

SECOND ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION
ON MATTERS PERTAINING TO RACING

HELD BY
THE JOCKEY CLUB
IN THE
PRESIDENT'S ROOM
OF
THE SARATOGA ASSOCIATION
SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 22, 1954

PARTICIPANTS:

Breeders ALEX BOWER
HOWARD M. REINEMAN

Jockeys EDWARD ARCARO
HEDLEY WOODHOUSE

Officials FRANCIS P. DUNNE
FRANK E. KILROE

Owners IRVING GUSHEN
ALFRED G. VANDERBILT

Publicity Representative ROBERT F. KELLEY

Representatives of Tracks SPENCER DRAYTON
EDWARD KILROE
LUKE O'BRIEN
ALEX M. ROBB

Trainers HIRSCH JACOBS
W. C. WINFREY

Turf Writers BOB HORWOOD
BILL LAUDER, JR.
PAT LYNCH

Veterinarians DR. J. G. CATLETT
DR. JORDAN WOODCOCK

The Jockey Club OGDEN PHIPPS

Moderator: MARSHALL CASSIDY

Guests CARLETON BURKE
Director of Racing, Santa Anita Park
CALVIN RAINEY
Steward, Delaware Park and Hialeah Park

INDEX TO TOPICS

	PAGE
Blacksmiths, training of apprentices	39
Claiming races, special—for horses bred by owner or bought as yearlings	13
Fogging of stable and paddock areas daily	59
Holding barn—to obtain saliva and urine samples	61
Hypodermic needle, possession	9
Isolation barn for horses with contagious diseases	61
Jockeys' engagements, juggling by agents	43
Jockeys, naming at time of entry and no change thereafter	28
Medicines—whether should be kept on hand in barns	62
Nerving and alcohol block rule	10
Newspaper owners and editors—awareness of racing as leading spectator sport	21
New York tracks—modernization of plants	48
Plastic goggles for horses	51
Purse distribution—percentage allocated to stakes	53
Saratoga Springs—how to assure the continuance of racing upstate	15
Shoes, frequent changing for turf and soil	37
Shoes, limit on type in turf races	37
Shoes with toes—cause of unsoundness	35
Smoking in barn area—enforcement of prohibition	51
Stake engagements—to go with claimed horse	46
Stallion contracts	58
Suspension of owner or trainer for unpaid bills	49
Television—film patrol projection in press box	32
Trainers—qualifying nationally	45
Veterinarians—private practice	7
Whipping horse over head when running out	50
Winner's circle—limit to number of people permitted to enter	31

INTRODUCTION BY
MR. OGDEN PHIPPS

Mr. Widener has been detained abroad and has asked me to express his disappointment in not being able to welcome you to this, The Jockey Club's second round-table conference. We believe the entire racing industry profits by such frank discussions. We are not gathered here to make rules or regulations. Our purpose is to acquaint each other with our problems in order that we may discuss their effects on all groups. Questions which have been sent in will be presented without indication of origin. It will prevent confusion if each person wishing to speak will secure permission by raising his hand. We have a great many questions. We don't want to shorten in any way the discussion on any one of them, but I think we don't want to have any one drag on. We want the views of everybody on all of them.

Marshall Cassidy will present the questions and explain them if they need explanation, and then we will hear from all of you experts.

QUESTION No. 1. "SHOULD VETERINARIANS SERVING IN OFFICIAL CAPACITIES ON THE RACE TRACKS BE PERMITTED TO DO PRIVATE PRACTICE ON THOROUGHBREDS DURING THE RACING SEASON?" The second part of the question is, "DURING THE OFF SEASON?"

MR. CASSIDY: There's quite a difference between during the racing season and during the off season. In New York we have 200 days of racing and the official veterinarian can be presumed to earn a fair salary during that time. This does not apply to practice on small animals or draft animals or any animals outside of racing Thoroughbreds. Dr. Catlett, you have worked a long time as a veterinarian, suppose you tell us what your opinion is. I know you don't do private practice.

DR. CATLETT: The first part of the question, regarding practicing during the racing season, I definitely think they should not, because I don't think anyone can serve two masters. A veterinarian treating an animal and then examining him for a pre-race I think would be in an embarrassing position. However, I do believe that he should be permitted to do so in the off-season, because it is quite a problem to get veterinarians familiar enough with the Thoroughbred horse to be qualified to do pre-race examinations. I don't think you can expect a man who is working a short season, a 30 or 40 day meeting, to give up private practice the entire year. Also, working during the off season better qualifies him to do pre-race examinations and makes him familiar with various conditions.

MR. CASSIDY: This has nothing to do with emergency treatment, does it?

DR. CATLETT: That's correct.

MR. CASSIDY: You would approve of any veterinarian working in an official capacity, taking emergency care of any horse?

DR. CATLETT: I think we should. We have to do that emergency work at times.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think that it is necessary any time a veterinarian has done an emergency job on a horse, for that veterinarian to follow it up?

DR. CATLETT: I think it is better for practitioners to do it after the emergency treatment.

MR. PHIPPS: The emergency work would be free of charge?

DR. CATLETT: Yes, definitely.

MR. CASSIDY: Dr. Woodcock?

DR. WOODCOCK: I agree with Dr. Catlett in that I believe that a veterinarian should not practice on the race track during the season. However, even though we do have some 200 days of racing in New York, I, for one, find it difficult to build the entire year on the salary I get as veterinarian for the New York State Racing Commission, so that I have a practice. I practice on hunters, jumpers, and show horses up in Westchester County. I have never practiced on the race track. The way the rule is worded insofar as practicing on Thoroughbred horses is concerned, I have violated the rule because there are many Thoroughbred horses among hunters and jumpers. I think it could be changed so that no veterinarian working for the association or commission be allowed to practice on the race track, or at the race course, or words to that effect, rather than not be allowed to practice on Thoroughbred horses.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think it is proper for a veterinarian who is working in an official capacity at the race track to maintain a farm during the racing season, to which he takes horses for rest or treatment?

DR. WOODCOCK: No sir. I don't believe that would be proper, because those horses are actually involved in the act of racing, except for the time they are at the farms. They are there probably recuperating or having various things done to them to bring them back to the races. I think there is a distinct difference. I think however, if there is a farm in this veterinarian's area, where he has been practicing for

years, if it's a breeding farm, I don't see why he shouldn't be allowed to do obstetrical work and broodmare work.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think that if a veterinarian has a farm or is connected with a farm, he should be permitted to solicit work for the farm, for horses to be wintered there?

DR. WOODCOCK: Well, in the first place I don't believe the veterinarian would do the soliciting. If there is such a farm in that veterinarian's established area for practicing, and he is called upon to do work on horses during the off season, I believe he should have the right to do that.

MR. CASSIDY: How about owning a farm?

DR. WOODCOCK: I think that's a little bit different. Because if he owns the farm, then he will do the soliciting and he is no longer working as a salaried man.

MR. CASSIDY: Hirsch, what do you think about it?

MR. JACOBS: I agree with it.

MR. CASSIDY: Bill?

MR. WINFREY: Well, I don't have much opinion on it. I agree with all I've heard. Off season it seems to me that they should be allowed to practice, to take up the slack in the wintertime.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Dunne?

MR. DUNNE: I agree with what they've said. I don't see how you can work six months and then you sit around six months. They'd probably be better veterinarians if they practiced on horses in the wintertime than if they were practicing on rabbits.

MR. GUSHEN: I agree with both the doctors. But there's a question in my mind as to whether or not there are enough qualified veterinarians to be able to separate the two. If there are, I should like an answer to something in my own mind as to why, in my travels throughout the country, I see so many sore-legged horses go to the post. Either the veterinarians who work for the commissions or racing associations are not qualified, or, if they hold both jobs, they overlook a horse that's not fit to go to the post. I'm sure a lot of us who have seen lots of races throughout the country can testify to the fact that there are too many sore and lame horses going to the post. That's definitely something we should try to correct. I don't have any solution to the problem, but there's a question in my mind as to whether there are enough good, qualified veterinarians to be able to serve both, in order to be able to separate them.

DR. CATLETT: It is very difficult to get veterinarians who are qualified because veterinarians today do not have the opportunity to work on Thoroughbreds, or horses of any kind, as a matter of fact. However, I do think, as you will find in every line of work, you have some men better qualified than others. As far as sore horses going to the post is concerned, I don't take issue with you on that. It's true, there's no question about it.

MR. GUSHEN: I brought this up for one reason, I was just wondering if there aren't a sufficient number of qualified veterinarians to be able to serve as veterinarians for the association and decide between horses that should or should not go to the post. Which is the lesser of the two evils? Whether or not to have good qualified veterinarians serve in both capacities, or whether to allow it to continue the other way? That's the only reason that I brought it up, which is the lesser of the two evils? It may be that if you can't get a sufficient number of good veterinarians to judge a horse before a race, then it might be to the best interests of all to allow them to serve in both capacities, because we've got to have people who know their business.

MR. CASSIDY: I think the question has shifted a little bit, Irving. The question of whether there are enough veterinarians to serve in an official capacity isn't quite

the problem, nor whether there are enough practicing veterinarians. How many veterinarians work in New York?

DR. CATLETT: About six practicing veterinarians.

MR. CASSIDY: Is there more work than those six can take care of?

DR. CATLETT: I think it is well taken care of.

QUESTION No. 2. "DOES A HORSEMAN NEED A HYPODERMIC NEEDLE IN HIS POSSESSION OR ON THE GROUNDS OF A RACE TRACK AT ANY TIME OTHER THAN WHEN ITS USAGE IS PRESCRIBED BY A VETERINARIAN FOR A PARTICULAR HORSE?"

MR. CASSIDY: I have been under the impression for some time that there's no prohibition against the possession of hypodermics in the State of New York. I'm sure that's wrong. I think that in the last six months or a year, the law has been changed back again to what it was probably ten years ago, whereby a person who has a hypodermic syringe must have a prescription for it or have the doctor secure it for him. Do you know whether that's true? Mr. Drayton?

MR. DRAYTON: I know in a number of states it's true, but I don't know if it's true in New York or not.

MR. CASSIDY: The head of the State Bureau of Narcotics was here the other day and we had a discussion regarding marijuana. I asked him at that time if there was a law prohibiting the ownership or possession of a hypodermic and he explained it as I have just reported it. We have presently a rule which permits a person to use a hypodermic providing he has a prescription for a specific case, which should adequately cover liability in respect to the narcotic law. But a man who has a hypodermic which is no longer needed, frequently keeps it. And if it is found in his stable, he would be subject to arrest, I presume.

MR. DUNNE: It might be a city ordinance.

MR. CASSIDY: No, I think this is state. Do you know anything about it, Doctor?

DR. CATLETT: I know definitely there is a city ordinance, the City of New York, which prohibits the possession of a hypodermic syringe without a doctor's prescription. As far as the state is concerned, I'm not sure, but I think so.

MR. CASSIDY: I think this question was submitted primarily to determine whether it is necessary for a horseman to have it to use or whether a horseman, when he has a horse that needs treatment by hypodermic injection, should have a veterinarian attend him. That of course would be nice for the veterinarians. Every time a horse would need an injection, you'd have to pay the veterinarian's fee for it. Does anybody have any knowledge on that?

MR. GUSHEN: I know in the State of Massachusetts there is a state law that forbids anybody to have a hypodermic in his possession. We had a case not long ago where a man, a trainer, was caught speeding I think. Anyway, he got fresh with the policeman, and they searched his car and found a hypodermic needle. They asked him what he was doing, and so forth, and he told them what it was, and they reported it to the Massachusetts State Racing Commission.

MR. CASSIDY: What did they do?

MR. GUSHEN: They were going to suspend this trainer for possession, but this fellow had purchased this needle in New Orleans and out there I think you can buy a needle without a prescription or anything. You can buy it in a drug store. And he got a certificate from a doctor in New Orleans to the effect his wife was sick, or something, and she had to have treatments for some kind of disease she had, and the thing was straightened out. But there's definitely a state law in Massachusetts.

DR. CATLETT: I believe having hypodermic needles around the stable is one

of the greatest means of transmitting disease that you can possibly have. I think stable personnel should be thoroughly taught the proper technique for using it. It is dangerous. I think one of our greatest epidemics was caused or certainly aggravated by the careless use of hypodermics. Therefore if the veterinarian does prescribe it for a particular horse, I think the equipment should be returned as soon as it is no longer needed.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Winfrey, in respect to having a hypodermic, can you think of an emergency that would occur where it would be a distinct advantage to have a hypodermic available?

MR. WINFREY: The way it is set up around New York, I think any emergency can be covered by a veterinarian. There are several whom we can call upon and we can easily get one within an hour. I think as Dr. Catlett says, the careless use of them can do an awful lot of harm as far as epidemics go. I have had no experience using them, and I wait for the veterinarian, myself. I don't believe an emergency would arise that couldn't be treated by a veterinarian.

MR. JACOBS: I don't think one should be allowed in the barn. It is dangerous to have around. You don't know who might use it. The help might use it on a horse, or something, you can't tell, to stimulate a horse.

DR. WOODCOCK: I can't at the moment think of any emergency which may arise for a horse that could be treated by a trainer or anyone other than a qualified veterinarian which would require the use of a hypodermic needle, anyway. If it is necessary that a drug be administered by hypodermic, then it should be administered by a veterinarian in the case of emergency. Probably the reason the question was submitted was the use of various injectable hormones and vitamins. Therein lies the big question as to whether or not hypodermic needles should be allowed to be around the stable area. The trainer sees the veterinarian come in two or three times a week and give an injection of concentrated vitamins for a horse and he wonders to himself, "Why do I have to pay this practicing veterinarian. If he would just let me have the needle here I could do it just as well." I think that was probably the reason the question was submitted and not that of an emergency. I believe that it should not be allowed in the stable area.

MR. CASSIDY: On a farm, Mr. Reineman, do you have any knowledge as to whether they are used or needed?

MR. REINEMAN: Of course on our particular farm we have a veterinarian. But before we did employ a veterinarian, we always had one from town do the work.

MR. BOWER: In the case of emergency at foaling time, I think when it is necessary to open a mare, it's advisable to have the needle there to anesthetize so you can make that incision and let the foal come out. I've heard some veterinarians go so far as to say that they will provide the equipment to have on hand for use at such a time.

MR. CASSIDY: I think that purpose is foreign to the question, anyway.

MR. REINEMAN: We never, to my knowledge, have had occasion to use any deadening effect. We just cut the mare and she usually has her mind on something else and doesn't pay too much attention to it.

QUESTION No. 3. "SHOULD ANY CHANGES BE MADE IN THE PRESENT NEW YORK REGULATION REGARDING NERVING OR BLOCKING?"

MR. CASSIDY: I'm not sure that you all know the rule. I will read it to you. "Any horse whose median, volar or plantar nerves have been either injected or removed shall not be permitted to race on any of the New York tracks. Any horse which has been either nerved or blocked below the fetlock (digital nerves) may be permitted to start, providing such nerving or blocking has been reported by the trainer prior to entering the horse in a race." I think the reason for this question is

to determine how it has been working and I think our veterinarians can probably tell us best. Once again, Dr. Catlett?

DR. CATLETT: I think the nerving rule we have now, the one you just read, is very satisfactory.

DR. WOODCOCK: I agree.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think that horses which are reported as having been nerved, a digital nerving job, or blocking, should be posted so that people would have knowledge of it if they wanted to claim a horse or something like that? Or should that be private information?

DR. WOODCOCK: No, I don't think that it should necessarily be posted, in that respect. I believe the person in charge, such as Dr. Catlett in the Horse Identification Department, and the veterinarians who do the pre-race examination, if they are informed I think that's sufficient. If we race under that particular rule, I think perhaps what you have in mind is whether a horse is claimed and the person claiming the horse may come back and say he didn't know the horse was nerved. Well, if he's racing here in New York and he claims a horse, under that particular rule I see no reason for him to have any comeback.

MR. CASSIDY: Suppose a man wanted to claim a horse, and he wanted to know whether that horse had been nerved or had been reported to have been nerved do you think if he went to the authorities and asked them, that they should tell him whether the horse had been nerved?

DR. WOODCOCK: If he's a legitimate owner or trainer in the State of New York, I believe that if he went to the stewards and asked whether a horse was nerved the stewards should then tell him, "Yes" or "No."

MR. LAUDER: How many nerved horses are running in New York?

DR. CATLETT: That hasn't been definitely established as to just how many, but I would say less than 5%. That's a rough guess but I'm sure it's nearly right.

MR. GUSHEN: I'd have to disagree with the doctor when he says that any legitimate owner in New York, if he wanted to claim a horse and wants to get some information, should have the opportunity of going to the stewards and the stewards should tell him whether or not a horse has been nerved or anything. I think that's entirely out of reason, because by the same token if they're going to tell him that a horse is nerved or blocked they could go to the stewards and ask if a horse has a bad knee or bad shoulder because that information would also be in the possession of the veterinarians and the veterinarians can report it. I don't think that that information should be given to anybody. First of all, you take all the fun out of claiming horses. If anybody would know what they were doing, then you'd have happy horsemen and happy horsemen are no good for the game.

(*Laughter*)

MR. JACOBS: I believe under the rule in Maryland, the veterinarian examines them and they post it on a board. They have a list in the office of each meeting there of the horses that are nerved. But I think the rule in New York where you're allowed the low nerving is the best rule. You're a little safer with it.

MR. CASSIDY: What do you think about the posting of it?

MR. JACOBS: I think it's all right. I don't think there's any harm to it. I don't think it would be very good though to have a man maybe run to the stewards every race to find out if a horse has been nerved.

MR. DUNNE: I agree with Mr. Jacobs here. I don't see why you shouldn't put up a list of the horses that are nerved. If anyone wants to look at it, he can look at it.

MR. JACOBS: In the first place, they won't allow a horse, even if he is nerved, and if he's sore, to run anyhow. He's still got to be sound. And getting on to another point there, you said about blocking, I don't believe a horse is allowed to run if they know he's blocked.

MR. CASSIDY: Yes, in the same area.

MR. JACOBS: That's a new one on me.

MR. CASSIDY: Did you hear the rule I read? "Any horse that has been either nerved or blocked below the fetlock may be permitted to start, providing such nerving or blocking has been reported by the trainer prior to entering the horse in a race."

DR. CATLETT: Mr. Cassidy, that's usually intended for horses that have been alcohol blocked or permanently blocked by neurectomy.

MR. CASSIDY: Is there any assurance that an alcohol block isn't permanent? Or semi-permanent?

DR. CATLETT: Not to my knowledge.

MR. JACOBS: There's another block you can use that will last twenty days.

DR. CATLETT: The New York rule concerns alcohol blocking.

