OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENT ON THE SUBJECT MATTER PRSENTED ON THE RESEARCH PROGRAM

O. G. Hankins
U.S.D.A. BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Gentlemen, I have a large number of pages of notes here, but I imagine the main thing you want me to do is to hurry with what I have to say, so we can go ahead and get the remainder of the business done. So I promise to make a real effort to get through with my remarks expeditiously.

I suppose I should admit that in the beginning I did not take this job too seriously, maybe not quite as seriously as I should have, and yet after I got here and began to assemble my notes and to think about what I should say, I began to realize that I was somewhat on the spot. However, I hope I can get off that spot.

I made some comments this morning following Mr. Bratzler's paper, in which I was much interested and which I had read before presentation. One of the points which interested me then, and has in times past, is the question as to cooperation within the institution and cooperation between two or more institutions. That point, too, I believe comes up very definitely in Dr. Brady's paper just finished. Mr. Sulzbacher's paper also in a way had a bearing on it because of this matter of the large amount of equipment that is required to do a complete sort of job. It may appear almost impossible from the viewpoint of the individual department in the station to supply all of that equipment; so cooperation between departments seems almost a necessity. Yet, such cooperation is not always 100 percent pleasant, since personalities and other factors enter into it, but probably in most cases it is essential.

With reference to the matter of cooperation between two or more institutions, I don't know that I can say it any better than I did this morning. It seems to me in that respect the first question is the problem. Let's not cooperate for the sake of cooperation. Let's be sure we have a real problem of broad significance before we get serious about trying to set up a cooperative organization between two or more institutions.

In connection with the discussion of the first paper this morning somebody made a good point in referring to methods. We do not need perfect methods for them to be called standard methods, and I should like to emphasize that. If we wait for perfect methods we will never do anything. We hope always to have the opportunity for improvement in methods as we go forward. So at any given time it is almost a necessity to say "Well, this is the best we have. Let's use it and do the best we can with it and call it standard".

We had such an interesting discussion of Professor Bull's paper it would be sort of superfluous, I think, for me to try to say anything more about it. Moreover, there is the prospect of a resolution coming up here, I suppose to be discussed and perhaps adopted, and so without any further comment I am going to pass on.

Then there was the subject "The place of the graduate student in a meat research program". I was very much interested in that for two reasons. One is that we have had a graduate student working on a project at Beltsville, - a cooperative arrangement with the University of Maryland, - quite satisfactorily in many respects. Moreover, we are thinking about an expansion of that method of getting research done, through an allotment of funds, assuming that funds will be available, which is still a question at the moment, - to one of the state experiment stations for use for one or perhaps more graduate students. We think there is good reason to believe that the plan would work out satisfactorily.

There was one rather obvious statement made, which I suppose from one point of view it is unnecessary to repeat and yet it seems worthy of mention. The size and scope of a meats research program may depend greatly on the number of graduate students available. That, of course is simply being realistic about the situation in a particular place.

Then we heard Phil Anderson talk about methods for determining the effect of freezing and storage on the tenderness of beef. I was much interested in his approach to that topic and the line-up of items he gave us to be considered. You will recall I made some comments this morning on the experience we had in sampling beef in this type of study. I think of that first serious study of this kind we ever made and we have tried to do at least as well as that in succeeding experiements we have conducted at Beltsville.

There was another point in that connection which rather impressed me. Some one mentioned the significance of the degree of marbling. As I recall it, the opinion was expressed that the degree of marbling should be observed and recorded. I wonder if that is entirely adequate. There is a problem there, we believe, that relates to the composition of the beef. That is, we have been concerned -- in fact, we have a project on the books that is concerned, with the intramuscular fat content, to be really specific about it, and its relation to the tenderizing effect of a given temperature or a definite rate of freezing.

I agree with the comment, too, by the way, that it is best to refer to rate of freezing not simply to temperature of freezing because it is possible to have different rates at the same temperature. But in any event I would call to your attention again the possible effect of differences in composition when one studies the effect of different freezing rates on the tenderness of meat. There may have been experiments conducted where that factor was not taken into account and in consequence the results were difficult to interpret.

We had considerable discussion this morning, you will recall, about so-called subjective and objective methods of measuring tenderness. I don't propose to belabor that point here. I suspect the proper way to dispose of it is to say that there is a place for both of them in any given experiment. We rather hold that view, although we are inclined to have more confidence in the objective than the subjective.

I thought Mr. Henrickson's paper was very interesting and informative. Much of the subject matter of course, we have heard about before, and yet seldom do we get as much information of that kind in one place. I, for one, am grateful for the opportunity of hearing it and I look forward to reading it. One point in the paper that made an impression on me was the possible relation

between bacterial and enzymatic action. Another point that may well be mentioned was the suggestion that the histological condition as observed may help to explain other changes that occur in meat tissue.

I think I will digress at this point to tell you that there are at Beltsville quite a large number of samples of rabbit muscle tissue that have come from the study where we have been inquiring into the possible inheritance of tenderness. Some of you may have seen brief reports on that work in the reports of the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry in recent years. We have reached a stopping point in the study. Considerable data have been accumulated and we have shown that there are significant differences in tenderness between certain strains of New Zealand white rabbits. We have preserved these samples of muscle tissue and there is a prospect now of getting into a study of histological characteristics in relation to the observed differences in tenderness.

I had some responsibility in getting Bill Sulzbacher on the job of preparing the paper he presented, and we had several rather serious discussions about it before he began to write. I am sure you are all going to interpret it as it was meant, - that, as someone said, it is the prime grade. It is something to aim at. On the other hand, we regard those facilities as perhaps the minimum, if one is seeking a complete setup in order to be prepared to do the kind of meat research that we all want to do. None of us are going to obtain such facilities in a short time. We don't have all of them at Beltsville by any means, although we have been very fortunate in recent years, as many of you know. We have added very materially to the facilities there and, in fact, we are just now finishing what I believe to be one of the best low temperature setups in the world. But there will always be desirable equipment that we do not have, I suppose.

I, like the rest of you, consider the last two presentations as companion papers, one supplementing the other, and, as a matter of fact, I am inclined to consider the first paper on the program along with them. In fact, I have been seeking a thread that runs through this program or a point of major consideration that might be separated out and given some special thought or comment. I think perhaps the best I can do along that line is to consider those three papers together.

Lyman Bratzler presented his discussion under the title of, "The Opportunity for Cooperative Meat Research Between the Agricultural Experiment Stations and with the United States Department of Agriculture," and then there was the next to the last paper by Bill Cole, "The Need for a Study to Determine the Effect of Quality and Finish on the Acceptability of Beef," and Dan Brady's paper on "A Detailed Analysis of Factors to Consider in Organizing and Executing a Meat Research Project to Determine the Effect of Quality and Finish on the Acceptability of Beef." I rather believe that those boys to some extent were all thinking along the same line. I am not going to say much about these last two papers. They were both very pertinent, very good, and very timely. I think we would agree 100 percent here that there is a need for that kind of a study.

