

ved at cost to the school children of Gary. In addition to domestic science, they are taught sewing and millinery.

The children of Gary have many advantages that children living in other cities have not, yet the cost of education in Gary is less than that of any city of the same size in the United States.

The Gary plan has proved so practicable in the two schools of New York, where it was tried, that Comptroller Pendergast has committed the board of education to the new system of school administration and expects to save the

school board \$4,000,000 during the year of 1916.

Taking these facts into consideration, it is evident that the Gary Schools are the most scientific, the most economical yet devised. To many teachers who have visited them they have afforded a revelation of the wonderful possibilities for social service that lie within the grasp of our present school system, and as one prominent educationalist has said, "Our best wishes for Gary is that these new ideas and ideals may become as contagious as the measles and that all our schools may become infected with them."

WHY WE PROTECT OUR GAME AND INSECTIVOROUS BIRDS

By NORMAN CRIDDLE

There are two important reasons why we should protect our game and insectivorous birds. The first is that the former affords sport and recreation to many, as well as food. The second, that in most cases, the value of both is great on account of their destruction of noxious insects, in other words, if we wish to continue to derive pleasure and food from game birds, we must provide for their protection so that the supply is maintained. Similarly, in the case of insectivorous birds their preservation is necessary so that they may keep in check various insect pests which might otherwise increase to abnormal proportions and so destroy crops, trees, etc.

There is an idea, prevalent among some people, that the destruction of wild life can be continued indefinitely and that we have only to discontinue for a short time to enable the various kinds to regain their previous numbers. This, however, is a fallacy which it is well to guard against. As a matter of fact we have only to reduce any animal below a certain standard to provide for its total extinction. The reason for this being that all have their natural enemies, such as diseases and animals that prey upon them. Consequently if we destroy more than a certain percentage the nature enemies will find barely

sufficient in the remainder to live upon, and so the species becomes extinct. Who would have imagined, for instance, that the passenger pigeon could ever become exterminated? A bird that was so numerous as to almost darken the sky as the countless individuals flew by, yet of the millions that existed 40 years ago not one remains. It should be clearly understood, however, that though mankind was responsible for this extermination through the greedy slaughter of nestlings, the final art of extinction was brought about by the pigeon's natural enemies, which having but a remnant to attack made escape impossible. This is why it is so very necessary to maintain a reasonable number of birds if we desire to perpetuate the species, and to see that we do not reduce any kind too far, otherwise we may suddenly discover that protection is no longer of avail and that we have destroyed something which we are unable to replace, thus committing a crime against all posterity.

In a certain wood lot near my home there reside several ruffed grouse (partridges). They have a free run there and are not molested at any time by hunters. As is the case with nearly all birds, constant association with man has greatly reduced their fear, so that