MR. LAUDER: Knowing very little about the technical angle of blocking and what it will do to a horse, I was wondering, would it affect the horse so that it might affect the public's support of a horse? After all, the public is interested in what they are betting on, to a certain extent. Some of them might know a little bit about horses. Would this blocking have anything to do with the performance of the horse that might be interesting to or should be known by the bettors?

MR. CASSIDY: I don't think they should have any more need for that knowledge than they would as to whether the horse had a rheumatic condition. Certainly at times he's better than he is at other times. Or anything else that is of a physical nature. If it were something that would hurt him or stop him I think that might be something they should know.

MR. LAUDER: Wasn't the reason the rule was put in, and I vaguely remember it, because certain types of blocking or nerving would sometimes cause the horse eventually to lose control of the foot and break down? Now shouldn't a thing like that be posted for the public?

MR. CASSIDY: Well, we don't permit those horses to race, so there would be no reason for posting it.

MR. LAUDER: In other words, digital nerving or blocking is not the same type?

MR. CASSIDY: No, it is entirely different. That's probably what confused you.

MR. LAUDER: I was confused on that, I wasn't sure.

MR. CASSIDY: Blocking above the ankle completely deadens the foot, and all that area below the ankle.

MR. LAUDER: And that is not allowed in New York?

MR. CASSIDY: No. The other type, digital nerving or blocking, is not considered at all dangerous.

DR. CATLETT: I don't know, but I understand that in some places where they do post these things, that horses are nerved, it can be used both ways. A horse could be posted as having been nerved solely for the purpose of discouraging someone from claiming him.

MR. HORWOOD: Mr. Jacobs referred to that new block, I think it's generally called the thirty day block. Is that legal, or is it not? Does that come under the head of an alcohol block? I know it is being used, and I'm wondering.

MR. CASSIDY: It is, below the ankle.

MR. HORWOOD: The reason I ask is that you made a distinction between an alcohol block and a novocaine block.

MR. CASSIDY: Well, a novocaine block is not permitted. The rule didn't have the word "alcohol" in it here on this card but it has in our posted rule, as Dr. Catlett said.

MR. HORWOOD: What I'm trying to find out, is this thirty day block an alcohol block or what is it?

MR. CASSIDY: By a thirty day block you mean an alcohol block, don't you?

MR. JACOBS: I don't know what the name of it is. I don't believe they allow it around in New York.

DR. CATLETT: They've recently come out with other local anesthetics other than alcohol that do have a prolonged effect.

MR. CASSIDY: Would you consider that they are permitted under this rule?

DR. CATLETT: I don't think so.

MR. CASSIDY: How long would a block by novocaine be effective?

DR. CATLETT: Only a few hours. There are some other things used.

DR. WOODCOCK: There's a preparation called ephedrine which is naturally a derivative of the normal novocaine but it's put into a solution which prevents its being absorbed over a period of time. That period prolongs the action of the novocaine over the part. It's used in human medicine, particularly in muscular conditions, joint conditions, and so on, where they want to alleviate pain over a long period of time. It has been used in horses and it is, in my estimation, not the desired thing to have at the race track, but it is not an alcohol block. The use of the alcohol block has always been with the idea of having a complete interruption of impulses through the nerves the same way you would if you actually took a section from the nerve. But they were always able to get around the fact that the horse had not had a neurectomy performed on it. Now with this other thing it's a matter of just maybe 15 or 20 days at the most that the horse would be able to perform all right, then the nerve would gradually get its impulses back again and the horse would go back and be lame.

MR. CASSIDY: Would it be true that it would appear in the saliva or urine tests if a horse had been blocked with novocaine or ephedrine?

DR. WOODCOCK: That I can't answer.

MR. PHIPPS: Not if it had been done 20 days before.

DR. WOODCOCK: We've never done any experimentation with that. I don't know whether the action of the particular substance that this is dissolved in, which slows down the absorption of the novocaine, would allow enough of the novocaine to enter the blood stream and so forth so that there would be positives. The question can't be answered unless experiments are done.

MR. GUSHEN: Suppose you injected ephedrine into a sore horse 50 hours before race time. Would you have any knowledge as to whether that would show?

DR. WOODCOCK: Not the slightest.

QUESTION No. 4. "SHOULD A DISTINCTION BE MADE IN CLAIMING RACES FOR AN OWNER STARTING A HORSE WHICH HE HAS BRED OR BOUGHT AS A YEARLING?"

MR. CASSIDY: This probably has reference to a rule in our rule book permitting the racing secretary to write races for two-year-olds, which to all intents and purposes is under a closed claiming rule. The conditions of the race are that the man must have either bred him or bought him during his yearling period. It makes a separate classification whereas other people with two-year-olds have to run in a more or less open race. What do you think about it, Mr. Vanderbilt?

MR. VANDERBILT: I don't think you should have one rule for one fellow and another for somebody else. I don't believe the solution to the problem for the fellow who breeds or buys yearlings and whose horse may be claimed is by giving him more protection in a claiming race than the fellow who gets his horse later on. I think if there is need for such protection it should be up to the ingenuity of the racing secretary to write some kind of a race which gives this fellow a chance to win a race with his horse without jeopardizing him. I think the other would work a hardship on the

fellow who bought his horse as a two-year-old. He may have taken a greater gamble when he bought his horses than the fellow who bought them as yearlings.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Kilroe, what do you think?

MR. F. KILROE: Any form of closed claiming is something I know only by hearsay, because we've never had it in New York in my experience but from everything I've heard about it, I think it's bad. The logical thing would be that the horse running in that type race could only be claimed by another man running a horse in the race, which is the only protection you could give him in a claiming race. In that way, you'd have a lot of so-called policemen entering a race where they have no particular chance, just to make the owner eligible to claim someone else's horse out of it. I agree with Mr. Vanderbilt. Possibly we could write a race for two-year-olds which have been the continuous property of an owner since they were yearlings.

MR. JACOBS: I don't think it would be wise to change, anyway.

MR. CASSIDY: It isn't a change. It's a question of whether it's a good thing.

MR. WINFREY: I think the racing secretary would probably be able to handle it through his condition book better than by any change of rule because it might mean a great difference to a man buying a yearling and a man buying a two-year-old. They're both exposed to as much risk, and you're protecting one and not the other.

MR. ROBB: Does the racing secretary know in any way whether or not any of the two-year-olds possessed by owners have been bred or bought as yearlings by those owners?

MR. F. KILROE: You can check on the back of the certificate.

MR. ROBB: What I thought was this, that if some sort of a notation were made on the records given to you, then you'd have a better chance of writing races of that particular kind if you wanted to do it.

MR. F. KILROE: My own feeling in New York is that we have so many two-year-olds for the opportunities they have to run, that I hate doing anything that would restrict them.

MR. ROBB: I don't think we're talking only about New York here, are we? In New York there are plenty of two-year-old races, but I was thinking that elsewhere it might be valuable for a racing secretary to know what two-year-olds on the grounds were either bred or purchased as yearlings by the owners who have them registered. There are plenty of races for two-year-olds in New York.

MR. CASSIDY: That information would be available.

MR. GUSHEN: I don't have very much to say about this particular item. Of course, the difficulty lies, I think, in the fact that most of the people around this table are New York minded and, racing in the New York area, they lose sight of the fact that there are other race tracks throughout the country where the same conditions do not prevail. I think that the two-year-old situation in New York is considerably different than you'll find in a great many other parts of the country and I don't think that the same rule could apply to New York, that would apply in other parts of the country on account of the conditions.

MR. ROBB: Wasn't this designed to really get at the breeding situation?

MR. CASSIDY: The rule itself?

MR. ROBB: If the owner or purchaser of a yearling were to be allowed to have closed claiming, and so forth, it would be an encouragement possibly to the breeding industry. That's what I was wondering.

MR. CASSIDY: I don't think it was considered that way at all. I think the rule in the first instance was proposed by a man who probably bought yearlings rather than bred them. He didn't want to lose them. It has always been my opinion that a horse is only worth his actual value at the time you run him. If you run him for that, he can win and if you don't run him for that, he can't win.

MR. ROBB: I was thinking that the first time or two that he runs his two-year-old he doesn't actually know sometimes what he has.

MR. CASSIDY: For the first time or two we have maiden races, and we have condition races.

MR. ROBB: We have in New York, but I was thinking of elsewhere.

MR. GUSHEN: The only difference would lie in the fact that, as I said before, conditions are so different. I am sure breeders like Mr. Vanderbilt and others can afford to give their yearlings and two-year-olds a lot more time to develop and see what their actual worth is, and whether they can run. But in other parts of the country, you take the small breeders, or those who breed for their own racing stable, or who go and buy cheaper yearlings in order to be able to try and get a better horse, they don't have the financial stability, most of them, to be able to give a horse a lot of time. As is the case in many situations, a horse probably doesn't develop until late in the fall, and whereas they find that when they race in May or June, the horse probably would only be worth \$5,000 or \$6,000 in their opinion because he hasn't shown anything, later on, a month or two later, the horse may be worth a lot more. I imagine this question was brought up for that purpose more than anything else, so that people will have an opportunity to really judge their horseflesh in the early part of the year before they lose them.

MR. ROBB: Well, there was this other question, too. I recall some years ago we used to try to race one of our strings outside of New York. We didn't want to go in claiming races, and there would be maiden races and other races in the book. And we worked the horse up to that particular race, then it wouldn't fill and there you were, stuck.

MR. GUSHEN: That's very true in other parts of the country. It doesn't apply to New York though because you have such an over-abundance of two-year-olds.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Reineman, as a breeder, do you think a rule of such nature would be valuable?

MR. REINEMAN: I personally don't think that it's fair to give any advantage to anyone.

MR. HORWOOD: I agree with Mr. Reineman.

QUESTION No. 5. "IT IS GENERALLY AGREED THAT ANY LOWERING OF THE STANDARDS OF SARATOGA RACING WOULD NOT ONLY BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE SPORT IN NEW YORK BUT TO THE AMERICAN TURF AS A WHOLE. WHAT CAN BE DONE TO PRESERVE ITS PRESENT CONDITION BY WAY OF INCREASING INCOME?"

MR. CASSIDY: This question no doubt is based upon the condition that may occur at any time: that is, the possibility of Saratoga not operating for two or three weeks in New York, which gives it the financial backing to be able to conduct a meeting here of a high caliber. It is a problem specifically for the legislature, if they stop the Saratoga meeting at Jamaica. It may be possible that someone here may have a suggestion that might help preserve racing here in Saratoga which is so important to national racing. It has been thought maybe the legislature could be persuaded to increase the track's share of the take when operating up here, maybe 2% more than it gets, and that may provide a sufficient amount of income to make it possible. This is an important question, not only to New York, but to racing in general.

MR. GUSHEN: I think that the legislatures should be asked on no weak grounds to increase the take not only here but in New York too. I've said that many times. But I don't think that the question is a very difficult one to answer. I think that Saratoga could be preserved, and I think that you could have a full meeting at Saratoga

also. All it needs is decent hotel accommodations, that's all, a couple of more hotels like the Gideon Putnam or something like that where people could come here and be assured that they would have decent living accommodations instead of having to live in some motels or not have any place to eat or sleep. The people who come to Saratoga as a rule are people financially responsible, and who can afford to pay. They want to have a good time and enjoy the racing, enjoy the baths and everything else. But when you have ten people fighting for one room in the hotel, that's not conducive to the fact that you want to preserve racing in Saratoga. In my estimation, that's the most simple thing, and I think that the racing associations themselves should try and find a means of supplying living conditions here for people, if they want to bring them in.

MR. ROBB: If the track went to you and asked you to build a hotel, would you consider it a good financial investment?

MR. GUSHEN: Personally, no. But I think the racing associations themselves might, because they are the ones that would profit most by it.

MR. ROBB: Yes, but they hardly have enough money to build hotels themselves.

MR. GUSHEN: It isn't a question of what they have. It's a question of trying to build for the future. If they're going to preserve racing in Saratoga, I'm sure that if they have sufficient hotel accommodations the handle, the difference between what they handle now and what they will handle later would be sufficient to pay for the extra hotel accommodations, for the money that they would spend. It's an investment in the future.

MR. ROBB: That's true, but unless the state itself puts up the hotels, you could hardly get investors to feel that it was a good investment.

MR. GUSHEN: Private investors, I will agree with you on, Mr. Robb. If Saratoga was able to race six weeks during the year and be able to increase their handle by \$300,000 or \$400,000 a day, I'm sure that the revenue would be more than sufficient to pay for the interest on the bonds for building the hotels.

MR. CASSIDY: The cost of building hotels for the limited number who stay there would make it a very difficult task to undertake.

MR. GUSHEN: I think it doesn't have to be a six week proposition. I think that with a place where people come for baths and a lot of other things a couple of months a year, I think if the rates were made reasonable enough, so that people could come and pay part of the upkeep and expense for six months of the year instead of six weeks, I think it could be made to pay.

MR. CASSIDY: I wonder why they tore down the Grand Union and the United States Hotels?

MR. GUSHEN: We're not talking about private investors now. We're talking about people who are interested in preserving racing in Saratoga. I will agree with Mr. Robb that if you went to some financier or some builder and asked him, from an investment angle, he wouldn't do it because I don't think it would pay him. But the racing associations wouldn't want to make a profit out of it. Even if they lost a hundred thousand or two hundred thousand dollars a year it would pay. Because they would get more than that back again from the revenue that they would get for the six weeks and the extra handle.

MR. LYNCH: Perhaps there should be a more militant attitude toward the state and their investment here. They have an enormous interest, as we all know, in racing. It goes at about 11% of the handle, and I'm only thinking of what other states do in similar situations, not necessarily connected with racing, but I'm thinking of French Lick Springs in Indiana and Hot Springs in Arkansas. The air up here I guess is as good as any place else in the world and in addition to that the state is tied up strongly from a revenue standpoint, I know that they built the Gideon Putnam. But the fate of Saratoga racing is one thing that we're concerned with and we

all want to see it perpetuated forever, for that matter, and they have a big investment up here. I wonder what their attitude is to it? In addition to that, this area around here might become hot shakes one of these days soon. Up here at Massena, New York, I see they're spending six hundred million dollars for a dam and they're going to have the St. Lawrence Seaway right in the backyard up here. And you've got the Throughway which is going to run right straight through to Buffalo and connect with the Jersey Turnpike. General Motors I believe have gone to Syracuse, and a lot of other industries. This area might start to boom a little and it may attract a lot of private investment too. Certainly some people can take advantage of the baths and see profit in building hotels.

MR. CASSIDY: Don't you think the immediate problem is the important one at the moment? That is, to make the legislature realize the importance of racing at Saratoga?

MR. LYNCH: I think they've got a big stake in that.

MR. HORWOOD: In regard to the legislature, don't you think that unfortunately the legislature will only see that they gain much more revenue from racing downstate in New York, and when anyone asks for a bigger percentage for Saratoga to preserve Saratoga, they would only say, "No, we would rather eliminate Saratoga entirely and continue downstate." I think it's very dangerous to start asking the legislature for something like that.

MR. CASSIDY: That's probably true, but don't you realize how difficult it is to get any racing association to accept dates in Long Island in the latter part of July and August? It's not the bonanza it appears to be. I doubt that the state would get any material difference if you raced at Belmont Park during August.

MR. HORWOOD: I think it would be hard to convince the legislators of that, though.

MR. CASSIDY: It might be.

MR. HORWOOD: Because you can't expect them to be far-sighted. They haven't been in regard to racing taxation anywhere.

MR. LAUDER: I think there must be some state representatives from this area who would certainly like to see racing perpetuated in Saratoga. I agree with Mr. Lynch that a more militant attitude on the part of the racing associations is necessary. After all, the gentlemen who own the stock in the racing associations and race, have a business. It is their business. Nobody can tell them where they should run it. If they want to run it in a back lot somewhere, it's their business. There was a column in the paper yesterday about how the state was giving the racing associations two million dollars to let them run in Saratoga. Most people have that idea, and it's a false idea. These men who run racing in New York are in business, they have an investment, they stand to lose or to gain. I don't see that legislation can tell them where they must run. After all, the racing people can say, "Well, shucks, we're not making anything out of this, let's take a sabbatical for the year of 1955, and all go to Europe and have a good time and let the state get its forty million dollars somewhere else." I think in a very great hurry you would see some stirring in the legislature, and the legislators would think, "Well, shucks, where are we going to get the forty million dollars. Are we going to add sales tax in New York? Are we going to make people pay it some way else? We've got to get it. We'd better cooperate with the racing people and maybe their figures are right, we would get as much or more if we gave them a greater percentage." I think those figures could be worked out and I think the racing associations should be much more militant. I think that possibly the presidents of the racing associations—this is something I've been harping on for a long time, and I'm not a politician and I suppose that politicians must go through circles—but I think if the presidents of the racing associations and some others with

political standing, went to the Governor or to the legislative committee and spoke, rather than sending their envoys, that they would be listened to.

MR. LYNCH: Along those lines, Mr. Cassidy, there's a man who owns horses in New York, I don't suppose I should mention his name right here, but he's a very prominent owner and I don't suppose too many people know that he's a very close associate of Governor Dewey. He only told me in the box here the other day that he would love to sit down with Governor Dewey and discuss the entire situation of racing in New York. His wife seemed to believe, for many strong reasons, that he certainly would have an audience, and a very friendly one. I said, "Why don't you do it, I'm sure we'd all be interested in that, it would be wonderful if Governor Dewey could be acquainted with some of the problems of racing." He said, "Well, I have no official standing, and I couldn't very well go in without some kind of a commission from the racing people themselves to sit down and talk with him." I'm sure some people, including the president of one race track, certainly know his position, and it puzzles me why he's not used.

MR. PHIPPS: Jock Whitney is Chairman of the United Republican Finance Committee of the State of New York and comes in contact with Dewey a good deal, and we all know how Jock Whitney feels about racing. I'm sure he has had discussions with him. I am sure there are others, too, and I think we should use every-one we can.

MR. LAUDER: Legislators are scared to death to go back to their constituents and say, "Well, we've given racing another 2% in the handle." There should be a campaign to acquaint the people who go racing—and who do not go racing, but still vote—as to just exactly what the prospects are for racing in New York with an equitable take—something that could match New Jersey. Let's face it, New Jersey has taken an awful hunk out of New York and they're doing it strictly on the different percentage two ways. Many large bettors in New York who are not improvers of the breed but who are bettors, will go to New Jersey when they are racing in New York City because they get a better break on the take. To a large bettor that means a lot of money. Then in another way the New Jersey tracks have been able to build wonderful facilities for the customers, to make things very comfortable, very pleasant because they have more money. They have a better percentage of the take. To match New Jersey, New York must at least have an equal shake.