Then the next thought that comes to mind is that there has been a regional project proposed which could be expressed in this same kind of language. I wonder if this would be an appropriate time, Mr. Tomhave, for me

to ask Bratzler, Cole and Brady if they would care to relate what they have said here to this regional project proposal. With your permission I will go ahead. Lyman, would you care to say anything about your paper in relation to the regional project?

MR. BRATZLER: I figured on taking it up afterwards, O.G., but I might say that in my paper I just tried to bring out the possibilities of some type of cooperative research. I think the two should be completely divorced. We don't want to associate the regional meat project, if we get one approved, with the Reciprocal Meat Conference. That is my personal feeling on the matter, and I think we will bring that out a little later during the business session. In my paper I just threw out to the group at least what seemed to me to be the two possibilities for some organization. I figured on leaving it up to the group to decide.

MR. HANKINS: May I say I did not mean to imply that I was associating the proposed project with future activities of the Reciprocal Meat Conference. I am thinking in the abstract about the project that you, Cole and Brady have spoken of and I am not bringing it up as a matter which necessarily concerns the Reciprocal Meat Conference. I have been trying, as I said, to find a major point coming out of this program.

Mr. Cole, would you care to add anything from the point of view of the regional project?

MR. COLE: I think that Brady can tell us a little about what has happened.

MR. BRADY: I think everybody is entitled to know all the facts, and I don't think there was any indication in what Lyman said that there might be a little misunderstanding on the part of some of the folks that we are trying to hide something. Some of you remember that in the meeting of the American Society of Animal Production last fall there was a sort of jelling of thought since the last war -- and this has been brought out today -- as far as the experiment stations are concerned we have sort of lost a centralized drive. Some of us can remember enough about the good points of the cooperative meat investigations that we thought that some of that has a place here.

Now times have changed and with the various regional projects, it seemed that maybe one of the things that might be initiated to start with is the possibility of some of the folks cooperating on a project that has to do with quality evaluation. Lyman wrote most of you to get your reaction. You had various reactions and those of you who expressed your ideas expressed yourselves as being interested in a project of the general vein which we have discussed here this afternoon. We have followed along with that. There are quite a large number of stations in this north central area including two stations outside of the north central area, Tennessee and Texas, that have indicated a great deal of interest in it. They wish to take the ideas and the advice of various people, including various folks from the U.S.D.A. However, I want to say first that this regional project idea was initiated basically by various experiment stations. These thoughts and ideas were put together and developed into a regional project. A copy was presented to our Director for consideration of all Directors in the north central area. I understand they are considering it and that they have some type of report that is due in August. That is as much information as I have.

We have one of the members of that committee here. He might care to add something.

MR. HANKINS: As I understand it, the main point of similarity is that these papers, especially the last two papers, have dealt with the same general problem as this proposed regional project. Is that a correct statement?

MR. BRADY: That is right.

MR. HANKINS: I don't know that I have anything further to add to my comments. I think we have had a very interesting and informative program of papers here, and although I have had to spend much of my time making notes I have enjoyed it a great deal. I appreciate the invitation to be here and to be on the program. Thank you very much.

- - - - -

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: Thank you, Dr. Hankins. Gentlemen, we will now open our business session. So far as I know there is no old or unfinished business.

Mr. Kerr, of Maryland, has some information with reference to the Eastern judging contest which he wishes to present. Mr. Kerr.

MR. KERR: The question was raised about holding a meat judging contest in connection with the Eastern National Live Stock Show. There is no question but that the Eastern National Live Stock Show is growing in importance and is putting on what most folks consider a top quality livestock show, comparable in some respects to the International, to the American Royal or other shows in the West. There has been expressed a question here by some of the men as to the possibility of holding a meats judging contest in connection with that show. We do have a livestock judging contest which can be participated in by any school at the present time, but we are now in the process of making up our premium catalog for the coming show, and they wanted to know whether or not we were actually going to have a meats judging contest. The representatives of the Eastern National have asked if I would not get a definite answer from this group at this meeting as to whether to plan for a contest so that we could put information in the catalog about the contest.

I wrote to Mr. Pollock about it soon after last year's contest. I think he sent out letters to many of the schools in the area or perhaps to anyone across the country that might be interested in sending teams to that show. No time or date in connection with the show has been set. The show runs from November 11 to 18 inclusive, Saturday to Saturday, but as for the date that the contest would be held, we have made no specific statement as to the exact time. I would rather leave that up to the agreement of the greatest number of those here who would like to participate, but the National Live Stock and Meat Board have indicated that they would go along and help to put on that contest -- I have been assured of that by Mr. McDonald and I think by Mr. Pollock and others -- providing we get enough teams interested actually to come to the contest. When I say this I do not mean to detract any at all from

the Eastern States Exposition. I hope we will not try to butt in, in any way on that particular show. It is simply a question here of "Here is a show." We have been offered the facilities of the Eskay Packing plant in which to hold the contest. Of course, our judging contest would be held in their plant in Baltimore.

I should like to have expressions from some of the men here who will be coaching judging teams as to whether or not they are actually planning to send teams.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: Mr. Pollock, would you care to say a word with regard to this matter?

MR. POLLOCK: We have sent out letters to all the states tributary to this meats judging contest which might be held in Baltimore. I do not have the details in mind at the present time. Have you in your folder, Mac, the states that have indicated they want to enter this intercollegiate meat judging contest at Baltimore?

MR. McDONALD: No, I have not.

MR. POLLOCK: How many were there?

MR. McDONALD: Nine.

MR. POLLOCK: There were nine states. How many of you men enter a team? Put your hands up, one man from a state. (6) Three states have indicated that they will send teams that are not represented here. Putting on a meats judging contest for three states is a very difficult thing to handle. It costs from $1,000 to $1,200 to put on one of these contests The National Live Stock and Meat Board is not interested in putting that much money into one for three states. However, if you have nine states competing in a contest of this kind it is worth-while to put on such a contest.

How close does that come to conflicting with the American Royal? What is the date?

MR. KERR: November 11 to 18. I mentioned it comes that week.

MR. POLLOCK: We will check over the list of states that are competing or who want to compete in this contest, and if we have assurance that we will have enough states to make it worth-while, both for you fellows and for all the trouble and effort necessary to put the contest on, I think we can handle it for you.

MR. KERR: I should like to ask this other question. Would Monday, the 13th, be a more suitable day? I should like to get an expression here.

MR. POLLOCK: We have found that Tuesday is about the best time for this. That is, early in the show.

