solution of the problems in the science of meats. You have before you a great opportunity to serve the livestock and meat industry. This industry is looking to you to furnish them with trained men that can assist in solving these problems. We are certain that the Second Reciprocal Meat Conference will give additional impetus to your effort and to the increasing interest in meat instruction and research in the colleges and universities.

On behalf of the National Live Stock and Meat Board I wish to thank all of you for your outstanding co-operation in making the conference an outstanding success. Personally I have thoroughly enjoyed serving as general chairman of the Second Reciprocal Meat Conference. I have experienced an inspiration and a depth of pleasure that I cannot express.

There are several committee reports to be made. Professor Bray, will you report on the Recommendation for Modification in the Rules for the Inter-collegiate Judging Contest.

PROF. BRAY: I do not know any more torrid topic on the schedule than this committee report, Mr. Tomhave. I do not think I will experience the amazement that Mr. Beard indicated he received when he showed his pictures to the industry. I do not expect we will have a silent period following this report.

As Mr. Tomhave indicated in the appointment of this committee, he assigned men to represent various parts of the country. The report that we are about to present to you for your consideration is the expression of that group. I suppose we might as well start out with the hottest part of the subject first.

This is from the committee on recommendation for the Intercollegiate Meat Judging Contest.

To the Members of the Reciprocal Meat Conference:

Recommendations.

No. 1. It is recommended that the grading of carcases be carried out to the nearest one-third of the grade. This is in line with grading on research projects being conducted in co-operation with the Standardization and Grading Division. We further suggest a total of twelve points to be allowed for each carcass of which two points be given to classification and ten points for grading.

The following method of scoring is suggested: In the proper one-third of the grade, ten points; one-third of a grade from the correct, eight points; two-thirds of a grade from the correct, five points. More than a full grade from the correct, no points at all.
The committee considers twenty carcasses adequate to test a contestant's knowledge of grading and classifying.

The additional two points for grading each carcass seems to be in line with the increasing importance of this phase of the contest.

No. 2. It is recommended that ten lamb carcasses be added to the contest for grading purposes only, the scoring to be the same as that for the grading of cattle.

No. 3. The committee strongly suggests that the judge, who places the class and reads the reasons, give the oral discussion on the classes after the contest.

No. 4. The committee recommends close supervision in the handling of cuts by contestants. A contestant should be warned for mishandling any carcass or cut, and disqualified from judging the class upon a second offense.

No. 5. And our last recommendation: Recommend that a suitable trophy, to be held in permanent possession, be awarded to the winning team in each contest. This is in addition to the traveling trophies.

Further, it is requested that a similar plaque to that awarded at the American Royal be awarded to the high teams in the various phases of the contest at the Chicago contest.

I submit to the Meat Conference for its approval, the recommendation of the Committee on changes in the rules of the Meat Judging Contest, Mr. Tomhave.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: You have heard the report of the committee, gentlemen. What is your pleasure? Is there any discussion?

PROF. MACKINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, in order to get this before the group, I make a motion that the report be accepted.

PROF. COLE: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: It has been moved and seconded that the report of Meat Judging Contest committee be accepted. Is there any discussion? There is no discussion.

... The motion was put to a vote and unanimously carried ...

There is another committee to report. May we now have the report of the Resolutions Committee.

PROF. ZIEGLER: This is a report of the Resolutions Committee.