MR. ROBB: You can't get away from natural laws and you can't get away from economic laws. If Saratoga were deprived of the few weeks in New York, which helps it to finance the type of racing that is held up here, the question is, if Saratoga did not have that financial support from New York, would the horses and the horse-men, which race now—and after all, they're the ones which make Saratoga racing—would they still come to Saratoga and race for smaller purses? My guess is, that some would but a great many wouldn't. So the problem is how can Saratoga build up its attendance and mutuel play so that it can still attract the good stables which make Saratoga what it is, and I think that the problem is a separate one. Of course, going to the legislature is a very good thing and should not be overlooked, but the problem is an economic and financial one for the management of the Saratoga Association to handle. How can it, if it has to run for smaller purses, build up its attendance and mutuel play, so that it can increase its purses. Nowadays, even the big stables go elsewhere to win big purses since the tax laws were changed some years ago. It is necessary for them to go where they can win big money. There are a number of ways, and I think that those ways could be very well discussed as far as Saratoga is concerned. How can it build up its attendance and mutuel play so that it will retain the type of stables which come here now?

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think it would ever be possible to build up the mutuel play and attendance?

MR. ROBB: Not to what it is with the New York support. So then it comes back, would the big stables, the name stables, which actually do make Saratoga racing what it is, would they continue to come and race for lesser purses? As a matter of fact, they do now to a certain extent. Would they continue to come?

MR. LYNCH: Mr. Cassidy, is it an established fact that without the three weeks down below this meeting today would be right behind in the red?

MR. PHIPPS: Yes, definitely.

MR. LYNCH: I don't think enough people realize that. Of course there have been some hazy statistics and everything published in the papers, saying that they made this and made that and what about before the war, I don't think enough people really know that this meeting would founder if it didn't have the support from down-state.

MR. LAUDER: Following along Pat Lynch's idea, this may be a revolutionary idea, but most big businesses, and after all, racing is a big business, issue a financial statement which is available to anybody, anybody can see it, the general public knows how General Motors is doing, and all the others. Why not financial statements from the race tracks? Let the general public see a thing like this. Let the general public realize that you've got to have the meeting in New York to support Saratoga. Show them you can't build a new track if those figures do show that, that you can't build a new track on the take you've been getting. Let's not keep this such a secret. Put it out in the open, see what happens. Maybe if more people realized what the score was, you'd have a better chance of getting a larger percentage of the take.

MR. PHIPPS: Would a financial statement be news to the press?

MR. LAUDER: As far as I'm personally concerned, yes.

MR. PHIPPS: It is of course available, it could be gotten. And of course stockholders get their annual report.

MR. LYNCH: A lot of people have the idea in relation to the operation of race tracks, I don't know whether you remember old Windsor McKay who used to draw cartoons. In the old American he used to draw the fellows in the silk hats with the white vests and call them the vested interests. Well, people have that idea about the operation of race tracks, that you've really got a bonanza. As Bill Lauder suggested, maybe if that stuff could get around and show actually that without the three weeks you couldn't have this purse distribution, or pay the help or anything else it might get the story across a little more forcefully.

MR. LAUDER: It might make a little more good will, and after all that's something you can't buy.

MR. ROBB: It might also encourage the legislature to say, "Let's do the racing down in New York."

MR. LAUDER: That's very true, Mr. Robb, but can the legislature say you can't race in Saratoga?

MR. ROBB: No, they can't.

MR. LAUDER: That's the point I'm making. This is your business.

MR. ROBB: It all comes back to what I said before, the financial problem. Are there any suggestions as to how Saratoga without the support of the New York racing can increase its attendance and mutuel play here?

MR. LAUDER: Well, to go back to what Mr. Gushen said about the hotels, I think that's a very good idea. But I would make another suggestion. Down in the south and southwest they have these wonderful motels. They are hotels, actually. They cost much less to build than a three-, four- or five-story hotel. The upkeep is much less. You don't have as large a staff. You don't have as many bellboys around. It's cheaper for the person who is living there. It is more convenient and the rooms can be just as lavish and just as comfortable and just as pleasant as in the finest

hotel in the world. The outlay would not be as much. It would be a better financial deal.

MR. VANDERBILT: I hesitate to get into a generality about New York racing. I think there are about three things we generally do wrong here. One is that I think we throw a lot of money away needlessly. Two is I think we are always concerned with going to somebody for help. I don't think other businesses are run that way. Third, I don't think in New York we ever consider the idea of spending money because that is the way to make more money. It seems to me we are generally spending money when we get in the position where we have to spend, or if our backs are against the wall. I think the efficiency of the race track operation is not comparable at all at least to California and those places. I don't know what our slippage is on club house return checks, the gate men stand around and let the familiar faces in, I'm sure we lose a lot that way. I don't think that's a solution necessarily for Saratoga.

MR. ROBB: If you want to face hard facts, in the operation of Saratoga, perhaps Saratoga would not be Saratoga racing without steeplechase racing. I don't know what Saratoga's experience is and I know that we wouldn't give it up at Belmont Park, but I do know that from the financial angle, and if you want to look facts in the face, we do not make any money on jumping races. If you had to face the hard financial fact, and you can't get away from economic laws any more than from natural, what Alfred said is true. It's a matter of management right from the beginning. You can't go to the legislature and you can't ever expect the legislature to do anything that's going to solve the problem. It's got to come from within. It's got to be handled as a hard financial problem just as any other business has to handle a hard financial problem. I hate to have to think that way in connection with Saratoga.

MR. KELLEY: Has anyone ever studied what nine races a day might do?
(Laughter)

MR. GUSHEN: I think that one of the most constructive things that was said here was said a little while ago by Alfred Vanderbilt. The trouble with New York racing associations, and I said that publicly, is that they sit against the wailing wall and just cry their eyes out that they're not making any money. But they don't do anything to make money. Just as Mr. Vanderbilt said, a lot of people go out on a limb and take the bull by the horns and spend some money. Afterward they find out that they get darn good returns on it. But the New York racing associations unfortunately have sat back for many years and have done nothing to improve conditions or anything else in New York with the result that it is gradually deteriorating. As I said many times, it certainly is not going to get any better. New Jersey and other associations have stolen the play from them and will continue to do it, and they have done it in a manner, as Mr. Vanderbilt said, like business people.

MR. ROBB: Are you familiar with statistics on that? Because you're wrong. New Jersey has not stolen the play from New York except in the newspapers.

MR. GUSHEN: Well, let me say then that New York certainly has not made any headway so far as racing is concerned in the last six or seven years. I'm sure you'll agree to that.

MR. LYNCH: What are your statistics on it, Mr. Robb?

MR. ROBB: Well, we'll come to that in connection with another question.

MR. LAUDER: There's only one thing in answer to that. Didn't the racing associations hire an accountant to make up a very nice little booklet which was sent to the legislators and to the Governor with graphs showing what has happened to the handle and the attendance in New York since the increase in the take and since the advent of the New Jersey tracks, showing New Jersey up and New York down? Not knowing actual figures, it would seem to me that there must be some connection

there, that some of the "down" in New York must have gone into the "up" in New Jersey.

MR. ROBB: That's possible, but that's not the entire problem. There are a number of things which go to make for success in the management of a race track just as there are a number of things in the success of any business. Transportation is one. Since the New Jersey Throughway, I have the figures for New Jersey racing prior to the advent of the New Jersey Throughway, or Turnpike. And if you don't think that New Jersey Turnpike was the turning thing, you're crazy. Another thing was that two years ago they knocked one percent off our takeout in New York and immediately the tide started to swing the other way. You can do all that they have done in New Jersey, and all of those things are important, like building escalators and having good publicity and all of that sort of thing, that's all important in any business, including the race track business. But in New York the figures demonstrate that if we get a fair shake on takeout, we can forget all the other things, and their turnpike—and we're going to get that—and while it isn't going to come as close as the Jersey Turnpike did to some of their tracks, that New York Throughway isn't going to hurt New York racing. And as far as our attendance is concerned, it has been standing up beautifully. If you feel that at this particular junction you want to stand for a few brief statistics. . . .

MR. CASSIDY: We'll comment on that with another question. There's one thing I would like to say about the influence of Jersey over New York in its advancement, I think we are not taking into consideration the fact that the public would much sooner bet against the over-all take in New Jersey than in New York. You can't blame that on the race tracks.

MR. HORWOOD: I would like to make one minor suggestion that I think would increase the revenue at Saratoga and that is a battery of mutuel machines behind the infield odds board, even if it was only used on Saturdays. I talked to at least ten people in Schuylerville alone last night who complained about how much they were shut out yesterday.

MR. ROBB: That's one of the problems of internal management that's very important.

MR. HORWOOD: They seem to get good crowds in the infield and they would be much bigger if they could bet over there.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Reineman, you are not a Saratogian, but I think you do appreciate the value of Saratoga racing to Kentucky and other parts of the country, have you any idea that might be helpful?

MR. REINEMAN: No, I'm sorry to say I haven't anything constructive to say.

QUESTION No. 6. "WHAT CAN BE DONE TO MAKE NEWSPAPER OWNERS AWARE OF THE FACT THAT RACING IS THE NO. 1 SPECTATOR SPORT IN THE COUNTRY?"

MR. CASSIDY: I imagine that means newspaper owners and operators. I can think of a lot of things the New York newspapers could do to help, but I'd rather hear it from the press. Mr. Kelley, what would you think?

MR. KELLEY: I don't know where the question came from.

MR. CASSIDY: You're not supposed to.

MR. KELLEY: No, I'm curious as to where it came from because the New York Times in a rather widely quoted and frequently referred to front page article publicly established the fact that racing was the No. 1 spectator sport, and there were a great many other articles, and one was the cover story on Native Dancer which was done by Time. I think newspapers are pretty well aware of it.

MR. HORWOOD: The first issue of Sports Illustrated, which is published by the

same organization as Time, has a box which contradicts that. It says that racing is not the No. 1 spectator sport. Softball is, I believe. I just wonder what is the purpose of that box. It can't have any basis in accurate statistics because they include unpaid admissions. Where do they get those things, and what was the purpose I wonder in it being published? It is one of the more conspicuous things in a magazine in which it is very hard to find anything.

(Laughter)

MR. GUSHEN: I don't think any racing man would object to yielding the No. 1 spot to softball. I think it has been established today that racing is the No. 1 spectator sport.

MR. LAUDER: The question was, Mr. Gushen, how to make newspaper owners aware of that, and the publishers of Time, Inc., evidently are not aware of it.

MR. GUSHEN: My own opinion of course is I don't think that the daily newspapers give the coverage to racing that they do to other sports. Some do, but some unfortunately don't. You pick up a morning paper and you see a little bit of a piece about a race that may be worth 50 or 100 thousand dollars. You see other sports, you see columns and columns and columns. I think we should do something about that, in the daily newspapers.

MR. CASSIDY: Had I submitted that question I would know specifically what I had reference to and I'd tell you what it is. I can't understand why the Herald Tribune didn't send their man here for the full meeting. I think this is important, it's important to New York, and Mr. Lauder has been here only a very few days, haven't you?

MR. LAUDER: Last weekend, and then starting this Thursday until the end of the meeting.

MR. CASSIDY: And that I think is an indication of the attitude of that particular paper. I think it's important that it be mentioned. As I say, I didn't send this in. Maybe, Mr. Lauder, you might have something to say about it, since we're talking about you.

MR. LAUDER: As far as the Herald Tribune is concerned, I am not going to try to second-guess my manager. Generally I think that one of the things that is very important is the fact that most newspapers feel that racing news is read only by people who are interested in winning bets; people who are interested only in the odds, only in the charts, only in the entries; that actually they don't care much about reading the stuff because, well, you can't find out who is going to win tomorrow by reading the story of what happened yesterday. As far as this question is concerned, to make newspaper owners aware of the fact that racing is the No. 1 spectator sport, I think that there should be some way to make the higher, so-called unpaid echelon, the editors, the publishers of papers—if racing wants to take this trouble—realize that there is a lot more to racing than just the entries and the charts and the selections. There can be good stories, interesting stories, readable stories from a race track which do not necessarily concern themselves with who won and how much he paid. I think all newspapers want to print interesting, readable stories. Certainly if racing is the outstanding spectator sport in the country, there must be many people who go racing and who are interested in reading about racing, who are not primarily concerned with how much they can make and the entries. Now you don't want to throw those people out as prospective readers. You don't want to lose them. Now, maybe the idea of this question would be, how to make the publishers, the editors who decide pretty much how much space will be given to what, how to make them realize that there can be very interesting stories about racing, and readable, and readable by people who do not necessarily go to the track to bet. That I think is a question of, I don't like the word education, but actually that's what it is. I have in mind one particular instance. You spoke of the New York Times before having

printed this story on the fact that racing is one of the outstanding spectator sports. There is an executive in the New York Times who a few weeks ago knew nothing about racing other than the fact that they ran the entries, charts, didn't know anything about it, didn't care. He was brought to the race track, he was shown a little bit about racing. He was taken around, shown the stable area, interviewed owners, trainers, jockeys, had himself a fine time at the race track for a few days and suddenly realized, "Gee, this is good. There's a lot of stuff here. There are a lot of good stories here." Now there is an executive who has been sold on racing. And he is willing to run racing stories. He feels it is now a part of the complete coverage that the New York Times gives sports. That's one instance. I don't know how you want to do it, or how you would do it, but I think if other executives on other papers had the same opportunity, they undoubtedly would feel the same way.

MR. CASSIDY: I think that's a very worthy thought.

MR. ROBB: There are so many stories that are news, there are so many things that could be news about racing, and I think it's up to racing to furnish the papers and publishers with that in various ways.

MR. LAUDER: Well, it's all right to furnish it, but if they don't believe it they're not going to use it. It's got to be explained. I don't know how you're going to do it. But somehow there must be a feeling of good will towards racing, possibly, from the higher echelon.

MR. REINEMAN: I must agree completely with Mr. Lauder. There's one thing that I believe we have been overlooking in racing. The race tracks themselves have their publicity men, but as a combined group we do not have publicity such as we should have. We should have a general promotion scheme to teach people what good racing does, what it means. We all put out a little magazine here, there, and it doesn't get into the right hands. We don't have people going around holding people's hands and buying a drink for the right fellow. In regular business you do it.

MR. ROBB: We had that experience during the war. The T.R.A. was started in 1942 and probably all over the country they started to pin the ears of racing back and I used to get many and many a letter. As a matter of fact, I had one man just to put the clippings in various piles to indicate what was wrong in this bunch, here, here and here. And there were about sixteen or seventeen different reasons why editors all over the country were pinning back the ears of racing. We'd get letters from all over the country saying, "Please furnish me with the facts, so that I can go after my local man." Well, if we had devoted ourselves to helping individuals who wanted to help racing, we would have had no time left, and we decided that a process of education was the proper thing to do. So we got out the book, Thoroughbred Racing and Breeding, the T.R.A. did, published 4,000 copies of it at its own expense and saw to it that every editor and sports writer throughout the country got a copy of that particular book. After that was done, and it got good notices, we went to Coward McCann, the publishers, gave them the book, gave them the plates, gave them the copyright and they put it out for the public. It's gone through three editions, I think. Is that right, Spencer?

MR. DRAYTON: It may be on the fourth edition.

MR. ROBB: It may be on the fourth, but that thing should be brought up to date. Then we got out other books, "Call Me Horse," for one, and we started the weekly release too to sports editors, and so on. But it is a continuing process of education. You can't waste all your time answering individual kicks. I do think that the national organization should be doing more in that line.

MR. REINEMAN: Everything you say, without any question, is correct. But that only scratches the surface. What we need is a combined effort to spend some money to do it. Get a pro to do it.

MR. LYNCH: In relation to that, Mr. Cassidy, newspaper people are a funny

breed and they don't want to be educated by pamphlets, booklets or anything else like that although it's a fine idea. My suggestion would be to get them to the races, get them interested in racing and they'll want to read it in their own paper. I think if you get them to the races, it would be a great thing.

MR. REINEMAN: It is by personal contact, that's the thing; we've got to get a good publicity director who can take people by the hand.

MR. LAUDER: Pamphlets and booklets are fine, but editors and publishers get many and many a pamphlet I am sure on their desks, and secretaries go over them and file them for future reference. There's no personal touch. I think the personal touch is very necessary.

MR. HORWOOD: This is not just another bit of scratching the surface, but there's a national newspaper publishers convention every year. Racing has the New York Athletic Club day, why can't it have a National Newspaper Publishers Day or even week, in connection with that convention, wherever it happens to be held? Make a move to get those people there.

MR. CASSIDY: I was going to say that Mr. Horwood is one of the few men who has a really tough job in interesting his owners in racing.

(Laughter)

MR. ARCARO: Mr. Cassidy, why is New York so far back in glamorizing racing? California doesn't seem to have any trouble. If it weren't for Native Dancer and Stymie I don't think anybody would write anything nice about racing in New York. I mean, as far as glamorizing it and giving it color is concerned. I know that my clippings, most of the nice clippings, are certainly from out of town.

(Laughter)

I mean that, they glamorize it. They make a big thing out of it. In New York they don't do that.

MR. CASSIDY: Who is it that glamorizes it?

MR. ARCARO: I don't know how they do it, but they build it up before it happens. They take a lot of interest in it.

MR. CASSIDY: Is it the newspapers who glamorize it, or is it the racing associations?

MR. ARCARO: I don't know, but I agree with Mr. Reineman that you should have a committee, spend a little money, money does a lot of things. In California in the press stand they have a big table with a lot of sandwiches. They glamorize it. They have the jockeys in the morning so their selections are not held up. These are all handicappers, I presume—they certainly can judge their handicapping by the riders who are put on the horses.

MR. CASSIDY: On that subject, and since it's somewhat unrelated to what we're talking about,

MR. ARCARO: It isn't unrelated at all.

MR. CASSIDY: I just mean somewhat unrelated. I would like to know how it would affect you if the riders were named the day before and they couldn't change.

MR. ARCARO: Mr. Cassidy, I would take the worst of it. I'm not thinking of that. I'm thinking of racing in general. In California, it certainly didn't do Longden, Shoemaker, myself and some of the top riders any good where you were named on a horse that morning and you couldn't be changed. You had to ride that horse. It certainly didn't do us any good. Naturally, I'd rather sit around until the next day and take a shot at it. You might switch and get on a better horse. But we're speaking of racing and educating the public and trying to get some good publicity out of it. It's pretty horrible in New York for the average person who's a race fan, to look at the paper and see, "no boy," "no boy" and "no boy." I think California did a good thing for racing.

MR. CASSIDY: We'll wait for another question on that, because it's big enough to discuss by itself.