MR. KERR: I think we can handle it on Monday all right, because our livestock judging is on Saturday again this year. There has been some

talk of trying to shift that over into the week of the show, but I do not believe it will be done this year.

MR. POLLOCK: I think Tuesday is better because it takes a day in the cooler, picking out the carcasses and classes. They are not operating in packing plants on Saturday and some of them are not operating much on Friday, but if you have Monday to select your carcasses and classes it works out better to hold the contest on Tuesday than on Monday.

MR. KERR: I should like to hear how some of the team coaches feel about it.

MR. EDGAR: The budget plays an important part in our participating in that contest. We probably could not stay over until Tuesday. We would get there on Saturday and leave on Monday.

MR. POLLOCK: It requires a day to get these classes together. It would be almost an impossibility to hold it on Monday.

MR. COWAN: I think there is just one more point in that connection that Mr. Edgar did not give. I would say it is this: I do not know how many of the other schools are bumping into this same problem, but we run into a considerable amount of criticism from the standpoint of keeping these boys away from school over a long period of time. To have the boys participate in the livestock judging contest on Saturday, we leave about Wednesday, so as to get there on time. Then if for one reason or another we have to hang over until Tuesday or, say, Wednesday, it makes it a little too long out of school right in the middle of the semester, when usually there are a lot of examinations coming up and things of that sort. I know that we run into a lot of criticism if we stay away too long a time.

MR. KERR: In that connection you must remember this. Of course, it would not affect us so much because we are at home this time, but we leave the following Saturday for the International, and again some of the teams run into that.

MR. POLLOCK: We have Mr. Warner here who works on picking out the classes. How about it, Mr. Warner?

MR. WARNER: I would hate to go into the cooler Monday morning, at seven o'clock, and have it ready even by noon. If they brought different boys and it was agreeable to everybody, I suppose we could set it up and have it Saturday, the same day as the livestock contest.

MR. TYLER: I happen to have a couple of teams in the livestock contest. If we drive five or six hundred miles to a contest with the show really starting on Monday--you really bring the boys that distance to see a pretty high caliber show -- if you do not let them see it, you have defeated your purpose. Perhaps the trip justifies the contest, but if you are going to take a team that distance it should be able to spend a day or two around the show.

MR. COWAN: Would it be possible to have the livestock contest Monday and to have the meats contest Saturday?

MR. KERR: I do not know. It is worth investigating.

MR. COWAN: I think the last time we brought it up at the Livestock Coaches meeting, they seemed to think we have too full a week.

MR. KERR: That, of course, is the thing we run into at some other shows as well. The facilities, when your actual judging of the livestock classes and breeding classes starts Monday morning. The question of whether you are going to have the facilities to do the livestock judging. It is much more convenient if we have a full place to show, and, of course, we lack space partly.

MR. POLLOCK: Do you mean space or time?

MR. KERR: I mean to bring in our rings of livestock and for the judging by the livestock judging teams. We do not have sufficient space under one roof to do all that.

MR. POLLOCK: That would not interfere with the meat judging contest.

MR. KERR: No, it would not interfere, but he was asking for a change in the livestock judging contest to Monday and to have these on Saturday. I am anxious to get these opinions to see what we can do at Baltimore.

MR. COWAN: In connection with the Eastern States contest Dr. Rice, the Superintendent, has already sent out to many of you gentlemen the entry blanks for entry into the meats judging contest. I wonder if I could get an idea of how many schools might possibly be competing in that contest this fall. I know that last year there were three, and the year before, four or some number like that. In other words, not very many. It is hardly worth-while holding it, as Mr. Pollock has said. I just wonder if there are any schools that figure on participating this coming year that have not participated previously.

That contest, by the way, has usually been held on a Sunday, at the H. L. Handy Packing Company and it is usually some time about the 20th of September. It is rather a bad time from the standpoint of registration. Could we see just how many there might be that are interested in attending the Eastern States contest around that time of the year? Will you come, Tom?

MR. ZIEGLER: Not if we have one at Baltimore, but we will if we do not.

MR. COWAN: I think if you decide to hold one at Baltimore and not to hold one at Eastern States we should definitely take some action. It is up to the Superintendent and the Meat Board, of Course, to do something about these notices that have already gone out to teams regarding participation in this contest in September at Eastern States.

MR. HALE: This year they are putting in lamb grading and they are going to do something about beef grading which they have not in the past. If you push it up, then you are shooting into Chicago right afterwards, and it is like playing professional ball. It is one game after another. If you have it a little earlier you get a chance to train some boys, and you work on them again before you take them to the next contest rather than just bunching them right together. Unless you intend to bring two different teams, one to Baltimore and one to Chicago it might be too bad. It does mean pulling the boys out of school and the Liberal Arts people complain about their missing classes.

MR. ZIEGLER: How are you going to get classes for grading of carcasses when they had to select two carcasses last year that no one could place?

MR. COWAN: I talked with Beal and Ayre and they are going to try to bring in a carload of steers which will be slaughtered and you will have your full length. So that will take care of it.

The one thing I like about the Eastern States contest is that it does come a little earlier and it gives a chance for the boys not to be out of classes for such a long time and a chance to work on them and to groom them before they come into the Chicago contest.

I do think that if it is going to be a contest you certainly have to have more than three teams because otherwise it is no contest.

MR. TYLER: Maybe I am the one that you want to discuss this with because I think I had a part in this idea. Dr. Foss and I were talking last summer and we decided that maybe a Baltimore event would open it up to a few more schools. It is just too far for those of us in North Carolina, Virginia and perhaps Tennessee to try to get up to Massachusetts, not that we were trying to do anything to eliminate that contest. We did not even think about it in that way at all, but we are not able to participate and we want a contest close to home and that is why we are trying to get that contest.

MR. HALE: Could we have a contest and have it in a central location, in Ohio or Buffalo, or somewhere like that?

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: Are there any other suggestions? In order to clear the atmosphere I wonder if we can again see the hands of those that would definitely go to Baltimore. Let us see the hands and see how many there are. (6) Six definitely, and are there any other possibilities? (2) Anyone else? How about West Virginia?

MR. HENRICKSON: We will come.

MR. VANDER NOOT: I might speak for New Hampshire and say that there would be a possibility of coming.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: In other words, there is a possibility of eight or nine teams compared with four at the other place. Is that correct?

It would seem that it is up to you folks to decide what you are going to do. I think Mr. Pollock has expressed his opinion as to what they will be glad to do. They feel that it would not be desirable or advisable to put on two contests in the same area. I think that is good judgment.

Are there any other comments?

MR. PIERCE: I think in that same connection there has been some thought to proposing a contest at the Denver or National Western Show which would take in some of the mountain states, such as Wyoming, Colorado, Montana, Idaho, Nebraska and a few of the others, which would be a little more centrally located.