MR. GUSHEN: I think along that line, of course it probably covers something that has already been said. I think first of all a concerted effort should definitely be made, and not only by the racing associations. I think that a concerted effort should be made by all recognized agencies in racing. I think that whether it's the T.R.A. or anyone else, I think that they should definitely try and combine the various recognized agencies and put on some promotion scheme whereby they would be able to do the necessary work to educate these people. Along the same line I think it would be a very nice gesture if not only the New York racing associations, but all racing associations throughout the country would cater a little bit more, as it was explained here, to the publishers, and to the managing editors and to the sporting editors, and everything else. They can just as well every once in awhile make a day, call it "Publishers' Day" or "Editors' Day," invite these people into the race track, have a little luncheon for them, and not only the racing associations, but I think a representative of the breeders, a representative of the owners or anything else should be there. They should be able to sit down and discuss their problems and educate them to the fact of what racing really is. I think this personal contact would do a great deal, especially if it comes from all the agencies in racing.

MR. VANDERBILT: I think we're getting back to the same old thing of crying again, that the newspapers aren't being fair to us. I think in all honesty that most of the people who run newspapers are interested in selling newspapers. I think that you might be able to get an extra splurge of some kind by buttering these fellows up for awhile and explain this, that and the other thing to them. But I think the real reason we don't get more newspaper space—if that makes much difference, and I'm not sure it does (I think we get a pretty fair shake)—is because there aren't more people going to the races. I think it all gets back to our bad facilities here in New York. I don't know about you fellows, but I am sure that if I had to pay my way in and go as a member of the general public, I'd go very seldom. We're all spoiled, we all go and we've got a place to park, and a table at the restaurant. We don't have to buck up against this thing. I think our problem of public relations is that. I don't think it's going to them and saying, "Look, we're the No. 1 sport, we should have more space." We get a lot of space. As far as Bill Lauder is concerned, I wish he was here every day. But I think his paper is looking for places to cut expenses. I think the net difference is whether they run a story with a by-line by Bill Lauder or an A.P. story. It gets about the same space. I don't think that this is something that is solved by hand-outs, or anything else except making more people want to go to the races. And I think the way you make more people go to the races is, let the ones who go have a better, more comfortable and enjoyable time and they'll come back more often.

MR. REINEMAN: By the same token, don't we alienate a lot of people by having certain persons, either by word of mouth, or what have you, indicate things that aren't necessarily true because they might be splashy? I think that's the type of personal contact that will educate the people now writing racing news as to the fact that we are legitimate, on the square and that instead of writing something nasty, let's write something nice.

MR. VANDERBILT: I think by and large we have a fair press here. I don't think that any business or any people are going to be 100% approved, or should be. I think it gets back to quality of product.

MR. ARCARO: I disagree with you. I don't think we have a good press in New York. Two or three turf writers who make a living out of the game, never do anything but knock racing. They seldom write anything nice about it. I don't think that's good press.

MR. CASSIDY: But you can't judge the whole group by two or three.

MR. ARCARO: I'm not judging the whole group.

MR. LYNCH: I don't think there's any policy-dictator on that. I think if you see most sports, fellows might be covering the Giants and a fellow gets an idea about Leo Durocher, and you might say Leo Durocher doesn't get a good press, or anyone else. It's just judgment and if it's wrong, I suppose it's wrong.

MR. LAUDER: I think the minute you try and tell anybody what he can and can't write, you're sunk. A man who comes out to the race track to cover the racing, has the leeway that his paper will allow. If he sees something that he thinks is wrong, I think he has every right to write, I don't think anybody should try and change his mind, if he is right. If he is wrong, take him to one side and say, "Now look, here are your facts, here are our facts, you see you're not quite right. You're wrong." But if the man is right, if he doesn't write something nice but if his facts are correct, there's not a thing you can do about it except change so that what he is writing about, which is wrong, is made right.

MR. LYNCH: There again it comes down to a question of management, Mr. Cassidy. What a man writes in the paper is strictly his own business and his editor's. If his editor believes that it's doing his paper good to write anything maliciously, or unfactual, or anything else, that's the business of the paper and if he's wrong and wrong often enough, it will reflect in the sale of his paper. That's like discussing what's wrong with Saratoga, or what's wrong with Jamaica.

MR. CASSIDY: What I was going to say to Bill a minute ago is, if the man who writes would just make a slight effort to find out if what he is writing is correct, I think a lot of it would be eliminated. But I think writing is done frequently without any investigation of the facts. And I think that possibly Pat answers that somewhat by the manager of the paper, or the sporting editor, printing the type story that will sell. Eventually it will stop, because it will hurt their own paper.

MR. LAUDER: There you come back once again to the question of—a word I don't like, I wish I could think of another one—education. Tell them what's right. Explain to them. Not necessarily to the man who is writing, but if you can't explain to him, go to his sports editor and say, "Now look, this just isn't factual. Here is what it is. Come on out and I'll show you."

MR. CASSIDY: Who should do that?

MR. LAUDER: Well, who gets hurt? Mr. Gushen and Mr. Reineman I think had the idea. Get together and have somebody whose job that is. Have somebody, call him what you want, troubleshooter, anything else. Don't try and tell people what to write because that's going to backfire, it's the greatest boomerang in the world. You can't tell anybody what to write. But if you think he's writing something which is not right, try and explain to him and tell him what is right. Education—I hate that word.

MR. JACOBS: You've got to have a good press, that's one thing. And I think if they do write something wrong, show it to them. Where was it we had some trouble, a horse was left at the gate, or something? They said the gate didn't open, they wanted their money back. And they took a group in and showed them the picture. They walked out satisfied. Why not when someone writes a story, show it to them?

MR. CASSIDY: I think that effort has been made a number of times, Hirsch, individually. Sometimes with success, sometimes not.

MR. JACOBS: You've just got to keep trying.

MR. KELLEY: If possible, I would like to say a word if I could, because this affects me rather intimately. This business of public relations and all. I would like to go back to the general attitude, the general thinking of Alfred Vanderbilt. I think racing is too sensitive and too conscious of what it calls a bad press. I think there is an erroneous state of mind that if you can get some mysterious concern or some

mysterious individual, you can then work magic and you are going to control the press. Nothing could be further from the truth nor more dangerous thinking for racing. The way to control the press, or whatever way you want to express it, is by controlling the things the press complains of. The way to get a good press is, as Alfred has said, to give good management, the best racing and the best accommodations you can. Public relations start as small as drinking fountains. Public relations are composed of the plain, ordinary elements of any industry or product. I'd like to add one other thought to this. When I first took this job about ten years ago there was a columnist who was considered to be one of the biggest stumbling blocks racing had. I had his column ringed over a period of about six weeks, and, statistically, he knocked every sport there was. He wasn't singling out racing. I think we are too prone to believe racing is singled out. I do think the education part of it is terrifically important, but I wouldn't stop with educating editors. I think it is most important to educate people through TV and radio and magazines. It is important the way the sport is depicted here, in order to reach the majority of people who know little or nothing about racing, but who would vote about it if there ever came a need for a public action on the sport.

MR. GUSHEN: I think this can be based down to just a few normal situations same as in any other line of business. Let us assume that we do not have a bad press. Let us assume that our press is normal. I know in my business if I've got a customer, and he may be a good customer, I'm going to try to do everything I possibly can to make him a better customer. In my own business I have agents all over the country and they contact the people that I do business with. That's their job, they get paid for that. Yet there's a certain something about the fact that when I travel throughout the country on my business, that I personally go in to see that customer. There is something about it that is appreciated not only by the agent, but it is appreciated by the customer, because there is a certain touch, a certain contact there that the customer receives that cannot be bought nor can it be brought to the attention of the customer by writing him a letter or sending him a pamphlet or anything else. By the same token I believe that no matter how much of a drive you are going to make, to send a man a letter or a pamphlet, telling him the facts, the racing associations in conjunction with a representative say, of horsemen, with a representative of breeders, a trainer, or anyone else, should every once in a while get together and work harmoniously, and get these people into the race track, these responsible people, not to try to control their writings or what they write, just to show them that they are wrong. How else can you show them except by asking them to come to the race track and look for themselves? If they can come to the race track and can see all of these recognized agencies work together and are trying to do the very best that they can, I think that that is definitely the best education we can give them.

MR. E. KILROE: I think we in racing are unduly sensitive about the criticism we get in the sports papers. I think we just have to ride with it. Anytime someone comes around and says, "Boy, did you see what they said about your track in the papers?" I think about what they are saying about the management of all the ball parks in New York, about the people who run the fights, and every other sport. I don't want to seem complacent, because I know there is plenty of room for improvement, particularly in physical plants, but I don't think there is much room for improvement in the standard of racing we put on. It's not glamorized, partly I think because the New York papers don't play up the west coast style of reporting. I'd rather have it the way it is.

MR. PHIPPS: It seems to be the feeling that California handles it very much better and Mr. Burke knows California better than anybody. Do you have anything that you can advise us here?

MR. BURKE: I can't think of anything. I'm glad to hear all the discussion on

these different subjects and appreciate being invited. I think it just resolves itself into making proper accommodations for the public. That will build up your attendance. That will build up your mutuel play. The regular players will come anyhow. They will stand out in the rain. They don't care whether they sit down or not. They'll keep coming every day. But you need something more than that. As long as you have the turn-over of population in New York—you have millions of people throughout the year here on a visit, for pleasure or business, or something like that—they'll come to the races if you have the proper accommodations and put on a little more glamor, as Eddie says, and then you'll have a more glamorous press, I think. But to put on more glamor means spending more money, and that's the great question in New York. The tracks don't get the money that we get to make the proper improvements in accommodations, and all the things that are necessary to attract the customers.

MR. CASSIDY: I think Mr. Burke very ably summed up the question for us. Does anyone else have any comment on this question which has been under discussion for quite some time? While you were talking I made note of another question which I think is important enough to bring up individually.

QUESTION No. 7. "WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF THE POLICY IN CALIFORNIA OF REQUIRING THAT JOCKEYS BE NAMED AT TIME OF ENTRY AND THAT NO CHANGE BE PERMITTED FROM THAT TIME ON?"

MR. CASSIDY: That question has been considered and discussed a great many times in New York and it has been the contention of the officials, and definitely mine, that a horseman and owner should be entitled to ride the best jockey he possibly can and that if a boy is available the following day who wasn't available at the time of entry, as he may have been on a horse on the also eligible list or his horse may have been scratched, that horseman who wanted that boy's services should be privileged to have them. For that reason I have been opposed to a hard and fast rule that does not permit a change up to scratch time. I thought that scratch time was sufficiently early for the press to have the information and we have made definite efforts since that time to have the card complete at scratch time so that the jockeys will be named. I'm surprised to hear Eddie say he thinks so well of it, not because I expect him to be selfish and want to get as many good mounts as he can, because I don't. He has always been absolutely fair. But the owner doesn't seem to be considered as fully as he should be. I should like to ask some opinions so that we could learn more about it from the owners. Alfred, how do you feel about it?

MR. VANDERBILT: I don't feel strongly about it. It has never worked any hardship on me. I have a contract rider anyway. But I would think it probably is a good idea. I think it would protect the in-between rider.

MR. ARCARO: I wasn't thinking of that when I said that. I was thinking of the public because that's who we're dealing with.

MR. LYNCH: Mr. Cassidy, he brought it up in relation to the press, too. The problem is going to be solved by you people and the newspaper can't tell you when you're going to name jockeys or anything else. You've got a business to manage here and you're going to do the best you can, but as long as the question was brought up in relation to the press, I'll give you a brief idea of what is involved. We were discussing Bill Lauder before not coming up here and the basic reason for it was one of economy. As Bill knows, running newspapers these days is not a very profitable enterprise. When you send entries out overnight and we get them and it's full of the no-boys, we send them in. We don't like to print inaccurate information, particularly incomplete information. That stays in overnight and then in the morning when the scratches come out we get the revised list of riders. Well, in the newspaper

business we have to put in what is known as a replate. That requires a man on the job to take the information over the phone, the correct jockeys, and then he has to bring it to a linotype setter who ordinarily would not be in at that hour, working on that particular assignment. From there it must be sent up to the composing room, put right in the paper itself, and a printer has to work on it. A new plate has to be cast, and sent all the way down to the press room. The presses must be stopped and whatever particular page is involved with this replate, you put it on. I don't know what is actually involved in salaries in a thing like that, but it is a problem and would be a way a paper could save some money. That's part of the problem you have in the newspaper business.

MR. CASSIDY: I think that's one of the things we want to discuss. The way these questions or problems affect any of the departments in racing.

MR. LAUDER: That's all fine for the early morning run, Pat's paper, the Journal American. But the entries are sent out. Around one o'clock they get it, at two o'clock they get in the papers. Many people like to look at them that evening. They don't get those changes, those complete boys. They get only the no-boys. Now Bob Horwood's paper, for instance, is printed in the evening. They don't replate in the morning. The man who makes that up for Bob's paper doesn't know, for instance, that such and such a boy is going to ride because he's a contract rider, and he is well and is going to be there, even though it might be listed as a no-boy. Many times stables who have contract riders on the grounds, perfectly able and well, list a no-boy instead of putting in their contract rider who everybody knows is going to ride. Now Bob's papers of course are papers which are supposedly the final word in selections, past performances, and everything else, and his paper is incomplete with all those no-boys. Scratch time the next morning doesn't do him any good. His paper has gone to bed, printed, it's on the streets, that's it, final. They go on what they get the previous day. All the morning papers have to go on what they get the day before.

MR. CASSIDY: I know the problem is quite serious for the newspapers.

MR. HORWOOD: I think it is also an economic problem for the race track, because an awful lot of people, even those who go to the race tracks, they like to figure their races in the evening, and they like to at least have a pretty good idea of what they are going to do the next day. They can steam themselves up if they see a horse they like with a jockey they like. And if it's no-boy, that interest isn't there.

MR. JACOBS: About the riders on the program, around New York there's a lot of difference. We've got three race tracks down below, and you've got your agents scattered all over. It's a pretty darn hard thing to get a boy you want, and you hunt around for the agent. Up here you probably could because everybody is around up here. They're in one place. But down below it's a lot different. I think they've been getting all the riders on in the afternoon, and they have a pretty good percentage of them on in the afternoon down below. They were lined up on the board and there were very few without a rider on in the afternoon, down at Jamaica.

MR. LYNCH: Mr. Cassidy met our problem on that by letting someone fill those riders in that we have to know, but it's like everything else. For a long time it goes on very well, it's never 100%, but we don't expect that. But it fades off.

MR. ARCARO: That's why I wanted to hear Mr. Jacobs' story on it. He's a trainer and he rides many riders. I didn't think about it the way he does, or know his position in it.

MR. F. KILROE: I think there is a point in what Hirsch says. We have a physical difficulty in New York with three different tracks. But I think out in Santa Anita, it worked to everyone's benefit except the owner of the best horse and the agent of the best jockey. Here either of them is in a position to wait and get, in one case, the best rider for his horse, and in the other case, the best mount for his rider. It works a great injustice on the in-between rider, as Alfred mentioned, and as a result in

many cases where there is a small field, the in-between rider will get to ride half as many times as he would if you make a trainer name a rider at the time he makes an entry. I think in that way you improve the standard of riding of the lesser riders because they get that much more experience. I think we do have to consider the public, it is beneficial for them to know riders, the night before. The owners put a lot of money into it, but they can only get it out if the purses are big, and purses can only be big if the number of customers is big.

MR. DUNNE: I was formerly very bitterly opposed to this thing, too. I don't know why. The more I hear of it, the better it sounds to me. I'd like to try it.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think it's possible to do it with the tracks so widely separated as they are in New York?

MR. DUNNE: I don't see why we couldn't do it. We've got all these agents around here, they'll have to bounce a little bit more.

MR. ARCARO: "Bones" will put a hole right in my head tomorrow morning.
(Laughter)

MR. JACOBS: I think it could be done if you waited until after the entries closed. Wait a certain period of time before the entries are out. If you wait a certain period of time you can put them on before the entries are out.

MR. DUNNE: How did you do it out in California, did you draw the entries?

MR. F. KILROE: Any open mounts they call out as they are drawing entries. Of course, we had everybody in one place there. But I think the agents could arrange to be wherever the draw is, or be contacted by phone.

MR. VANDERBILT: You have another factor there, Jimmy, and that is that your entries close at nine o'clock before the people concerned leave the track.

MR. F. KILROE: In many cases you're going to wind up with some open mounts unless you make some rule that they must name a rider when they make the entry.

MR. CASSIDY: Don't you think it would have to be a hard set rule to do any good?

MR. F. KILROE: Mr. Burke and I will agree they allow a change in a special type of case. There's always an exception.

MR. CASSIDY: What for example would be the special case? Mr. Burke, do you know?

MR. BURKE: Well, there might be an instance where an owner would show where he would be distinctly benefited if he makes a deal with the other rider, and the other rider's decent and they're all satisfied, why the Stewards will allow it.

MR. CASSIDY: We do that, too.

MR. F. KILROE: The principal exception I was thinking of was the case of where you have coupling in a race. A trainer may want to name Eddie on both his horses and make up his mind later.

MR. CASSIDY: That's different, of course.

MR. BURKE: I think it's been brought up that it might be a detriment to the owner. It might be a detriment to the owner in some particular case, one case, but the next dozen races he was in, it would benefit him. For instance, the day before the owner will say, "I want to get Eddie Arcaro, I want to get Willie Shoemaker, I want to get one of the top riders on my horse." Well, their agent will say, "I don't know yet, maybe I've got so and so. I have to wait and see." That owner is left flat.

MR. CASSIDY: What do you do with a horse that's on the also eligible list? I mean, in the event of a late scratch. Suppose Arcaro, Shoemaker, Guerin, well, say, all of our top riders, just happened to draw six horses on the also eligible list.

MR. F. KILROE: They can be named on a horse in the race and on the also's, too. If the horse on the also's gets in, we take him off the second call and put another boy on at scratch time.

MR. CASSIDY: That makes your scratch time accurate. And it does help your evening papers.

MR. F. KILROE: Mechanically what we did, as we drew the entries, occasionally even with the nine o'clock closing we would find a trainer got away from us. In that case, the stewards would look up the horse and see who has been riding him recently, and if that boy was available, they would put him on. In other words, get what would seem like the best rider available out of the field of jocks, and then we would put that boy on the overnights. Then he was stuck with him.

MR. CASSIDY: Bill, how do you feel about this?

MR. WINFREY: Well, it might present a few difficulties here that it doesn't out there but I don't believe they're insurmountable here. I believe it could be done. You might even effect some sort of a compromise. You may not have the nine o'clock closing, you might move your ten-thirty closing up to ten o'clock, something like that. I believe it could be worked out. There's a lot of discontent out there but that's because there are three or four top riders, it seems, and they are hard to get by some people, and there are quite a lot of cliques. They had one thing out there that I didn't approve of and that was this: You put a horse in with an apprentice, a good apprentice, and something happens that you can't get that apprentice, and they wouldn't let you waive the bug. They insist you put a bad apprentice on him before they'd let you waive the bug. I think that's bad. I believe this probably could be worked out because it probably is going to do more good than harm.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Kilroe, what do you think about it?

MR. E. KILROE: My thinking has changed this morning. I have the opinion that we should put on the best show in the afternoon that we can. To do that we want to be sure that the best boy has the best chance. It sounds to me now that it would probably in the long run benefit more people by changing to the California rule.

MR. DUNNE: Well, out in California, it seems to me that the mediocre boy will profit by this.

MR. ARCARO: It's pretty tough when an agent has three or four calls in a race before he can look at a Racing Form and take his best shot. The top rider takes all the worst of it.

MR. WINFREY: It's different again out there, because they race together pretty near all the time and they know the horses pretty well.

MR. CASSIDY: How is it Longden gets all the horses he wants?

MR. WINFREY: Because the agents know more about what's going on pretty near than the trainers sometimes, and it's pretty well cut and dried out there.

MR. BURKE: That's the reason for the rule.

MR. CASSIDY: Luke?

MR. O'BRIEN: I agree with Eddie Arcaro's suggestion that the jockeys should be named the day before the race, and if the horse is scratched, the jockey so named is out of that race.

MR. CASSIDY: You mean the mandatory naming of the jockey?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Robb?

MR. ROBB: One of the things that we try to do in our radio publicity the day before the race is to name the top horses and the jockeys who are riding them. And I think it is a great advantage to know the day before what jockeys are riding—from the public's standpoint.

MR. CASSIDY: Anyone else like to say anything more about it?

QUESTION No. 8. "SHOULD THERE BE A LIMIT TO THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE ENTERING THE WINNER'S CIRCLE TO BE PHOTOGRAPHED AFTER A RACE?"

MR. DUNNE: I don't think so. If they want twenty people in there, let them do it. They get a kick out of it and it doesn't do any harm.

MR. E. KILROE: That's the way I feel about it. People want to have the family in there for a celebration.

MR. O'BRIEN: I agree with Mr. Dunne's and Mr. Kilroe's comments.

MR. F. KILROE: In California it's the custom in the boxes to make your move when the horse does.

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: I think if any criticism can be made of the operation in the winner's circle—and this is unfair because it's personal—is that it takes a terrible time to get the official or get the presentations arranged when Sammy Renick is doing the television broadcast.

(Laughter)

QUESTION No. 9. "WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE TO GIVE THE PRESS AN OPPORTUNITY OF VIEWING THE CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION MOVIE PATROL ON A RECEIVER IN THE PRESS BOX? IT COULD MATERIALLY AID THE TURF WRITERS IN COVERING RACES ACCURATELY."

MR. CASSIDY: Any service of course that could be given to them to help cover the races accurately would certainly be of value to everybody. There are a couple of problems involved. The picture couldn't be shown for probably fifteen or twenty minutes after a race is run. Because it takes that long to develop it and splice it and make it into a reel to run through from start to finish. The question of whether it would be of any value at that time is problematical. Another question, I haven't any doubt but what they can identify the horses on the small screen the projection is made on, but some will find difficulty in doing it and in having it run through without being able to stop it and bring it back to identify the horses. When we do it we control the forward speed, reverse, back and forth in order to properly identify the horses and see what happened. To review it in the press box as the stewards review it for a claim of foul, I think would require almost the presence of the turf writers in the same room where we are doing it to see the developments and hear the commentary on it as it is backed up and stopped. I don't know who sent this in, but I do know it would be nice if we could do it. I don't know whether it is possible or not.

MR. PHIPPS: How many turf writers are there at the track?

MR. LAUDER: Mr. Phipps, at Belmont it isn't really practical from a time standpoint to get down to that projection room. Now a delay of fifteen minutes is bad enough, but at least a good part of a lead could be written in that fifteen minutes and the picture would be primarily for review. It's a matter of getting a second look. You can be in doubt of what happened a lot of times.

MR. PHIPPS: Would you be interested in seeing every race?

MR. LAUDER: It would be primarily the feature race.

MR. PHIPPS: And if there were a foul or something like that?

MR. LAUDER: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: Ordinarily when you're writing a lead you have to go practically on what Capossela would say. It would be so much better if you could be graphic about it and write what happened, because you can't depend upon your eyes so often.

MR. PHIPPS: That's why I was wondering if in a special case, such as the Belmont, whether it would be too much of a nuisance to go and see it run back and forth on the television.

MR. LAUDER: May I make a suggestion? I don't know whether this would be

against the rules, or anything else, but the question on foul claims, when the stewards sit in with the jockeys and discuss the thing and watch the picture, before the official sign is put on the board or before the disqualification is announced, would it be possible to have representatives from the press box sit in, and take the information back to the press box and say, "This is what happened. This is what was done."

MR. LYNCH: On that again, if you've got a big race, say, the Belmont Stakes, and there's a foul claimed, most of us are writing on an edition and the few minutes involved, you've probably got your story written in ten minutes.

MR. LAUDER: Yesterday, had the Whitney been run five minutes earlier I could have gotten the winner of the Whitney in my first edition. As it was I had nothing on the Whitney in my first edition. That's how much time means to us.

MR. HORWOOD: Also, I didn't think anyone would wait until they saw that picture before writing, but there are times—everyone has a different deadline—there are times when you might have had quite a wrong impression of a race, not where there's a disqualification. Well, a couple of years ago in both the Realization and The Jockey Club Gold Cup, there was a lot of controversy about what happened in the backstretch. Eddie I think was supposed to run into a blind switch one time, and somebody else was supposed to have been put into a blind switch in the other race. And everyone saw those two things differently. I think if we had had the pictures and had been able to see it a second time, everybody would have been able to write a better story.

MR. CASSIDY: Bob, do you think if you were to see a picture, for instance of a race with twelve horses, and it were run through from start to finish, that you would be able to identify the horses?

MR. HORWOOD: Well, I don't know how perfectly. Of course we've just seen the race itself.

MR. CASSIDY: I'm not questioning your ability, I'm questioning anybody's, mine or anyone else's. I see them thousands of times. It's whether the first run of it would be sufficient as we often have to run it back so we can follow it through from where the identification could be made.

MR. HORWOOD: I couldn't really answer that.

MR. CASSIDY: Well, it would be difficult, I can assure you that.

MR. DUNNE: I don't see why they shouldn't have it if they want it.

MR. PHIPPS: The question is whether that is what they really want, though.

MR. LYNCH: When there is some controversy about a race, at those times when we have come down and have seen the pictures, they've been able to stop them.

MR. DUNNE: Well, you could put that remote control thing up there for them just as well as you could anywhere else. They could back it up whenever they wanted to.

MR. E. KILROE: They'd have to wait until the stewards were through with re-viewing it.

MR. LYNCH: That would only be necessary I think at certain tracks. At Jamaica you can just run downstairs. Get permission and look at them. At Hialeah Park you just walk out of the press box and there's the projection room.

MR. E. KILROE: At Aqueduct it's right downstairs, too.

MR. CASSIDY: Would it be too late for the press to wait about fifteen minutes to permit the film to be spliced before seeing it? Usually they are working on it, particularly if there has been a claim of foul. Of course, a specific part of it could be shown immediately.

MR. DUNNE: Well, they don't have to splice it then, let them wait a few minutes. If the press calls down and says, "We'd like to see the horses run down the backstretch," show it to them and put it together later.

MR. CASSIDY: Well, that isn't the important thing. If they're not going to show a part of it they start splicing.

MR. DUNNE: They ought to know whether they want it as soon as a race is over. They can call down as quickly as anybody else.

MR. LYNCH: Usually it will be connected with something controversial.

MR. CASSIDY: If you were to have the set in there, you could call up and ask them if they would put on the section, say the five-eighths pole, going into that turn. Do you feel that that would satisfy all the writers? That they would all want just that one section?

MR. LAUDER: There's only one question that comes to my mind. You take, say, the three-eighths pole, and suddenly, on the screen a horse is bothered coming into the turn. Which is which? How many fellows looking at that picture would know which horse is which? If you take it from the start of the race you can spot the horse you are looking for coming out of the gate. But if you suddenly come into a race as they are going into a turn, and they have shuffled and the outside horse has been on the rail and vice versa, how many fellows can tell which is which?

MR. CASSIDY: I think anything we can do to get accurate reporting is certainly advantageous to everyone.

MR. LAUDER: I know lots of times I'd love to see part of a race over again. I come down many times at Jamaica as well as Aqueduct, as you know. But at Belmont Park it's just too far. Usually the feature race is the one we're primarily interested in and the one we are writing our story about, and that's practically at edition time. Now it would take us five minutes to go over to the projection room at Belmont Park, five minutes back, five minutes looking at the picture, two or three minutes to get it ready for us, fifteen minutes after the race. The edition is gone and all you're getting on the wire is yells from the boss.

MR. DUNNE: It doesn't make any difference to Walter Gamble and the rest of them whether they put that thing together immediately or whether they wait a few minutes.

MR. CASSIDY: No. Francis, I was thinking of the call, if they've started to put it together and they've got the first and second sections together, but the writers want the part, say, in the fourth section. Unless they knew the riders as well as we do it would be impossible to tell who they are. We usually have two or three views of the same spot.

MR. HORWOOD: I happen to see a lot of patrol films, just going into the race track I go through and pass where they're showing them to the patrol judges in the morning and I can usually identify most of those horses in the races the day before.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. O'Brien, what do you think about it?

MR. O'BRIEN: I think it is strictly a local problem at Belmont Park. You say at Jamaica and Aqueduct you're all right.

MR. ROBB: Even after a feature race at Jamaica, they would waste some time going downstairs.

MR. LAUDER: It's not so much a question of wasting time going downstairs at Jamaica, or Aqueduct. You go down to watch a film at Jamaica and if you get more than three or four people in that room, half of them don't see it. There just isn't room. If there are other fellows who want to see it too, it is a question of who's going to get there first. It's going to be like that running for the winner's circle at Santa Anita.

MR. ROBB: With the development of closed circuit television as is contemplated, I think in a very short time it will work out so you can see it.

MR. LAUDER: I think it would be very nice if we were able to have it.

MR. O'BRIEN: I don't see any objection personally to putting a television set in the press box.

MR. CASSIDY: How do you feel about it, Mr. Kilroe?

MR. E. KILROE: If the press would like it, it's no problem as far as we're concerned.

MR. LYNCH: Can you arrange to get the ball game on it?

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: I think the argument is certainly for it. We'll see what we might be able to do.

(Blacksmiths Lawrence Goettesheim and James O'Connell joined the conference at this point for the discussion of the following questions which concerned their work on the race tracks.)

MR. CASSIDY: We have a few questions on horses' shoes and so on which we would like you to listen to. If you have any comments, tell us what they are and maybe answer some technical questions which we can't answer ourselves.

QUESTION No. 10. "A PROMINENT BLACKSMITH HAS EXPRESSED HIS OPINION THAT TOES ON SHOES ARE A MAJOR CAUSE OF UNSOUNDNESS. WHAT IS THE OPINION ON THIS?"

MR. CASSIDY: Before we start on it I think it is wise to point out the possibilities as to why it may be dangerous to a horse's soundness. On any hard surface a toe raises the front of the foot up higher than the heel, and standing in the stall, if he doesn't have blocks on behind or caulks to keep the foot level, his position is an unnatural one. In running, if he's running on a hard track or the cushion is soft and he goes through to a hard under-surface, it could be equally true that the toes would raise the forward part of the foot up out of the proper position. The other danger is the possibility of a horse with toes, sharp toes, cutting another horse down in front of him. I think they also think it is a hazard to horses going around a turn because the horse's feet are out on the off-side away from them, but I don't subscribe to that because the other horses' feet are also going around a turn. However, I think an expression from the blacksmiths first might be in order. Larry, do you mind stepping up there and telling us what you think about it?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: With toes on shoes it is a strain on a horse when he's standing. If you yourself would stand in that position for a while, you would find out it would be a strain. The same way with a horse. We grind them down. Mr. Fitz always has me grind them down. My opinion would be this, if you take the toes off the horse in front altogether, I think you'd have sounder horses. You wouldn't have half as many horses with leg trouble, ankles, knees or tendon trouble.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think that a rim type shoe, which has a grasping surface with considerably more area than an ordinary toe, would be adequate, even for the rear?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: Well, a horse's driving power is in his rear part and I really believe that he should have a little grab there to get a hold.

MR. CASSIDY: Don't you think a rim shoe would probably do the same thing?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: Well, a rim plate, Mr. Cassidy, I don't know whether you get enough grab with a rim plate. I would advocate a rim plate for a horse in front. Behind I really think he needs something to get a hold with. You see, very few horses go wrong behind. We do have one once in a while. It seems that the strain and pulling power and everything, trying to get a hold getting away, puts a strain on his tendons.

MR. CASSIDY: Jim, what do you think? You don't think that toes in front are at all necessary?

MR. O'CONNELL: No, I don't.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think they are in the rear?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

MR. CASSIDY: You don't think a rim shoe would suffice? In place of the toes in the rear?

MR. O'CONNELL: No sir, I think you should have a toe.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Jacobs?

MR. JACOBS: I'll tell you, on these sand tracks, I'll take the toe when I'm racing. Probably training they're better off, but you'll find the horses with toes do the best running.

MR. CASSIDY: In front?

MR. JACOBS: In front. Take on the grass, like California last winter, didn't have no toes, no grabs, no nothing on, and they all ran good. They didn't allow them. And that track stayed good and the horses stayed good.

MR. CASSIDY: That's on the turf?

MR. JACOBS: On the turf. They all stayed sound, too.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Winfrey?

MR. WINFREY: I'm afraid of the high toe in the aluminum and always have them ground down like Mr. Fitzsimmons does. I don't know, it's possible they might get by all right in front with a rim plate on the sandy track. I think probably a low toe, a modified toe, would be much better than the toe on aluminum shoes. I'm not sure that they wouldn't get by with a rim plate because I've never tried them. But I know in the old days they used to run rollers behind. I think you would need a toe behind definitely and I would think a small toe in front, and I'm not sure that a rim plate might not work because I've never tried them.

MR. GOETTESHEIM: I can give you a little idea about the rim plates. I used a lot for a long time, which proved to me that they were all right. We had horses every now and again that bowed. Then you get them back to the races, they work to the satisfaction of the trainer, and we run them and they win. So it looks like if a horse gets used to something, he'll go on with it.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Reineman, would you have any thoughts to contribute?

MR. REINEMAN: I have discussed this point with some of the people at home. They definitely say that you must have toes behind, but it isn't so necessary in front. At the moment we are working with an inventor who has developed a front shoe that has a rubber insert. It has been tried and it does give a horse better gripping power than the flat plate. We'll have some of them ready within the month to pass around.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Gushen, do you have anything to say about it?

MR. GUSHEN: I couldn't tell a plate from a toe, Mr. Cassidy.

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: Dr. Catlett?

DR. CATLETT: Not being a trainer I don't know that I'm qualified to answer that, but it is my personal opinion that there are too many horses shod with long toes. I believe a horse could run better, that is it would be safer, if he runs without a toe in front but I do feel it's an advantage to have it behind.

MR. CASSIDY: Dr. Woodcock?

DR. WOODCOCK: Well, the objection that I have to a toe as seen on the race track is the fact that the horse is standing in his stall a great many hours every day and with just a toe and no heel, naturally puts undue strain on the tendons while at rest. The trainers know a great deal more about the result they get from shoeing horses with toes, but I feel that if a horse does have a toe grab he should also have heel, and heels on both sides. I've seen horses shod with a long toe grab and either the inside or the outside with heel grabs on it, so that they are twisted all over when

they are standing at rest. It seems to me that if that is the case and if the reason for these horses' breaking down is the toe grab when they hit the hard bottom on the race track, if that foot were leveled through both heel and toe, you wouldn't have the difficulty that you have.

MR. ROBB: Marshall, I went over Friday night to look at the shoes in the museum to see just what they were wearing because we have been interested in that for years and we've kept statistics at Belmont on what the horses are wearing. For instance, 88% of the horses today, at Belmont, anyway, are shod with aluminum and 12% with steel. Oddly enough when we made this survey the first year, which was two years ago, 88% of the winners wore aluminum and 12% wore steel. So it doesn't make any difference, apparently, what the horse is wearing. But we did discover this, that the toes on the aluminum shoes are invariably higher than on the steel shoes. Over in the museum when you see these plates worn by Blue Peter and others, most of them of course in recent generations are aluminum. But Citation's toes are the longest toes I've ever seen on a shoe and this spring when we were discussing eliminating the toes for turf racing, we discovered that most of the blacksmiths filed down the toes on the aluminum shoes, because apparently they do come too high.

MR. CASSIDY: Are there any other comments anyone would like to make on this subject?

QUESTION No. 11. "IN TURF RACES, SHOULD THE TYPE OF SHOES BE CONTROLLED?"

MR. CASSIDY: This question is prompted probably by the fact that in England they use exclusively a rim shoe, no toes. And they have races on the turf where they have to protect it from being cut up. In California, Mr. Burke, am I correct in saying that you had a ban on toes?

MR. BURKE: Yes, that's right. Smooth shod.

MR. CASSIDY: Smooth shod. At Belmont Park we use all kinds, and Mr. Robb kept a record of the performance of the horses with the different kinds of shoes. I don't know if he could possibly keep a record of their effect on the race track because they're running in all kinds.

MR. ROBB: There's no question but that the toes cut up the race track.

MR. CASSIDY: Yes, but you didn't keep a performance chart on that.

MR. ROBB: No, we didn't.

MR. CASSIDY: In Chicago, do you know what the ruling is?

MR. F. KILROE: They've been trying to get around to putting a limitation on the equipment, but they haven't gotten to it yet.

QUESTION No. 12. "WHAT EFFECT WOULD THE FREQUENT CHANGING OF SHOES FOR TURF AND SOIL HAVE ON A HORSE'S FOOT?"

MR. CASSIDY: That isn't what we are particularly discussing at the moment, but it has a relationship and if we did prescribe a certain type shoe for turf and the horse ran intermittently on the turf and a dirt track, it would mean frequent changing of the shoes back and forth, which of course wouldn't be of advantage to the horse's foot. I think we should attempt to answer the first question first: Should the type of shoes be controlled for races on the turf? I hardly know whom to ask first. I don't think any of us has had enough experience to tell, and the only people who probably would be concerned at the moment would be the operators of the race track, who have to keep the turf in condition for racing.

MR. ROBB: Maybe Ogden Phipps can help. Didn't National Steeplechase and

Hunt group make a recommendation to us that no toes be allowed on shoes?

MR. PHIPPS: I don't know.

MR. ROBB: I think I have that letter in the office. They recommended themselves that no toes be allowed.

MR. VANDERBILT: The French have in the scales room at Longchamps a board with what is allowed and what is not allowed.

MR. CASSIDY: They do then restrict it?

MR. VANDERBILT: Yes.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you remember what is allowed?