MR. POLLOCK: I might say for the Northwest, the Pacific International, and also Denver, we have contacted institutions two or three times in the past and there were not enough states interested in the contest out there to justify going ahead and putting one on. It might be the time to take it up again with the boys in the Northwest. It might be different now.

MR. ADAMS: How long ago was it?

MR. POLLOCK: Possibly five years ago.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: I imagine it would be in order to try to dispose of the eastern situation first and then to bring up the other one because we do not want to get the two confused.

MR. HALE: I do not want to make the motion but is there any possibility of moving the location of the contest and having it earlier than the first part of November, having it in October or the last of September at some packing plant? Some central location.

MR. ZIEGLER: I think the reason we have these contests at this time is because many of us are also judges on the livestock judging teams and in that way we kill two birds with one stone. To make this a special affair requires thought and organization and the whole thing is already set up. If you want to do something like that, it is going to take some more time.

I should like to have it said here and now that we are going to go to Baltimore and we will cut out Eastern States. The Eastern States cup has been retired. We like the place and we like the men with John L. Handy and Company but they do not have the facilities there. They do not have a full height rail and everything has to be in a quarter. Further, it is hardly worth-while with only three teams competing.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: Is there any action you want to take regarding the Baltimore situation? We have to dispose of it one way or the other.

MR. KERR: I should like to move that we have a contest at Baltimore and go along with Mr. Ziegler's suggestion, if that is agreeable

to the National Live Stock and Meat Board, to replace the one at Eastern States.

MR. TYLER: I will second the motion.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: I do not know whether to let all of you fellows vote on this or not. I think the best way to handle it is to have those vote who are going to enter teams. Is there further discussion on it?

MR. HALE: I suggest that someone write to Eastern States and explain to the Handy Company and Charlie Nash why we are pulling out of the Eastern States contest, so that there will be no hard feelings up that way. Last year somebody slipped a little and they claimed they did not know anything about the contest until Friday when it was too late for them to get their lambs and beef in.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: In order to dispose of the matter, all the men who are going to enter teams or there is a possibility of entering teams who are in favor of the motion as made will please rise. (7) Those opposed please rise. It seems to be unanimous. I presume the matter of the details and the date will have to be worked out in co-operation with the packing company and the National Live Stock and Meat Board. Is that right, Mr. Pollock?

MR. POLLOCK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: All right, that is disposed of. Now we can talk about the other, the possibilities of the Denver or the Pacific International. We can take just a minute. How many of the men who are present here would take a team to Denver if a contest were put on in connection with the National Western? We are trying to get an opinion now. Let us see how many would take teams to the Pacific International. There were seven hands up for Denver.

MR. POLLOCK: Have you the names?

MR. McDONALD: No.

MR. POLLOCK: You should get them.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: Most of the hands were over on this side.

MR. HALE: Is that on the basis of having it in place of the contest in Forth Worth?

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: I do not think so.

MR. BUTLER: Forth Worth is the only contest that will pay part of the expenses coming down. They had better make plans to come down there.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: Have you all the names, Mac?

MR. McDONALD: On Denver I have Iowa, Montana, Kansas, South Dakota, Texas, Colorado, Nebraska and Wyoming.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: Are there any others?

MR. McDONALD: How about Washington?

MR. MEYER: No.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: I know that this is at least an expression of opinion. I do not know that there is anything further we can do on that subject at present, Mr. Pollock.

MR. POLLOCK: I should like to have your ideas on one other point. In the past we have been calling on some dozen men to act as judges for all of them. We should have more men available to act in a judging capacity -- to act as judges in these contests. What ideas have you?

For instance, we have to call on Mr. Warner for all of the contests. We have to call on Mr. Edinger. We have Mr. Tomhave trotting all over the country. Mr. Tomhave may get a little lazy in the next two months and quit working. You cannot tell. You have to have somebody to take his place and for some of the other fellows. What are your ideas?

MR. COWAN: Phil Anderson would like to go to Denver.

MR. POLLOCK: How many of you fellows would like to go to the Pacific International to act as judges? Hands up. (Laughter) Well, that is something I should like to have you think over and give us your ideas and suggestions on it. For the stock judging contests they seem to have a limited number of men. Would you like to have us call on these packers to assist at these contests? You can say "yes" or "no" quickly. It makes no difference to me, but they have a lot of good men in the packing industry who have been in judging contests in the past. Whether we can get them or not I don't know, but we should have more people available to assist and to act as judges.

MR. MACKINTOSH: Why couldn't we do like the livestock men who submit a list of names of men to the officials of the contest whom they believed qualified and from that list get a sufficient number? I believe that something similar could be done here. I am sure there are a number of ex-contestants who have been sufficiently closely associated with meat since they have been graduated that they are perfectly capable, particularly when working under the guidance of some of the more experienced men. I think it would be good for them.

MR. POLLOCK: I think that is a very good suggestion. When you men get back home will you drop us a line and give us your suggestions? Names will come to mind whom you cannot think of right on the spur of the moment who would make good men for this and you could send the lists in and we could go over them and possibly select men to help out. There have been one or two occasions in the past we have been short-handed because we have not had the people to pick from to act as judges in these contests.

Will you make a motion on that, Davie?

MR. MACKINTOSH: I make a motion that each of us undertake to write Mr. Pollock suggesting two or more names each of men who we think capable and qualified who might be available to act as judges in these contests who are in fairly close proximity.

MR. BRATZLER: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: Is there any further discussion on that point? If not, all in favor of the motion signify by saying "aye" contrary the same sign. Unanimously carried.

MR. KERR: Before we get completely away from it, I should like to ask those coaches who are planning to send teams to the Baltimore Show if they will write letters--I can not say to whom specifically --suggesting the day of the week they would rather have our particular show and then we will try to work it out as best we can. Of course, we have to cooperate with the packing plant there and the National Live Stock and Meat Board, but I would appreciate receiving letters. I suspect it will perhaps fall on my shoulders to be superintendent for this year at least of that department. So if you want to, you may address those letters to me and I will turn them over to Dick Graves and Joe Shirley, the President and Vice President of the Eastern National.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: If there is nothing further, I believe the next order of business is the report of the Chairman of the Executive, Mr. Bratzler.

MR. BRATZLER: Thank you, Mr. Tomhave.

The first order of business is for the group to decide whether we shall have another conference, and the Chair will entertain a motion to the effect that another Reciprocal Meat Conference be held or that one not be held.

MR. BRADY: Mr. Chairman, I so move.

MR. ANDERSON: Second.

MR. BRATZLER: Any discussion? All those in favor of the motion to have another Reciprocal Meat Conference next year signify by saying "aye"; contrary the same sign. The motion is unanimously carried.

The Executive Committee that was elected yesterday has been in conference and we have set up a tentative working organization. I might say again that this organization will not be related in any way to a regional meats project that may or may not be formulated. This is entirely separate from that. The Executive Committee thought of these things in setting up this organization.