MR. WINFREY: It was all types of rim shoes that were allowed. There were various types, some with holds on each side and things like that. But there was no kind of a grab that was allowed as on the shoes that we use in this country.

MR. CASSIDY: That's on the turf?

MR. WINFREY: Yes, but they have some dirt racing, too. I was wondering if they used a toe on their dirt racing. I don't know where it is, either England or France has some dirt racing, I understand.

MR. CASSIDY: I think in England it is almost universal that they have turf racing.

MR. CASSIDY: Hirsch, you raced in California, how is it handled there?

MR. JACOBS: Well, I'll tell you, in California they didn't allow any toes. They had to be smooth shod. I believe I suggested it to Jimmy last fall, and they had them all smooth and everybody was equal. And the turf, you'd walk out there after a race, they didn't cut it up. You might cut a little, but the turf stayed good the whole season. And it's fair for everybody and good for the horse, too, as far as that goes. Although I think the horses run better with toes on.

MR. CASSIDY: Would you advocate a ruling that horses be required to run without toes?

MR. JACOBS: I wouldn't let anybody run on the grass with toes. Make everybody run equal.

MR. ROBB: Stephen Clark told me that over at Cheltenham last year where they don't allow anything but rim plates, he saw a couple of horses go down because they had had an extremely dry spell, the grass was very dry and slippery, but they had to go up a slight incline on this English course and they went down because they didn't have anything to grab with. I don't think any of our American tracks have any hills of that sort to begin with, but we do get dry spells. I notice sometimes at the tail end of the Belmont meeting it gets pretty dry and slippery. And the trainers can tell better than I can just what the effect of a dry, hard grass course would be. Under ordinary conditions I would certainly say that the rim plates or toeless shoes would be better.

MR. CASSIDY: Anybody else? Let's get back to Question No. 12: "What effect would the frequent changing of shoes to race on turf today and soil tomorrow and turf back again the next day—of course, they wouldn't race that frequently, but I mean theoretically speaking—what effect would that have on a horse's foot?"

MR. GOETTESHEIM: My answer to that, Mr. Cassidy, is, to change the shoes on a horse, you'd have to have the nail holes almost the same. The majority of horses will not stand too much nailing. Of course, you find a few that you could put them on every second day and be all right, but the majority will not stand all that nailing. In a short while you have a lot of holes in a horse's foot.

MR. CASSIDY: Is that your opinion, Jim?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, and the foot doesn't grow out fast enough to take care of it.

MR. CASSIDY: Does anybody have anything he wants to say?

MR. F. KILROE: There's a further problem that we didn't encounter last winter

but we were worried about it all the time. In the case of real bad weather we'd have to take the race off the turf. You'd have your horses supposedly shod for the turf race and you'd have to get them ready for the mud.

MR. CASSIDY: That's true, and you also sometimes as late as twelve o'clock have to change from one track to the other. That of course brings another equation into any regulation against using toes or caulks on the turf. It's a problem I suppose which will have to be determined by experience as it goes along. Francis, do you have any ideas on it?

MR. DUNNE: No. When I was training horses they didn't wear shoes.

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: You didn't wear shoes, either.

(Laughter)

The next one is an old subject being brought up:

QUESTION No. 13. "WHAT IS BEING DONE TO DEVELOP NEW BLACKSMITHS?"

MR. CASSIDY: We discussed it in New York, and we discussed it again in Kentucky, and at the time it was discussed in Kentucky I thought that they had a pretty fertile field and many opportunities for developing young blacksmiths because they have so many horses on the farms there and also horses not in training, so that they could afford to let a novice learn by working on the feet and shoes when it was of no great importance as to what effect it would have, that is, temporary effect. We have tried several ways to develop young blacksmiths and of course it is very difficult. The opportunities for him to get experience are very limited and when he works with one of our regular blacksmiths, no owner or trainer is going to let a novice shoe a horse. He isn't going to get the proper training he needs to go out on his own and be, you might say, licensed as a blacksmith. There have been some courses started, I think one started in Kentucky, and the report we heard was that the men who came out were almost extreme novices because they didn't have practical experience in working on horses' feet, isn't that right?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: You cannot learn the trade in ninety days.

MR. CASSIDY: I think it is acknowledged that you're getting old.

(Laughter)

You're almost as old as I am, but I don't think any of us is as old as Francis Dunne. Anyhow there is a need for young blacksmiths and even though we're trying, I don't think sufficient effort has been made. What can be done, how can we do it?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: We spoke about that, I believe, down at Jamaica.

MR. CASSIDY: That's right.

MR. GOETTESHEIM: We were trying some way, the last time I think I spoke to you about it, to see if we couldn't get some old fellow, who was too old to work as a horseshoer, to open up a school and teach some of the young fellows. Then the problem came up, if I remember right, of getting the horses to work on. I took it up with the international, and they wouldn't give me any satisfaction on it. They said they didn't know if anything could be done about taking a man and putting him in that work. But I thought we could overcome that if we could find a place and horses to be used. That seemed to be the biggest problem—to get horses to work on.

MR. CASSIDY: You'd run out of horses pretty quickly using them just for educational purposes.

MR. BOWER: Some four or five years ago there was a little dissatisfaction with the shoeing conditions around Lexington and an effort was made to interest the University of Kentucky in starting a school for horseshoers. They were very cooperative. They liked the idea and would go along with it, and the breeders went so

far as to bring in a retired Army sergeant who was then at the horseshoeing school at Fort Riley, a man with considerable experience in shoeing, and who had a lot of experience at teaching. But then the local situation solved itself and people lost interest in it. I think that can be revived. The horses are there, there are plenty of mares to work on. I don't know whether a breeder would let a novice work on his young horses, his yearlings, but I am sure there are a lot of mares around there that need trimming all the time and could stand maybe plating in the front. I think the whole thing could be revived. I don't know what would happen to these young men who were turned out, though, if they weren't accepted by the union. They would have the rudiments of the trade, but what would become of them?

MR. CASSIDY: As far as the union is concerned and our relation with this division here in New York, I'm sure that if any young blacksmith could pass the examination he would be accepted for admission.

MR. GOETTESHEIM: Mr. Cassidy, when he takes an examination, we want to make sure that he's qualified to shoe a horse. Now if you've got a horse, say you're making a living with him, you don't want to take a chance on a young fellow, if he doesn't know what he's doing. Now the examination that we give isn't too difficult. We ask him to make a set of shoes and put them on. If you can do that, there's no question about being admitted to the union. But the young fellow who comes in there after ninety days, he doesn't know enough about making a shoe, fitting it to the horse and putting it on. And it's for the people's protection that we have somebody who is qualified to shoe a horse. Therefore we insist upon them taking that examination.

MR. CASSIDY: That's definitely true that there is a responsibility there to have the work done properly, but the young fellow who comes in to take the examination, you say you have him make a set of shoes? Are there many shoes made today?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: Oh, yes.

MR. CASSIDY: By the blacksmiths?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: Yes.

MR. CASSIDY: Aren't the majority of shoes ready-made shoes that are fitted?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: There is a ready-made shoe, I believe you can buy them at, what's that name?

MR. CASSIDY: Thyben's?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: Yes, they send them from the factory. But there are quite a few shoes made.

MR. CASSIDY: I thought that was a lost art. Do many people make shoes yet?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: They all have to make shoes.

MR. O'CONNELL: There are three trip hammers in New York alone, Mr. Cassidy. One at Belmont Park.

MR. CASSIDY: I didn't realize it was continued to that extent. Would it be of any value to have all horses that have been destroyed or that have died to have their feet taken off for material to work on?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: You've got to have live horses. Of course you could explain it to them all right, but as far as driving nails—

MR. CASSIDY: I mean, that could be the last part of their training.

MR. GOETTESHEIM: Once you take the hoof off, it begins to shrivel, and gets hard and dried up. And it would be hard to get a nail in it in the first place. I doubt if I could drive one in.

MR. CASSIDY: But it certainly would be of value if you had it for training.

MR. GUSHEN: I think the problem lies in a different direction, whether it be a blacksmith, a veterinarian or anything else. I think they do a lot of practicing on dead animals in order to get their basic training. The problem in my estimation as far as blacksmiths are concerned is no different than in anything else. You can take

a veterinary surgeon and have him come out of a school and he'll take an examination and he will pass his examination, but still and all how many horsemen would want to trust their good horses into the care of a veterinary surgeon who has not established himself? I think the same thing applies as far as blacksmiths are concerned. The situation resolves itself around this, that the blacksmiths themselves should take qualified apprentices and teach them. In other words, they should help them. If an apprentice came to me or to anybody else and wanted to shoe a horse I probably would be just as reluctant as anybody else, but if this apprentice came with this man, and this man was with him and he stood and watched him and he told him that this is the way something is done and if he made a mistake he'd say, "Don't do it that way," in that way the man, whose horse it is, would get the proper kind of shoeing, and at the same time the man would get the kind of experience that he needs. But I estimate that the horseshoers themselves are responsible for this condition because they don't want to take anybody on and teach them. That's the situation. You've got to get practical experience, because, as this gentleman says, you can take a man and they give him a test and say he's qualified, but then they leave him on his own and that man can't get any practical experience because nobody is going to trust the horses to his care.

MR. GOETTESHEIM: You say the blacksmiths don't want to take a man and break him in. Well, I can explain that to you. By the time we take a boy for three years, it costs us between \$7,000 and \$7,200 to carry that boy for three years and the day that he takes his examination he can't shoe a horse for me. Now why should I take a stranger in and invest \$7,200 where I can't get a nickel out? I broke my own boy in, I can afford to give my own something, but I can't afford to give a stranger the same thing.

MR. GUSHEN: There's your basic problem. I'm sure everyone realizes, he took his own son and broke him in. I would do the same thing and so would everybody in here because it's his own son and he invested a lot of time into making him a good blacksmith. Now the problem is, what can be done to compensate these people for all the time and effort that they put into making a blacksmith?

MR. CASSIDY: We agreed to do that.

MR. GUSHEN: To the blacksmiths?

MR. CASSIDY: In New York a couple of years ago the New York racing associations and the HBPA agreed to provide the amount of money necessary to underwrite the expenses to train an apprentice.

MR. GUSHEN: What was the objection?

MR. CASSIDY: What became of it, I don't know.

MR. O'CONNELL: I know. The HBPA withdrew their agreement.

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: I didn't know that.

MR. GUSHEN: I don't blame these men, Mr. Cassidy, for not devoting three years, two years or one year for practical teaching and trying to make a good blacksmith, if they can't be compensated for it. But I think there's your problem right there. No blacksmith is going to amount to anything unless he's taught and taught properly no more than a veterinarian or any doctor. He has to do actual work before he can become ready to go out on his own. I think there's the problem. Something should be done to subsidize these people to a certain extent where they will be able to get the practical experience.

MR. CASSIDY: It seems to me that that might be the responsibility of the horsemen for whom the blacksmiths will eventually work and the racing associations who need the horsemen.

MR. GUSHEN: I'll agree to that.

MR. CASSIDY: That's just my opinion.

MR. GUSHEN: It's mine, too.

MR. GOETTESHEIM: I'd just like to say a word if I'm not out of order. After we break a boy in—this is something I've wanted to say many a time—after we break a boy in and he goes out on his own, he gets a little work in the spring of the year and when the oldtimers come back, of course, it goes right back to what I said before, you can't blame the man because he's making a living with that horse, he's a good horse, they'll say, "Now I don't want any hard feelings, but I want to get a man with a little more experience." Well, how is he going to get experience if they're going to treat him that way? That's the hard thing after the boy has put in three years. There are a certain few—Mr. Jacobs is one—who took a boy in right after he took his examination and he put him to work. But they are very few and far between.

MR. JACOBS: I think the only way, I think the big stables should have their blacksmiths take an apprentice on, and let them pay the apprentice. I've done it. Probably if he had maybe one or two a year, even, I think eventually you'd get new blacksmiths that way as time went on. I think that's the only way to do it, though. The stable would have to pay him. It's no benefit to the blacksmith. He's getting no benefit out of it in any way, shape or form. All he's getting is there's going to be another competitor, that's all he's eventually going to get.

MR. CASSIDY: This is the third time in a conference we've discussed this thing, and we are no further advanced today than we were when we started. I think the need is increasing tremendously. That's all for you two unless you have something you'd like to say. Thank you very much for coming over.

MR. GOETTESHEIM: You're welcome, I'm sure.

MR. GUSHEN: Mr. Cassidy, may I ask this gentleman a question? I just want to know for my own information. Is or isn't it true that the blacksmiths union has a quota as to how many apprentices or how many people they allow into the union in any one year?

MR. GOETTESHEIM: Certainly not.

MR. CASSIDY: Thank you, Larry. Thank you, Jim.

MR. CASSIDY: Will you ask the Jockey Agent to come in, please?

(Jockey Agent Goldwin Mitchell joined the group.)

MR. CASSIDY: You're going to be on the spot. You're the only jockey agent here. We have two questions. One, which we have partially discussed, is the question of naming the jockey at the time of making entry and not permitting a change thereafter. In other words, when the entry is made, that's final. That is the system in use in California, as you know. It has been discussed a little bit here and we would like to know what effect it would have in New York on the riders. I'm sure you know most of the reasons why it is good, that is, giving that information to the press in time to be in the papers the night before so that people can analyze and consider the races in the evening before the day of the races, and encourage attendance at the track.

MR. MITCHELL: I guess that would be a selling point, but it has its bad points too because sometimes a man is hurried into putting a rider on a horse, that he hasn't consulted the owner about, and then he has to take that rider off. It puts him in an embarrassing position.

MR. CASSIDY: You mean the trainer?

MR. MITCHELL: Yes, the trainer. And sometimes it stops you from working a little harder because you've got all afternoon to work in, the work is all completed in a little while in the morning.

MR. CASSIDY: That shouldn't be a bad feature.

MR. MITCHELL: I know it shouldn't be bad, but you have a chance of picking up some mounts in the afternoon, if you're on the job and your rider is riding. Personally, I don't see anything against it outside of that. I was in California on two occasions, in 1934 and 1935 and just three years ago. They didn't have it the first year, but they have it now and it seems to have worked out all right there, especially with the newsmen, they seem to appreciate it very much.

MR. CASSIDY: How do you think the better type riders would react to that? The boys who are in the greatest demand.

MR. MITCHELL: I don't think they'd take it badly, at all. I think they'd take it right in stride.

MR. CASSIDY: How do you think it would affect the middle class rider?

MR. MITCHELL: It's pretty hard to say. You see, if a man is rushed to put a rider on a horse, sometimes he, well, if so-and-so is available, he puts him on, but if he's not, he wants time to think it over, and he might not have that time. Supposing there's an also eligible list. I believe it's the rule out there to permit you to put a boy on only one horse and also on one on the eligible list, and you can't take him off. I don't believe it would work any hardship.

MR. CASSIDY: You think it would be workable?

MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.

MR. CASSIDY: Does anybody else want to comment on that? We discussed it a little while ago. Does anybody have anything more to say?

QUESTION No. 14. "HOW CAN JOCKEY ENGAGEMENTS BE HANDLED TO ELIMINATE THE BRUSH-OFF BY AGENTS UNTIL THEY HAVE SELECTED THE HORSES THEY WANT?"

MR. CASSIDY: Well, that's the same thing. If you had this California rule, there wouldn't be the question of not giving a man an answer until you found the best horse you could get for your rider.

MR. MITCHELL: It isn't that easy. There are a lot of horses you'd like to ride and your rider would like to have you get him on, but it isn't that easy because certain owners use certain riders regardless. If you're going to ride the good ones you must also ride the bad ones, the ones that don't appear so good.

MR. CASSIDY: That wasn't quite the question. The question is to eliminate the fact that you may have four people in the race that you ride for, and one of them has a very good horse that maybe you want to ride—I'm not speaking of you as an individual, I'm speaking of you as an agent—if one of those four with not too good a horse came to you, you'd say, well, I can't tell you now, I'll tell you later.

MR. MITCHELL: Well, they don't take that answer.

MR. CASSIDY: They don't?

MR. MITCHELL: They come over to you and you mark it right down then and there. The average trainer doesn't want any run-around.

MR. CASSIDY: How about the man who comes to the agent with a good horse, and the agent goes to the man who has already engaged the boy and says, "My boy can ride this horse in this race, it means quite a good deal to him. Is it all right with you if I change?" It's intimidation getting the man to change his rider.

MR. MITCHELL: Well, that happens rarely.

MR. CASSIDY: It does happen, though.

MR. MITCHELL: It does and has happened, but the average trainer, if you do that to him once, he's a little skeptical about you from then on, and you're almost finished riding for that particular stable.

MR. CASSIDY: I think that the system of naming them at time of entry would eliminate that possibility, wouldn't it?

MR. MITCHELL: I don't think it would, no.

MR. CASSIDY: Why?

MR. MITCHELL: Because in certain cases, it would make you change anyway. If a man had a good boy who was sick, or if he was called out of town, or he had to go out of town to ride a horse in another state, he'd still have to give the trainer a chance to get another rider.

MR. CASSIDY: That isn't quite the problem. This is a case of knowing what horses are going in, or are in, and entries have come out and no-boy is on him and you want to get the best mount you possibly can.

MR. MITCHELL: Of course the book as you have it here, if a man has first call, he has it.

MR. CASSIDY: It's listed in the book.

MR. MITCHELL: And he knows whether he has first call. If he has second, he knows generally who the first is. Unless the man might tell you, "I'm running a real good horse," and you just put "Smith" down, because he wants the race to fill, which is only right. Well, he knows perfectly well he has you or he hasn't.

MR. CASSIDY: That's with you, that's true, Goldie, but there are others with whom it's not so true.

MR. MITCHELL: Well, I don't know of any that do it wrong, sir.

MR. WOODHOUSE: Mr. Cassidy, each agent has to take his book up and have the clerk of the scales stamp it. Isn't that a safeguard in that respect?

MR. CASSIDY: Well, you'd be surprised how many controversies have to be settled as to who had the first call. Even though they put it in the book and it is supposed to be recorded in ink. It's as good as anything we've found.

MR. PHIPPS: Certain owners or trainers who are not in big stables cannot get the top jockeys.

MR. CASSIDY: It's hard to get them, yes.

MR. PHIPPS: The agent can always say, "My rider doesn't want to ride all eight races today."

MR. ARCARO: I don't want to ride the entire card any day.

MR. PHIPPS: Therefore, you have a perfect out.

MR. ARCARO: Yes, but I think they should have the privilege of refusing. They say, "My rider is on enough horses. I don't want him to ride any more."

MR. MITCHELL: Quite often a trainer will come to you and he'll say, "Now, I'm going to run a horse in the second race. Have you got a mount in there?" You look in your book—no. "Now, if you can get a good mount in there, take it, because the horse I'm running in there, any person can ride him, and I'd like so and so to make the money himself." Well, that gives you a little leeway.