We kept in mind the fact that we report on research work at the annual meetings of the American Society of Animal Production, and as such we felt that the future programs should be approximately 60 per cent teaching and extension and 40 per cent research.

The Executive Committee has lined up these committees. I know what is running through Mr. Pollock's mind when he looks at them and sees that we have whittled them down to nine. I might say that the committee suggested will be working committees. The Executive Committee has also suggested duties. Whether it can enforce them or not might be a matter for discussion. The committees, when they have their duties performed, will automatically be dissolved. They will not be considered as standing committees.

Further, the Executive Committee will be glad to serve as the Program Committee next year.

The 1950-51 Reciprocal Meat Conference Committees and suggested duties of each are as follows:--

EXECUTIVE AND PROGRAM COMMITTEE

1. L. J. Bratzler, Chairman
   Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan
2. D. E. Brady, Vice-Chairman, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri
3. National Live Stock and Meat Board, Secy.-Treas., Chicago, Illinois
4. R. W. Bray, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin
5. O. D. Butler, Jr., Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Texas
6. K. F. Warner, U.S.D.A., Washington 25, D. C.

RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE

1. J. J. Wanderstock, Chairman
   Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
2. Wayne E. Batterman, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin
3. T. N. Blumer, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina
4. Ray T. Crane, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas
5. James D. Kemp, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
6. Earl Lasley, North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, North Dakota
7. Wm. J. Loeffel, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska
8. E. P. Margerum, Jr., Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas
9. Thomas O. Meyer, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington
10. Ellis A. Pierce, S. Dakota State College, Brookings, South Dakota
11. Ralph P. Soule, Jr., Michigan State College, E. Lansing, Michigan
12. L. N. Tucker, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri
13. M. M. Voegeli, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan
14. L. E. Walters, Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma

Duties

1. Bring abstracts up-to-date.
2. Each sub-group to provide enough mimeographed copies of its work to provide a copy for all attending the next Conference.
3. Consider the possibility of new classification of abstracts - e.g., addition of a meat product manufacturing class.

RESEARCH METHODS COMMITTEE

1. O. G. Hankins, Chairman
   B.A.I., U.S.D.A. Beltsville, Maryland
2. D. E. Brady, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri
3. R. W. Bray, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin
4. F. E. Deatherage, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
5. J. L. Hall, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas
6. Joseph Kostelic, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa
7. V. K. Johnson, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
8. Albert M. Pearson, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida
9. W. L. Sulzbacher, B.A.I., U.S.D.A., Beltsville, Maryland

Duties

Select one (or more) previous project that has been published. Present a panel discussion in which the project is duscussed pro and con - as well as how it could have been improved -

1. Organization of project.
2. Selection of materials
3. Methods of procedure.
4. Collection of data.
5. Analysis of data.
6. Interpretation of data.
7. Publication.

BEEF CARCASS EVALUATION COMMITTEE

1. D. L. Mackintosh, Chairman
   Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas
2. Charles H. Adams, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska
3. R. J. Deans, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
4. O. G. Hankins, B.A.I., U.S.D.A., Beltsville, Maryland
5. M. H. Hazaleus, Colorado A. & M. College, Fort Collins, Colorado
6. M. C. Heck, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas
7. Charles E. Murphey, Standardization & Grading Division, P.M.A., U.S.D.A.
   Washington, D. C.
8. H. D. Naumann, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

Duties

1. Review work that has been done and bring definite recommendations for adoption or rejection by the Conference.

2. Points for consideration -
   a. Slaughter methods - weights, shrink, etc.
   b. Cutting methods.
   c. Grading.
   d. Measurements.
   e. Quality and product yield from any experiment.

3. Indicate those areas which need further research.

PORK CARCASS EVALUATION COMMITTEE

1. J. W. Cole, Chairman
   University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee
2. W. J. Aunan, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota
3. L. J. Bratzler, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan
4. R. L. Hiner, B.A.I., U.S.D.A., Beltsville, Maryland
5. M. H. Kerr, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland
6. Edwin A. Kline, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa
7. Zane Palmer, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri
8. C. L. Strong, Standardization & Grading Division, P.M.A., U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C.
9. George Wilson, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wiscinson

Duties

1. Review work that has been done and bring definite recommendations for adoption or rejection by the Conference.

2. Points for consideration -
   a. Slaughter methods - weights, shrink, etc.
   b. Cutting methods.
   c. Grading.
   d. Measurements.
   e. Quality and product yield from any experiment.

3. Indicate those areas which need further research.

LAMB CARCASS EVALUATION COMMITTEE

1. G. W. Vander Noot, Chairman
   Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey
2. A. W. Oliver, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon
3. Carl Roubicek, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming
4. Desmond B. Watt, Montana State College, Bozeman, Montana
5. E. J. Wilford, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

Duties

1. Review work that has been done and bring definite recommendations for adoption or rejection by the Conference.

2. Points for consideration -
   a. Slaughter methods - weights, shrink, etc.
   b. Cutting methods.
   c. Grading.
   d. Measurements.
   e. Quality and product yield from any experiment.

3. Indicate those areas which need further research.

TEACHING COMMITTEE

1. L. E. Kunkle, Chairman
   Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
2. P. A. Anderson, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota
3. Sleeter Bull, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
4. R. A. Edgar, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia
5. Carl Emerson, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri
6. E. D. Farwell, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan
7. Nathan S. Hale, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts
8. J. I. Miller, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
9. W. E. Tyler, N. Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina

Duties

1. Syllabus for basic meats course.

2. Laboratory manual for meat slaughter course.

3. Consideration of following problems:
   a. Graduate student plans to continue work at a land Grant College.
   b. How far (number of courses, or hours of credit) he should progress in specialized field - e.g.,

      Chemistry -
         Physical, Biochemistry, Colloids, etc.
      Bacteriology--
         Fermentation, Sanitary, Pathogenic, etc.
      Anatomy
      Statistics
      Economics
      Etc.

EXTENSION COMMITTEE

1. R. W. Snyder, Chairman
   Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Texas
2. Paul Brown, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
3. V. R. Cahill, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
4. James Christian, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
5. Howard G. Ford, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas
6. J. B. Francioni, Jr., Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.
7. W. L. Richmond, Mississippi State College, State College, Miss.
8. K. F. Warner, U.S.D.A., Washington, D. C.
9. George H. Wellington, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Duties

1. Inventory of extension achievements in meats.
2. Work plan for extension meats program.
3. What Animal Husbandry research results can be taught farmers through meat extension.