MR. CASSIDY: Of course there are many ways that they can avoid an issue by saying, "I've got a tentative engagement, and I can't tell you until I see the other man." There are so many ways they can get around it.

MR. MITCHELL: Most all your trainers will wait. They'll give you a chance to go see the man and see if he's going to go for sure.

MR. GUSHEN: Mr. Cassidy, is there such a thing as a tentative engagement for a jockey or rider?

MR. CASSIDY: Well, a man says, "I think I'm going to run this horse tomorrow. I want your boy if I run him."

MR. GUSHEN: Isn't that a little bit unfair if a man says, "I think I'm going to run the horse tomorrow?" Doesn't he know if he's going to run him or not? At the same time he's exacting a promise from the agent, and he may not run his horse and at the same time somebody else who definitely knows he's going to run his horse will not be able to get that rider.

MR. CASSIDY: He also may not get in, even though he wants to run.

MR. GUSHEN: But that can't be helped.

MR. JACOBS: You take a good agent, he's not going to mark his book up for the first one that comes along. If he's got a good rider he's going to have him on all the bad horses. And naturally, if someone comes along, and wants his rider, even though he hasn't got it marked in there, or he might put a few marks, a few names of someone he knows, he might put them on down, and say, "Well, I've got a call in there." And you happen to have a good horse, he'll probably say, "All right, you can have him—this fellow probably won't run in there." Or something of that sort. But if he marked the first one up that came along, he'd be in an awful fix. He'd ride all the bad horses. And they've got to protect themselves that way, too.

MR. MITCHELL: Well, when a proof comes out, a proof is generally there two or three days in advance of the book, a horseman can go in there and look at the proof, as a rule. And if he comes up to you and says, "Now there's a race, I think it's the second day, watch out for a certain race for me when the book does come out." And you do that—see so and so. That seems to work out all right. I've never heard any complaints.

MR. CASSIDY: Anybody else want to say anything about it? Thanks very much, Goldie.

QUESTION No. 15. "SHOULD THERE BE A NATIONAL CLEARANCE OF A TRAINER'S QUALIFICATIONS FOR A LICENSE?"

MR. CASSIDY: That of course is a matter entirely for the National Association of State Racing Commissioners on a national basis, and the local commissions on a local basis. The only way we could discuss the problem is as to whether it is desirable, and I imagine everybody might think it is desirable, so that a man doesn't have to take an examination every place. On the other hand, there are a variety of qualifications in different places, the qualifications of a trainer in Charles Town, West Virginia, might be a little different from Pimlico or some place else. So although I think it is generally desirable to not have to go in and qualify at each place, I don't know how you are ever going to get away from it.

MR. PHIPPS: Would a trainer who has a license here in New York have to take a trainer's examination at Hialeah?

MR. CASSIDY: I wouldn't be able to tell you, but I think he might.

MR. DUNNE: Where's Cal? Do they have examinations down in Hialeah?

MR. RAINEY: Yes, anyone who applies for a license for the first time.

MR. PHIPPS: Even though he has one in New York?

MR. RAINEY: No, if he had one in New York we would not require him to take an examination.

MR. CASSIDY: That's the point we're getting at. In some places where they are satisfied that the standards are the same, they would accept them.

MR. GUSHEN: Isn't it a fact that if a man is a trainer in New York or Illinois or somewhere else that that trainer's license holds good in other states?

MR. CASSIDY: Definitely not. I'll tell you a reason that will explain it to you. I think for probably twenty years or more New York was the only place that ever gave a man an examination. Then it extended to other states.

MR. GUSHEN: I'm talking about an examination for a license. I'm not talking about an application.

MR. CASSIDY: That's what I'm talking about.

MR. GUSHEN: If I, as a trainer, raced in New York and in Illinois, and say some place else for many years, and then for the first time went down to Maryland, I would have to take an examination?

MR. CASSIDY: Let's reverse it, let's take New England if you like: Massachu-

setts, New Hampshire and Rhode Island. If you had a license in all three of those states up there, and you came to Hialeah, you'd have to take an examination. The only state I know of that has received recognition in respect to the qualifications of trainers is New York—and I don't know of any others, as a matter of fact. I may be wrong now because we haven't been licensing for two or three years.

MR. DUNNE: You can have it back.

(Laughter)

MR. GUSHEN: Mr. Cassidy, you mean when he goes there for the first time?

MR. CASSIDY: Yes. After he's once had the license he doesn't have to take the examination over. Does anyone have any other comments on it? I don't know as we could ever do anything about it, no matter what the comments were.

MR. DRAYTON: I don't think you could do anything anyway because his other qualifications might change from year to year.

MR. CASSIDY: That's another problem, too.

QUESTION No. 16. "A STATE HAS RECENTLY PASSED A RULE PROVIDING THAT ALL STAKE ENGAGEMENTS GO WITH A CLAIMED HORSE. WHY SHOULD AN OWNER BE REQUIRED TO TRANSFER A VALUABLE ASSET WHICH IS NOT PART OF THE HORSE ITSELF?"

MR. DUNNE: I think it's a wonderful rule. I'm in favor of it.

MR. CASSIDY: Go ahead and tell us about it.

MR. DUNNE: It isn't a valuable asset, anyway. It's just an asset for that horse. If you're stupid enough to run a horse in a claiming race that's in a stake next week, and I'm smart enough to claim him, I ought to get to run him in the stake. I think this is foolish, all this stuff about transferring stake engagements when you sell a horse. I think they should automatically go with the horse. We had an instance here a few years ago. Sam Riddle sold a horse to a fellow and wouldn't sell him the stake engagements. I think that was preposterous. I think we should make this thing simple and intelligent. If a man buys a horse, the stake engagements should go with him. If he claims the horse, they go with him.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Jacobs?

MR. JACOBS: I think it's all right if you have the rule that way. But too often, I know I had a horse claimed from me right at Aqueduct, a jumper, Woodberry. He was in a few stakes, and he asked me if he could have them and I told him he could. I said, "Just pay me what I paid for the engagements." He said, "All right, I'll take it." He ran the horse a few days later, I signed the slip and all for him, the horse broke down. He never took it then, he never signed it. Last year I lost Bob O'Boy in Florida and Leigh Cotton asked me if he could have the engagements. He wanted to run him in the Belmont, he thought he could get fourth money in it. I said, "Just pay me the \$100 it cost me to nominate him and you can have it." And he paid me the \$100 and I signed it over to him. I think at least the man should pay the nominating fee, anyhow.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think he's entitled to the engagement?

MR. JACOBS: If he pays the nominating fee I think he's entitled to it.

MR. DUNNE: Why should he pay it? You paid it once.

MR. CASSIDY: Well, I'll take the opposite side of it because I think that the stake engagement is not part of the horse. It is something that the man pays for. It adds an additional value to the horse, other than the horse itself. I think it would promote claiming, not that I have any objection to claiming. But I think a man would claim a horse for the fact that he has another attraction besides his ability to run. You talk about a man losing his horse before he has a chance to determine how good he is. That's an encouragement to anybody to take the horse away from the

man as he has something more of value than his racing qualities. That's just my opinion.

MR. GUSHEN: I'm just wondering what possible value can a man have in a certain engagement, once he lost the horse? What value is it to him? It's of no value to him at all.

MR. CASSIDY: None whatsoever.

MR. GUSHEN: Well, when a man buys a yearling and the yearling is nominated for certain stakes as a yearling, they go with the horse, don't they?

MR. CASSIDY: You buy him with that condition of sale.

MR. GUSHEN: I don't see any reason why that shouldn't go with it.

MR. E. KILROE: I agree very definitely with Francis. It seems to me that the engagements should go with the horse. They are of no value to the former owner, except as a wedge for him to get something that he never expected to get. Because he's dead as soon as he loses the horse, anyway. And all he can do is hope to shake down the man who claimed the horse for some consideration for keeping the horse eligible.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think his equipment should go with him, too?

MR. E. KILROE: Well, all the vitamins he had before, naturally.

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: How about the vitamins in the bottle on the shelf?

MR. VENDERBILT: I disagree with you 100%. I don't think that the stake engagement is an accessory. I think that when you make a stake engagement you make a horse eligible for a race and I think the sound thinking is that that horse is then eligible for that race and can run in that race regardless of who owns him. I don't think there should be any question of a man's rights to stake engagements. I think it came about, the history of it was when we used to race under forfeits, when you had to charge a fellow for them. Now that you pay cash when you enter it, there shouldn't be any question about it. That horse is eligible and that's all there is to it.

MR. CASSIDY: That sounds reasonable.

MR. ROBB: And from the public's standpoint, if a horse is capable of running in a stakes, why should the public be deprived of seeing that horse in the stakes, especially, as Mr. Gushen pointed out, the stake engagements are of no value whatsoever to the man who previously owned him.

MR. CASSIDY: The fact that the public might be accustomed to seeing a horse run in a stake, I don't think that's important.

MR. ROBB: Not accustomed, but if a horse that could run, and possibly win a stakes wasn't allowed to run because the previous owner had not passed the stake engagements on, then the public is being deprived of the privilege of seeing the horse run in stakes.

MR. CASSIDY: Well, the argument that I think is strong as opposed to my thought is Alfred's. A horse is made eligible for a race, irrespective of a man's plans.

MR. GUSHEN: Suppose the same thing applied to yearlings. Suppose Howard or Mr. Vanderbilt bought a yearling or two-year-old eligible for certain stake races, and the same thing applied to two-year-olds, and then you found that this horse is a real good horse, eligible for stakes. And then when the man bought the horse this fellow would say, "This horse is liable to win this \$50,000 stake. You better give me \$5,000 or \$10,000 before I'll let you run him or transfer it to you." I think it would lead to a lot of unnecessary collusion, or anything else that you want to call it. I think when you're buying something or claiming something, it's just part of one thing and I think it should go with it.

MR. CASSIDY: That yearling business is part of the sale, normally. That's part of his attraction, it's advertised. When you buy a yearling, it's usually advertised

what stakes he's in, and that increases his value accordingly. The number of stakes he's been entered in increases his value.

MR. GUSHEN: I don't know whether it increases a horse's value or not.

MR. CASSIDY: There's a breeder sitting right beside you, ask him.

MR. REINEMAN: That's the purpose of it, to make it more attractive to the buyer. I will say that in a few cases I would rather have the money that I spent, than wind up with the horse.

MR. F. KILROE: I'm thinking from the point of view of the racing secretary and the association, I think the more horses you can keep eligible for a stake race, the better off you are. I go with Alfred's thinking and my brother's, you're selling horses as much in claiming races as you're selling them in an auction sale.

MR. BURKE: It's just a remnant of the old forfeit list, as Alfred said, where a man had to transfer these engagements, not only transfer them, but the man who got the horse had to accept them. Otherwise there would be forfeit charges against his horse and he might say, "Well, I don't want to have to pay those forfeits. I just wanted the horse." I think the rule now where the stake engagements go with the horse is the only common sense way to arrange it.

MR. WINFREY: There have been cases where horses have been nominated for stakes to make them a little bit salable. So if a man is going to do that, he should certainly risk the stake engagements with the claiming price.

MR. JACOBS: How about the rule here. It still holds. You've got to transfer the engagements. I think it would be a good idea then to see that that was changed.

QUESTION No. 17. "APART FROM BELMONT PARK'S ESCALATORS, IS ANYTHING PAST THE DRAWING-BOARD STAGE TO ENABLE NEW YORK TRACKS TO MEET COMPETITION, ESPECIALLY FROM NEW JERSEY?"

MR. DUNNE: Who can answer that?

(Laughter)

MR. O'BRIEN: I think our public relations questions all revolved around that one item this morning. While our New York tracks are not what they should be, there are so many problems involved, it's a matter of policy to be determined by the Directors what exactly should be done. I think none of us here can speak for our Board of Directors and tell you exactly what's on their minds. We do have blueprints, and lots of them, and more being made. I read about it in the Racing Form only the day before yesterday. Oscar Otis had a column on it stating Mr. Froehlich was drawing up plans on Jamaica and Aqueduct. I do think the New York tracks need to have something done, but there's a little more than just what profit you're making, it's a question of the large amount of capital required to do that work. It's beyond all our expectations because of the costs involved.

MR. LYNCH: Inasmuch as this new race track situation is in the not foreseeable future and the talk about twenty-five millions and things like that, what can be done to bring them a little bit up to date, let us say?

MR. O'BRIEN: Such plans are also in the making, as alternate plans—I think that also was in Mr. Otis' column—in the event it is found not practical to construct a complete new plant because of the large capital investment. However, this again is a policy matter for the Directors of each association. Which plans, if any, might be acceptable to the respective Boards, I cannot say. I agree with Mr. Vanderbilt's comments this morning that we must make our tracks more comfortable and more attractive for our patrons. I believe our entire public relations depend on such improvements.

MR. LAUDER: May I ask a question? Mr. Jullien has said that he had an idea

for Aqueduct, and I know that there has been an architect surveying and resurveying and looking and relooking all over the place. Can you tell us without overstepping any bounds what has been done on Mr. Jullien's idea for Aqueduct, of moving the stable area and pushing the track back?

MR. E. KILROE: The studies are underway now, and we probably will have some report within the next sixty days, I guess. I think you all know that we have been studying this problem extensively and expensively for several years. We talked about blueprints as though they were something that we got for nothing. We spent a lot of money on these studies, and we've been putting money out now for three or four years. We found people that we think are competent and can give us the best advice, and until their studies are submitted to our Boards there's nothing that either Luke or I can talk about.

MR. LAUDER: Do any of these blueprints concern possible changes in the present set-up of the track to make them more comfortable, and acceptable possibly to the customers, more conveniences and so forth, without the idea of completely knocking it down and building a brand new track.

MR. E. KILROE: That's an alternative plan. But I think we would all like to do the complete job, if it is feasible.

MR. LYNCH: Let me ask you this, Mr. Kilroe. What's the possibility of ever getting a new track?

MR. E. KILROE: Echo will answer that one.

(Laughter)

MR. HORWOOD: In that article of Oscar Otis's, it spoke of a new conception of race track construction. It was a little vague. It spoke of garden spaces and so forth. Evidently the idea was that instead of building an elaborate stand somehow or other a new track would be built to give a lot of sitting down space and a lot of walking around space and for comparatively little expense. I couldn't understand it in the article and I wondered if anyone else did.

MR. O'BRIEN: What he must have meant was for California or Florida or some such place.

MR. HORWOOD: It seemed to be a little different than that.

MR. O'BRIEN: I would say, so far as Jamaica is concerned, where you race in the spring and fall, such type of track wouldn't have any merit at all, due to weather conditions.

QUESTION No. 18. "SHOULD AN OWNER OR TRAINER BE SUSPENDED IF HE FAILS TO PAY HIS JUST LABOR OR RACING BILLS?"

MR. CASSIDY: I don't know why he should be. I know the policy in New York for a great many years is that it is none of our business. I don't think the commission feels that it is.

MR. DUNNE: It's bad enough being broke without being suspended.

(Laughter)

MR. O'BRIEN: The laws of the State of New York provide adequate remedies enabling persons who sell material and furnish labor to collect their claims.

MR. CASSIDY: I don't see how it is any obligation of racing.

MR. ARCARO: I think it is an obligation of racing, Mr. Cassidy.

MR. CASSIDY: I knew you would.

MR. ARCARO: I have my little business there and I think it is an obligation of racing. People run up feed bills, buy tack, and don't pay their bills. If they ran up a hotel bill, the hotel owners would be writing letters to you or the racing commission trying to collect their money. That's certainly a knock against racing.

MR. CASSIDY: The hotel owner writing a letter to the man who beat him out

of a bill would be the same as you writing a letter to the man who didn't pay your bill.

MR. ARCARO: But you said you didn't think racing was responsible for the fellows running up bills and not paying them.

MR. CASSIDY: No. I think they're definitely responsible. But I said, "Should they be suspended if they haven't paid their labor or feed bills?"

MR. ARCARO: I think they should.

MR. O'BRIEN: I don't think we should get involved in bill collecting or putting on pressure to pay just debts. I think there's enough in the ordinary process of the laws, particularly in New York State, to enable employees and others to obtain what they are entitled to. Before taking any action we would have to investigate all the facts. This would place an unnecessary burden on our officials.

MR. ARCARO: I still think it's a responsibility that racing should take care of itself.

MR. O'BRIEN: I think consideration ought to be given, when he's issued a license, to the fact whether he's financially responsible, that's all, but not for the purpose of making him pay his bills.

MR. CASSIDY: There's a group in New York composed of merchants who sell medication for horses, equipment, food, saddlery and things like that. The organization acts as a collection agency and the failure of anyone to pay is circulated. If they fail to pay you and you report it to your organization, that man is cut off from credit with everyone in your group.

MR. ARCARO: I know there are two or three, I wouldn't mention their names, they'll start at Thyben and run up a bill, then they'll come right next door to my place and run up a bill and then they go to Elmont Vet and run up a bill.

MR. CASSIDY: Whose fault is that? That's the fault of your organization.

MR. ARCARO: There is no organization. Thyben and I might work together but we might not be able to get Elmont Vet to work along with us.

MR. DUNNE: They have a Horsemen's Credit Association.

MR. ARCARO: I don't think it works very good.

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: Well, don't blame us for that! I think the best answer to your problem, Eddie, is to turn your unpaid bills over to your collection agency. Then they are cut off from credit every place. They can't ship horses on the vans, if they don't pay their bills.

MR. JACOBS: The blacksmiths have something. If you don't pay one, nobody else will shoe your horse.

QUESTION No. 19. "IS IT EVER NECESSARY TO WHIP A HORSE OVER THE HEAD WHEN IT IS RUNNING OUT?"

MR. CASSIDY: This question would seem to come from me, simply because Eddie and Woody have been in the room when I've asked a lot of boys, when they've hit a horse over the head, why they did it. And I get a variety of answers, some of them good, some of them not good. What are you going to do when a horse starts running out and you think he's going through the fence, and you keep trying to pull him in? If you can't do it one way you've got to do it another. But I imagine this question was sent in because it is done many times and there is a danger in hitting a horse over the head. Is it possible by brute strength to keep a horse from running out?

MR. ARCARO: I've ridden a lot of horses I couldn't budge, in fact you couldn't even turn his head. I think hitting a horse over the head is the last resort always.

Many horses will be running out going to the turn and if you'll turn the reins loose and tap him, you might guide him around rather than pull him around.

MR. CASSIDY: He'll get a little mixed sometimes and go in just the opposite direction from it. Personally I think it's done too much, hitting a horse over the head with a whip. I think judiciously done, it might work.

MR. ARCARO: I think most riders use it as a last resort, and I think generally you have kept that pretty much under control.