MEAT JUDGING MANUAL AND CONTEST COMMITTEE

1. J. C. Hillier, Chairman
   Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma
2. O. D. Butler, Jr., Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Texas
3. W. A. Cowan, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts
4. R. L. Hendrickson, W. Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia
5. E. C. Stillwell, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, Ontario, Canada
6. K. F. Warner, U.S.D.A., Washington, D. C.
7. P. T. Ziegler, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania

Duties

1. Prepare a Meat Judging Manual to be used by:
   a. College teams.
   b. F.F.A. teams.
      (1) Judging
      (2) Identification
      (3) Grading
   c. Home Economics
      (1) Identification

2. Grading recommendations.

3. Prepare a list of available meat contest judges for each contest.

4. Formulate eligibility rules for Royal and International catalogs. (At present the catalogs state that the same rules that govern livestock teams will prevail.)

Progress report to be given at 1950 International - Final report at Fourth Reciprocal Meat Conference.

MR. BRATZLER: Are there any questions regarding the proposed organization? For example, the Meat Judging Contests and Manual Committee. There has been some agitation for a Meat Judging Manual not only for those other than Oklahoma in the collegiate ranks but also for vocational education groups for pointers and help in coaching for meat judging contests. The Teaching Committee's functions primarily will be to develop and perhaps present a program, to give us some ideas on new methods in presenting the subject of meats.

That was part of our thinking. If I am stepping off the baseline now any member of the Executive Committee put me back on. Are there any comments? Do we have enough committees or do we have too many?

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, I would just recall that when the Executive Committee were discussing these various committees, the Teaching Committee, for example, we noted yesterday how much interest there was in the handling of graduate students, and there was almost equal interest in the grading of students, and the thought was expressed that perhaps as a teaching committee, not just as an abstract teaching committee but as a job for next year the committee might want to choose one of those specific

problems or situations and study it and make their recommendations another year -- suggestions and recommendations as to how graduate students can be handled or for improvements in grading. "Teaching" is a rather abstract title. I am sure that the Executive Committee felt that the group might want to pick a specific job so that it would not be just filling the calendar but it would be tackling a particular problem.

MR. BULL: Perhaps I should have said this while I was up before, but I think our biggest problem is with graduate teaching. From what I have gathered at this meeting we have a great variety of ideas about graduate teaching. Frankly, some of them I doubt are worthy of being called graduate courses. I think, since graduate work in meats is a relatively new idea, the study of teaching might well be restricted to graduate teaching. We have taught elementary courses for a long time and I think we have done a fairly good job, but the graduate problem has not yet been solved by a long ways.

MR. BRATZLER: An excellent suggestion. Is there anyone else?

MR. BRADY: There was some discussion on those carcass evaluation committees. I think it might be of some value to the folks to know what we had in mind there.

MR. BRATZLER: We set up one carcass evaluation committee for each kind of meat, particularly in relationship to the other regional groups that are working on these various projects. Rather than to call the committee a Beef Liaison Committee we called it a Beef Carcass Evaluation Committee. The same thing holds true for pork and lamb. It is very conceivable if prepackaging gets under way we may have to add another committee or discard those three and put another one in their place.

Does that cover it, Dan?

MR. BRADY: Well, I think it was the thinking, too, that we are not all familiar with what the present carcass evaluation standards are, if there are any differences of opinion. For instance a good deal of the work of the U.S.D.A. I believe that Ken said last night that the beef one has not been published, but I presume they would participate and try to get this information out for a lot of us folks who do not know as much as we should about it.

MR. BRATZLER: What do you gentlemen think of the proposed setup?

MR. BULL: I move that it be approved with the provision that teaching be restricted to graduate teaching.

MR. BRATZLER: You have heard the motion. Is there a second?

MR. KLINE: I will second the motion.

MR. BRATZLER: Seconded by Professor Kline. Discussion?

MR. BUTLER: I believe that perhaps we have not reached the millenium on this undergraduate teaching as yet. There are several other courses that we have thought about putting in, such as sausage making, canning courses, and courses of that nature. I still believe that there is room for improvement in undergraduate teaching. I would rather see that the committee has enough freedom to work on the undergraduate curriculum also.

MR. BRATZLER: Is there further discussion?

MR. HALE: I like Mr. Butler's suggestion. If you leave it open it cannot do any harm. You are not going to change your courses. They will just bring in suggestions for you to do what you want with them. So I say let us give them all the freedom they need.

MR. BRADY: The idea is that these are going to be working committees and they are going to bring in reports.

MR. BRATZLER: You have heard the motion which is to adopt the organizational setup with the exception that the Teaching Committee shall be limited to graduate teaching. All those in favor of the motion as stated signifying by saying "aye"; those opposed the same sign.

MR. WARNER: I should like to make a motion that the setup as outlined on the blackboard be adopted.

MR. FRANCIONI, JR.: I will second the motion.

MR. BRATZLER: Is there discussion? All those in favor of the motion make it known by saying "aye"; opposed the same sign. The motion is carried.

Next will be the resolutions. I will read the first resolution:

The members of the Third Reciprocal Meat Conference want to express their great appreciation to Mr. Thomas E. Wilson and other members of Wilson and Company for providing the facilities and carcasses for the Meat Grading Clinic.

The members as a group, and also individually, feel that the opportunity to work together on beef and lamb grading should help materially to improve the instruction at all represented institutions

Submitted by the Resolutions and Executive Committee -

D. E. Brady
L. J. Bratzler
R. W. Bray
O. D. Butler
K. F. Warner

MR. FARWELL: I move the adoption of this resolution.

MR. ANDERSON: I second the motion.

MR. BRATZLER: All those in favor signify by saying "aye"; opposed. Unanimously carried.

The second resolution:

"United States Government grades of Beef have been a distinct help to the entire livestock and meat industry. They have provided a common standard and language for comparing both cattle and beef. They have been used advantageously by producers, distributors, retailers and consumers. Research workers in breeding, feeding, management and meat processing use these grades consistently and constructively. Their results and recommendations are often reported on a grade basis.

"We are in accord with your announced desire to separate the cows in the present commercial grade from the young steers and heifers. Combining them into one grade has always seemed a mistake. To do this, however, we hope it will not be necessary to change the established meaning and significance of the grade names good, choice and prime. It has taken over twenty years to teach the meaning of these grade names and to fit them into the daily routine of the feed yard, market, retailer counter, and the home. We hope there is a better way to remedy the original mistake than to compound it by destroying the meaning of the three top beef grade names. We urge a further consideration of the possibilities."

MR. MARGERUM, JR.: In referring to the sentence, "We hope it will not be necessary to change the grade names prime, choice and good," I personally do not see any objection to going on record as being definitely opposed to the changing of those names or the standards for those grade names.

MR. BRATZLER: In other words, we hope to get this smoothed up so it will not be necessary.

MR. MARGERUM, JR.: No, we are opposed to changes in the grade names prime, choice and good. I don't recall the sentence exactly.

MR. BRATZLER: "We hope it will not be necessary . . ." You want to say that we are opposed to changing it?

MR. MARGERUM, JR.: Right.

MR. BRATZLER: I think that is one part here that would very well bear considerable discussion.

MR. HECK: I should like to discuss that. Who are we representing that we have the authority to make such a statement? In other words, I come from a state similar to Butler's. It is an area where they raise cattle on grass, and I certainly don't want to get up and make the statement here that I am representing the cattle men of the State of Arkansas.

As far as the college is concerned, I don't know whether I have the authority to make the statement that we oppose this. I should like to have the history of the whole thing, to make it a little more understandable or to clarify it a little, where it started, why it started, who started it, and so on, if some one is able to give it to me.

MR. BRATZLER: I am not able.

MR. MACKINTOSH: The resolution is coming from a group that I presume represents a research body, a body of research workers, and here we are not speaking for the cattlemen's associations of our states. We are speaking as a group of research workers.

MR. BRADY: Mr. Chairman, there is only one thought that I should like to interject. There are some differences of opinion. If we can compromise so that we have more or less the unanimous opinion of this group I think there would be certain advantages. Even though three-fourths of the group might feel very definitely as Mr. Margerum does, I think there might be some advantage to compromising. Maybe not.

MR. MARGERUM, JR.: May I ask the men from the grass states if they would be expecting their grass fed cattle to jump into the choice grade.

MR. HECK: No. But they could jump into the good grade.

MR. MARGERUM, JR.: Could we say that we are definitely opposed to the prime and choice changes and modify the other a little?

MR. HECK: Right.

MR. BUTLER: I can definitely say this: My boss has written a letter to Harry Reed approving this and I am not going to vote any other way from what he has already stated to be the feeling of the Animal Husbandry Department of Texas A. and M. College.

MR. BULL: The question is not a matter of whether grass cattle shall be graded good or commercial. If grass cattle are good enough to be good by our present standards, well and good, but this is a free and democratic country, and the public has been invited to submit its views on this matter to Mr. Reed and I see no reason we as a group of investigators should not do it.

Several cattle associations have sent in their resolutions on the matter, some of them from the grass states. Some from the grass states are opposed to the new system; some others are for the new system. The cornbelt feeders naturally are against the change.

MR. FARWELL: Let's clear up that one point as to the grammar. Davie says that all you have to do is to inject the subject into the sentence again.

MR. BRATZLER: "Combining them into one grade has always seemed a mistake." Suppose Mr. Farwell and Mr. Mackintosh copy these sentences down. "Combining them into one grade has always seemed a mistake. To do this, however, we hope it will not be necessary to change the established meaning and significance of the grade names good, choice and prime."

While they are working on that, are there any other suggestions?

MR. PIERCE: It seems to me that the discussion centers around two groups, those opposed and those opposed with certain reservations. I think I am the only one that it applies to. It happens that the Missouri River divides the state in halves. The eastern half of the state are closely tied in with the corn belt area, and they have a lot of pretty good size cattle feeders. The western half of the state is strictly range country.

I do not think that we as individuals, even though we have our own personal opinions are at liberty to express them as we should like to in a meeting such as this, because we are representing institutions which is something much larger than we are ourselves. I think we should have a vote of those who are opposed and of those who are willing to adopt the resolution the way it was originally given.

MR. POLLOCK: Mr. Bratzler, I am not trying to influence the thinking of this group, but less than two weeks ago I was asked, "Can you get those fellows to go on record in favor of our recommendations?" The recommendations were those of a group of about 126 cattlemen, meat packers, and market men meeting in the South Ballroom of this hotel.

Another person who knew that this conference was to be held called me. He is a cattleman and an officer of a Cattle Feeders Association. He didn't tie it in with you men, but he asked, "Can you use your influence to get support for our viewpoint on this new meat grading proposal?"

This subject is highly controversial. The National Live Stock and Meat Board as a Board will not even bring it up for discussion at our Annual Meeting. We will have an executive session Friday afternoon. I don't know where the idea originated for discussing the subject at this meeting as it is not listed on the agenda. I personally agree with many ideas which have been presented on this subject, but really, gentlemen, I honestly feel that it is out of line for you to take action on such a controversial subject.

MR. BULL: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree. I as an individual have a right to speak my piece and I expect to speak it. I can sympathize with the fellows from the grass country and I can sympathize with the National Live Stock and Meat Board; therefore I suggest that you start the resolution, "We, the undersigned teachers and researchers of meat," etc. Then those of us who wish to do so can sign it, and those who do not want to sign it will not do so. We can sign a paper and you can attach it to the typed copy of the resolution.

MR. BRATZLER: "We, the undersigned."

MR. BULL: "teachers and researchers in meats."

MR. BRATZLER: Is there any more discussion?

MR. KERR: Mr. Chairman, if you are going that far, I realize the committee have gone to a lot of work in trying to prepare a resolution but I would almost rather see you drop it completely, and as representatives of our particular institutions or in our particular fields we could accomplish as much as this suggestion might accomplish.

MR. MACKINTISH: Mr. Chairman, I rather differ with that because I think as a group we carry very much more weight and will receive very much more consideration than 30 or 40 individual letters. Undoubtedly many of us have already written.

MR. ZIEGLER: Mr. Chairman, I have the feeling that we are doing a certain organization an injustice; therefore I move that we drop this matter.

MR. HECK: Second.

MR. BRATZLER: You have heard the motion, seconded by Mr. Heck. Is there discussion. Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of the motion to drop the resolution from consideration by this group signify by saying "aye"; opposed. We will call for another vote by a show of hands.

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, I was strong for it. I wrote the resolution on which you have improved the grammar. I am already on record with Harry Reed, but I think Ziegler's point is well taken if we would compromise Mr. Pollock and his organization. I don't think we would, but if that is his judgment I accept it. I will vote to drop it.

MR. BRATZLER: I think we still have to decide what the vote is.

MR. FARWELL: I rise to a point of order. I don't think we have to vote on a motion to drop it. I think if Ken made the resolution he can ask that it be dropped, and he can withdraw his own resolution.

MR. ZIEGLER: You asked for a vote. Get a hand vote.

MR. BRATZLER: All those in favor of the motion to drop the resolution signify by raising their right hands. (25) All those opposed to the motion, in other words, want the resolution to be considered by this group raise their right hands. (14) The resolution as such has been formally dropped by your vote.

Resolution number 3.

"The men attending and participating in The Third Reciprocal Meat Conference wish to express their appreciation to The National Live Stock and Meat Board for the time and effort expended, and for the interest and hospitality extended to the group in making this Conference an unqualified success. Without the able guidance and leadership of R. C. Pollock, W. H. Tomhave, and G. A. McDonald, the accomplishments of this Conference would have been seriously curtailed."

MR. FRANCIONI, JR.: I move its adoption.

MR. ANDERSON: I second the motion.

MR. BRATZLER: Moved by Mr. Francioni; seconded by Mr. Anderson. All those in favor make it known by saying "aye." Unanimously carried.

The fourth resolution:

Resolution No. 4 Resolution to the Deans and Directors.

The members of the Reciprocal Meat Conference wish to express to the Deans and Directors of the Colleges of Agriculture their sincere appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the Third Annual Reciprocal Meat Conference sponsored by the National Livestock and Meat Board. In attendance at this Conference were 54 workers from 30 colleges, including the Ontario Agricultural College and the United States Department of Agriculture.

At this Conference the group set up an informal organization and appointed nine working committees to attack specific problems. Three of the committees will function in summarizing the best procedures available for standardized evaluation of the carcasses of Animal Husbandry research. A review committee is to abstract the research reports published since Volume 5 of the Meats Abstracts was completed. Teaching, Extension, and Research Methods Committees have also been given specific assignments.

The members attending this Conference are grateful for the opportunity to work together, exchange ideas, and consult on their future plans.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

D. E. Brady
L. J. Bratzler
R. W. Bray
O. D. Butler
K. F. Warner

MR. BRADY: I move the adoption of this Resolution.

MR. BUTLER: I second the motion.

MR. BRATZLER: Moved by Mr. Brady; seconded by Mr. Butler. All those in favor make it known by saying "aye." Unanimously carried.

MR. LOEFFEL: Just what is included under Research Review? Is it a revival of the old Meat Review Committee or something of the sort?

MR. BRATZLER: Whether it will be that detailed or not has to be worked out, but we should like to have more or less a continuation of it. I don't think the Biological Abstracts are getting nearly all of them, according to the ones that come across my desk, and particularly for the benefit of the younger men, I think we should continue it. Maybe we can work out some way to spread the burden around a little more. We will come to you for a lot of suggestions on that score, Professor Loeffel.

Is there any further business to come before the group? If there is no further business, I should like to turn the meeting back to our Chairman, Mr. Tomhave.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: I am sure that the meeting would not be properly concluded without a word from our genial General Manager, Mr. Pollock, who was good enough to come over and welcome you yesterday morning, and I am sure we should all like to hear from him before we adjourn. He has not been able to attend all of the sessions, but I know that he is vitally interested in this organization. Mr. Pollock, won't you say a few words?

MR. POLLOCK: You men are the ones who can evaluate these conferences as to whether they are worth-while. I attempted to get two

Deans to come in and sit through this conference and take reports back to the Deans and Directors of our Land-Grant Colleges. Dean Rusk at first accepted the invitation and then he called me up a few days later and said, "Mr. Pollock, I did not scrutinize my calendar close enough when I promised you," and he suggested two other Deans. I knew that one of them could not come but I contacted the second one. We were a little late and it was impossible for him to attend. I wanted one Dean, at least, to sit through this conference and make his own observations first hand as to what he thinks of the conference.

We are indebted to these Deans. Not one Dean hesitated in supporting this conference. I know the problems that you have been up against. It has meant travel out of the state for which funds are not always available.

In the future we will follow the procedure that we have in the past. The reports on this conference will go directly to your Deans and that is where you will get them.

I suspect Mr. McDonald has mentioned this. The idea of honoring some men at six-thirty tonight was not set up by the Program Committee. There are a number of you men who have been in this work for twenty-five years or longer. We are not recognizing you necessarily because of the time that you have put in but because of the service that you have rendered to the livestock and meat industry and to the one hundred and fifty million people in the United States. I hope that we have not missed anyone.

Mr. Snyder could not be here and Mr. Oliver could not be here, but the nine men who are here we should like to have assemble in this room tonight with the Directors of the National Live Stock and Meat Board and go in with them after everybody is seated in the banquet room. That room will seat 317 people and it just so happens that there are 317 reservations. We want the livestock men who are coming in here from thirty-four states to see the men who are carrying on this necessary and valuable work in the various institutions.

I am glad to see that you have taken action in setting up your 1950-51 committees.

I think the subject of research is something that we want to get into in more detail in the future and advance as far as we possibly can along that line.

I sat here and listened to the program yesterday and I thought about the program three years ago. It was very gratifying, indeed, to see the progress that we are making in these conferences. But we really have not started. We have not scratched the surface. I am glad to know that you are going to give most of your attention to teaching and research next year, and I should like to see you go just as far as you possibly can along the lines of research. Research is a popular subject. The National Live Stock and Meat Board, incorporated research in its program twenty-seven years ago. We have done everything that was set up in the program along the line of research. We are going to continue along that line in the future.

The Board is glad to cooperate with you. However, we do not want to have any part in directing your policies.

It has been a grand meeting, and next year we will be glad to cooperate with you and give you every assistance possible, with your program. As I have mentioned in the past, the National Live Stock and Meat Board is interested in Meat Research, Teaching, Extension, Education and all related programs and activities for the good of the overall livestock and meat industry.

There are two men here whom I should like to introduce at this time. Mr. Pickett, who is Secretary of the Kansas Livestock Association and a member of the Board of Directors of the National Live Stock and Meat Board from Topeka, Kansas, is here. I should like to have him take a bow.

MR. PICKETT: Mr. Pollock and Mr. Chairman: I do not have anything to say. It is my first trip here, and I am glad to get acquainted with you. I will reserve my speech for later. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: Thank you very much, Mr. Pickett. I believe that Mr. Warner has a guest whom he would like to introduce at this time.

MR. WARNER: Gentlemen, it is a rare privilege to introduce my own boss, Dr. Birley -- Ted Birley -- who used to be in charge of the Poultry Section in the Bureau of Animal Industry, a poultry man who was promoted to livestock and made good. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: We would like to have a word from you?

DR. BIRLEY: My mouth is full of words, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry I could not be here these past two days and learn more about your subject. I think I know something about it because we have been ably represented here by Messrs. Hankins, Sulzbacher and Warner. I have learned that they have done a good job. The Department of Agriculture is rather proud of their contributions to meat research. We are prepared to do a great deal more in meat research than we have ever done before. I think that is all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN TOMHAVE: As Chairman of your Third Reciprocal Meat Conference I want to say it has been a pleasure to again serve in that capacity. I consider it a rare privilege to be able to associate with this fine group who are engaged in meat instruction and meat research in colleges. You are doing a grand job, not that you do not have many difficulties to overcome but I know that you are making progress in your institutions. You are making progress in educating the men and women in this country to know more about the most essential food product that we have today.

I just want to say in closing, that I wish you the utmost success during 1950 and during all the years to come. Unless there is further business, the meeting is adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 5:15 o'clock.)

# # #