MR. CASSIDY: Thank you. Does anybody have any remark to make, I don't mean on his last comment?

QUESTION No. 20. "IF PLASTIC GOGGLES ARE SATISFACTORY FOR JOCKEYS, WHY ARE THEY NOT PERMITTED ON BLINKERS FOR HORSES?"

MR. CASSIDY: The reason I don't think they are is because of the danger of their being befogged and clouded with mud and water. And dust, I suppose, sometimes. On the other hand, the jockey's goggles can become clouded as well and I think it's of greater importance that the jockey be able to see than it is for a horse. The jockey guides the horse. However, a jockey can take his goggles off if they get foggy, he can reach up and push them off. A horse can't. Is it advisable that plastic goggles be permitted on blinkers for horses? What do you think, Hirsch?

MR. JACOBS: That horse in California that won a \$100,000 race, Fleet Bird, he ran in plastic goggles. They might be successful for a horse that's running against that dirt. But you can't use them in mud. As you said, the boy can pull the goggles off, but a horse can't.

MR. CASSIDY: What do you think about it, Francis?

MR. DUNNE: I haven't thought about it much, but I think they'd be all right. Naturally you wouldn't use them for the mud, anyway.

MR. CASSIDY: I was just wondering what would be done if a horse had been advertised as running in blinkers or goggles like that, and then there was a late change brought about by the track becoming muddy suddenly.

MR. DUNNE: Take them off and make an announcement that he's not going to wear them.

MR. ARCARO: You've got to use so much water on our tracks in New York, that the dirt sticks. Out west where the tracks are more dusty, that stuff doesn't stick to the goggles. It never did work around New York.

MR. CASSIDY: It seems to be the consensus that plastic goggles work well other places, but not in New York because the sandy substance of the soil takes moisture to keep it together.

QUESTION No. 21. "COULD NOT A STANDARD PROHIBITION OF SMOKING IN THE ENTIRE BARN AREA BE PUT INTO EFFECT, THE SAME AS IT IS IN INDUSTRIAL PLANTS?"

MR. O'BRIEN: I don't think so, Marshall.

MR. CASSIDY: I was just going to say I don't think it's possible with the geographic set-up we have.

MR. O'BRIEN: First of all, the stable help live in the area, and naturally are on the grounds much longer than you are in industrial plants. In industrial plants you have your lunch and rest periods. I don't think it's practical. I think at the present time all stables are cooperating about smoking and I don't think it's desirable to put too many restrictions on them.

MR. CASSIDY: The only trouble about it, and this probably has nothing to do

with this question, but we found that despite the signs that are put up in the stables, despite the penalties that are imposed on grooms and others found smoking, we do not receive all the cooperation in the world from the trainers. They seem to be reluctant to impose any salary penalty on a man caught smoking, where he may be suspended for two days without salary. We still are having an unusual number of complaints about people smoking under the shed. What can be done to make them conscious of the fact that it has to be stopped?

MR. O'BRIEN: I disagree that the percentage is so high as far as our observation at Jamaica is concerned, and the number of reports that come in from Pinkerton's. There are very few violations. Most of them are errors of thoughtlessness on the part of the individual.

MR. DRAYTON: I devised a plan several years ago of appointing a watchman in each barn, one of their own employees, and I know the first report I got, it was working very well, but whether they followed that up since then, I don't know.

MR. JACOBS: I don't allow any of mine to smoke. At Jamaica, after we had that fire there, and they put that into effect, people were conscious of it, but after a while, it wears off. Luke, you found violations at Jamaica.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. In the case of a trainer, he had taken his pipe out and put it in his mouth, but he had not actually lit it. I believe he was about to, when I came by. He was more surprised than I was that he had the pipe in his mouth. I found another trainer with a cigarette. He had just gone over to the barn, and he had forgotten to put it out before he walked in. In the groom's case I think it was just thoughtlessness, too. We all make errors. But I don't think we should make life too miserable for them. With continued vigilance on the part of the trainers and everybody else together with our watchmen and patrols I think it is pretty well under control.

MR. JACOBS: I think it is around New York, but I was down at another track and they're walking horses around the sheds, kids and everyone else, cigarettes in their mouths. They've got big signs, but nobody to tell them anything. I was scared to death. Out west the same way. They've got signs, but they're all walking horses right around the barn with cigarettes. You see them walking in stalls the same way. After they have a fire, then they worry about it. Once you have a fire you get a little conscious of it, you get a little scared. But if you don't have a fire, you get a little careless.

MR. O'BRIEN: As time goes on they will get careless. It will have to be the vigilance on the part of the track police to keep them going. I do think that all stables and their employees have really tried to cooperate.

MR. JACOBS: I think the best thing of all, you've got to put the sprinkler system in, as Belmont Park did. Hollywood Park put it in.

MR. ROBB: In addition to the sprinkler system, we have a system of patrols. We have two men patrolling all the time, twenty-four hours a day, and then from four o'clock until eight A.M. we have patrol cars going in addition to all the precautions we have taken. We found that it has been cut down tremendously, and as Luke mentioned, when you do catch a man, quite frequently he doesn't know that he has a cigarette in his mouth.

MR. PHIPPS: The patrol cars are watching the smoking, and are not just to detect a fire, because a fire can get started so fast, before you can even notice it.

MR. ROBB: These patrols, their principal duty is to check on all the things we are doing to prevent fires, including smoking. They go right into the barns and if they see a man smoking, there is a weekly report on any incidents that occur. We have had no incidents in the matter of smoking for quite a long while. They are behaving themselves.

QUESTION No. 22. "WHAT IS A FAIR PERCENTAGE OF PURSE DISTRIBUTION TO BE DEVOTED TO STAKE RACES?"

MR. CASSIDY: I first would like to say that in my opinion that is entirely individual because certainly tracks like Santa Anita and Belmont Park and all other tracks that spend a lot of money and effort to attract the best horses in the country, must necessarily give a greater proportion of their purse distribution to stakes. And money they give in stake events is promotion of racing, not only in that state but throughout the country. A major stake is very important throughout the country. It brings horses' names before the people. It's made the horse a top television attraction. It has been brought about by large stakes, and the number of them, so that to determine what is a fair average or percentage is very hard. I couldn't get anything but the 1952 records on it, but I found it runs from Charles Town where they give no money to stakes, all the way up to 40 or 50%. Each track, its location, and its objectives, determine how much should be devoted to stakes. As long as the overnight purse distribution is adequate and in keeping with the caliber of horses that are there, and they keep expenses down, the stake program has to be determined by the policy of the association. I notice that at Santa Anita, in 1952, out of a total of \$2,239,865, the stakes were 36%. In New York and some places it's higher. Belmont Park is 35%. In all these cases the minimum purse and the daily overnight purse is high. I don't know who sent this in and I don't know what anyone else's idea may be. The question again is, "What is a fair percentage of purse distribution to be devoted to stake races." Francis Dunne, what do you think?

MR. DUNNE: I don't think there is any percentage basis. I agree with what you said. I don't see how you can say it ought to be a certain percentage. Take Tropical Park. Last year Christmas and New Year's were on Friday, the next day was Saturday, so we had two stakes. This year, thank God, they're on Saturday, so there are two less stakes. I don't think you can make a hard and fast rule.

MR. F. KILROE: I have some statistics on this year's distribution, and at one track in New York its percentage of total purses to stakes was 28%, whereas Belmont's fall meeting runs nearer 40%.

MR. ROBB: It ran 46.5% last year. The over-all average for last year was 37%.

MR. F. KILROE: Of course, I'm just talking about flat racing.

MR. ROBB: Santa Anita this year was 35%.

MR. F. KILROE: Hollywood only ran 31%, but they have a different problem. They have their horses there. Santa Anita is competing with other winter tracks for horses from all over the country.

MR. VANDERBILT: I agree that it is a local problem. It depends on what kind of racing you have. I think to stress stake itself is a kind of an anachronism, and I think that some day some race track is going to find out that they do a whole lot better with their stakes if they forget the definition of a stake, and close the stakes like they do an overnight race. The reason for stakes is when the associations didn't have enough money and they had to make the purse big enough from the owners' subscriptions. I think a \$10,000 or \$15,000 race shouldn't be called a stakes. It eliminates a whole lot of horses that wouldn't be eliminated if they closed within seventy-two hours.

MR. CASSIDY: Spencer, do you have anything to comment?

MR. DRAYTON: No, I don't.

MR. CASSIDY: Ed?

MR. E. KILROE: I think what you're trying to do is preserve a fair balance between distribution available for the top quality horses, to give the inducement to people to go out and buy and breed the best horses and still have enough money left over so that you can carry your day-to-day, run of the mill races. I've been surprised,

in checking back on the figures, that we do strike pretty much of an average around New York. We have about one-third of our total distribution going for stakes. And as far as I can see that keeps both the stake owners and the small horse owners contented.

MR. O'BRIEN: I think it is strictly a local matter, the question of whether the tracks are endeavoring to bring in all the better horses for stakes by putting up larger purses for their feature races. Large stake purses will attract good horses, the top horses. I think it's strictly a matter for the local associations to determine what amount of money and what type of purses to put up to attract the horsemen to their respective tracks.

MR. ROBB: I did some figuring. Stakes are an incentive and also a reward for the development of better horses. Some tracks have a larger proportion of better horses and necessarily they should have more stakes races to reward the better horses in the various classes, distance, middle distance, and according to sex. Obviously, the length of the meeting is a determining factor. A short meeting would have a higher percentage. And then I checked up. Belmont in the spring last year, 29% of its purses were stakes, 46.5% in the fall, because it was a very short meeting. The over-all percentage was 37%. Jamaica was 31% plus, Aqueduct 32% plus, Saratoga 29% plus, Garden State which did not have as many good horses as New York, 20%. That's interesting when you consider also what's being given in New York for overnights. Three of the New York tracks went over Garden State on the average overnight purse. Santa Anita this spring had just about the same percentage, 35%, of its purse distribution for stakes. This year, 1954, we will wind up about the same, except that our overnight average will be higher this year even than it was last year. And over the period of the past ten years, Belmont's average distribution per day has been the highest in the country for the ten year period. So I think that it depends entirely on the length of the meeting and whether or not the track is accustomed to getting a large proportion of the better horses.

MR. JACOBS: In regard to our stakes, I think in a lot of our stakes the nomination fees are too large, and they close too early. We had one race there, we had a \$250 nominating fee and that's too high.

MR. DUNNE: How much was added?

MR. JACOBS: It was a \$100,000 race. But take the Derby, it's a \$100,000 race and there's a \$50 nominating fee.

MR. DUNNE: Take down in Garden State, they've got a \$200,000 race and they only put up half of it.

MR. JACOBS: Every race track has been getting to do that now, and where we only had a few of them, now we're getting so many races that it's going to cost people so darn much money in nominating fees. Stakes are good, there's nothing wrong with the stakes. A high starting fee is O. K., but no one likes to pay for a dead horse. You don't mind paying, say, \$1,000 to start, but you hate like the devil to go on and pay a high nominating fee and then your horse doesn't even run in it. Santa Anita last year, they closed most of their races, only the big ones closed in December but most of the other races, even a \$100,000 race closed only a week ahead of time. And if you had twenty nominations for it, you had about eighteen or twenty that were going to run in that race. You had the live horses, and people didn't have to throw a lot of money away nominating them.

MR. CASSIDY: I agree with that and I've advocated it for a long time. On the other hand, you've stepped into another category, and that's the amount of the nomination fees. That's no part of this question, and it should be a separate question. Let's settle the other one first, about establishing a fair percentage of purse distribution for stakes.

MR. JACOBS: A fair percentage in each individual place is different. Take Cali-

fornia, they can give a big stake, like \$100,000 stake. They handle so much. But the overnights are high with it. But you take a place that gives a \$100,000 race, and then they cut the others all down to nothing. Even their better horses will run for small purses. They're all out of proportion.

MR. CASSIDY: Isn't that a local condition?

MR. JACOBS: It is a local condition, but they use bad judgment. They can't afford to give that kind of a race. They're trying to drink champagne on a beer salary or something like that. They just can't do it. They do it, though, but it's not right.

MR. CASSIDY: Of course, these questions are specifically pertaining to New York.

MR. JACOBS: New York keeps a good average all around, as far as stakes and all go. The overnights for better horses could probably be graded up, sometimes, instead of putting another stake on. Because you take some of our overnight races a lot of times don't have enough.

MR. CASSIDY: We have a lot of high-priced overnight races.

MR. O'BRIEN: In New York—I can't speak for the others—I think our overnights are determined independently of stakes. The amounts that are given in stakes are not taken into consideration in determining the amounts for the overnight purses. The determining factor is the type of race it is in the book, isn't that right?

MR. F. KILROE: You're thinking in terms of what you can offer, and how much money you have left. It's the same thing, the overnights have to come out of the general purse.

MR. O'BRIEN: We determine the minimum purse and we grade them up according to the quality of races.

MR. F. KILROE: For any race I think you would have to set a minimum of how much you want to offer in purses.

MR. O'BRIEN: I don't think it's determined on a percentage basis. It's determined by the competition you meet with and the type of horses on the track.

MR. JACOBS: Purses, it's all purses. You take from one and you give to the other. You take it from your stakes, you give it to the overnight races or vice versa.

MR. O'BRIEN: Any increases we have put on our stakes have not interfered with our overnight purses.

MR. JACOBS: Looking over it, you'll see \$4,500 for a certain type of race and then maybe a week later you'll see the same race is \$4,000. It's the same race, exactly the same wording and all. So there had to be some cut somewhere that they could only give a certain amount of money. I mean, you've just got a certain amount of money that you can give. You've got to give the same kind of money to the same kind of a race. It could be an oversight.

MR. F. KILROE: I would like to say something about Alfred's remark that he could foresee a day when we wouldn't have any stakes but just seventy-two hour overnights. I can see the benefit to the association in that, but I hope it will be a trend that is a long time materializing. I think we do have to set certain limitations on our greed, or whatever you want to call it. If we don't establish a stake program, those races are going to be run regardless of how they fit in. There's going to be an awful temptation to say, "Well, we've only got five for \$25,000. We can get eight horses for \$10,000, let's can the stakes, the so-called stakes, and run big overnights."

MR. VANDERBILT: To have it work, Jimmy, you'd have to have, instead of stakes, guaranteed overnights. You would advertise large guaranteed purses, large overnight purses which you would guarantee would run regardless of the starters. You'd eliminate early closing and all that attendant nonsense and bookkeeping and entrance fees.

MR. E. KILROE: Suppose you closed a week ahead, you could start under stake conditions as far as management is concerned.

MR. VANDERBILT: Take the Saratoga Cup, for instance, which is run Friday. What advantage is it to the Saratoga Cup to close it a month ahead and charge people \$35 or whatever it is to come in? As long as the association guarantees that on Friday they will run the Saratoga Cup at a mile and three quarters for so much money added, every horse in the world is eligible then and there's no loss.

MR. WINFREY: You see a lot of races with so much money to the winning horse, and they'd get the same field with probably half that money. I'd rather see it go to the in-between horses and maybe maintain a little higher minimum purse, because after all, I don't know what percentage it is, your cheaper horses, but it must be up eighty some odd, and you've got to keep your smaller owners going. Then if you have enough money after they're taken care of, then add it on to the top. I approve of the later closing because it seems pretty silly to me to give a lot of money and have some good horses on the grounds that aren't eligible for the race.

MR. HORWOOD: One slight advantage to not early closing, but closing at least a week in advance, and that is, you can publicize those races to some extent. If you have a list of nominations and know on Saturday, for example, that you have four stakes coming up the next week, and you know who is eligible in those stakes, you have some idea of who might run in them and you can publicize those stakes, which you can't do if they're closing in less than seventy-two hours.

MR. VANDERBILT: I think you can, Bob, because everybody is eligible. It might be a little trouble to make your list of probables, or something like that.

MR. HORWOOD: If there could be a way found to provide you with the names. Now I can find out fairly easily because I get a work tab, but the average writer doesn't get a work tab, he doesn't know who is available, who's likely to run in the race, and he doesn't have anything to go by. But I was interested too in what Bill said about getting more money for the middle horses. I don't think that the New York overnight distribution is so good in this respect. We do have occasionally a \$10,000 or \$15,000 overnight race, but I have to write advances every day and it's too often on \$4,500, \$5,000 or \$6,000 races, and the value to the winner is only a few hundred dollars more than he can get with a \$5,000 claimer. And a man with a \$5,000 horse, I think, is better off now than a man with a \$20,000 or \$25,000 horse. At the end of the year he has won more money with it. I think one reason for that also is because we've got too many stakes for two-year-olds. In the first half of the year, those horses are automatically out. Because they win some cheap little stake, they are eliminated from nearly all the overnight features.

MR. PHIPPS: I think you've got a real point on these two-year-olds because they've won stakes being eliminated from racing, which is practically the case, isn't it? They cannot then compete in stakes in New York.

MR. F. KILROE: It is very hard to get the owner of the winner of one to go against a stakes winner.

MR. HORWOOD: The stake winner is penalized and the other people are afraid to run against the stake winner, so it works bad both ways.

MR. GUSHEN: I'm sure you gentlemen will realize that this will stray a little bit from the question, and this question of overnights against stakes has been thrown in my lap dozens of times by management and also by horsemen. Of course, I agree with all of you gentlemen on the fact that it is a local problem, because it is difficult to judge percentage of distribution in Santa Anita as against that in, say, Tropical Park. A lot of race tracks today, as you gentlemen probably know, operate on certain percentages of handle. The percentage of stakes against the overnights is what I am concerned with mostly. I have no quarrel with Santa Anita or Belmont Park or any of these other large race tracks that maintain a good distribution. But my con-

cern is for some of these smaller tracks that have a minimum of, say, \$2,000. Their distribution is such that a horse that runs for \$2,000 gets the minimum purse of \$2,000, and then they don't have enough money to give the horse that runs for \$5,000 or \$7,000 or \$8,000 more money. In other words, there isn't enough of a spread. I am sure Francis Dunne has had that experience, and I know in New England we have that experience and at quite a few other race tracks. And by the same token you see stake races for \$50,000. Now, I don't object to stake races. As I said before, I think they are wonderful. But they should be in proportion to the amount of money that you can distribute. Stake races to a certain extent are necessary. It is probably a lot better for Santa Anita to give away \$750,000 in stakes than it is for some other race tracks to give away \$75,000, because they don't have the distribution. Now it is either one of the two things. Either the stake races are too high or the minimum is too high, because there is no incentive there for a man to run a \$7,500 in that area and you're putting a premium on cheap horses. That's the thing that I have been concerned with for a long while. I don't think myself that race tracks, who have a certain amount of money to distribute and where the minimum is such that they cannot give graduated purses, should run these \$50,000 and \$75,000 races because they just don't have the amount of money necessary to distribute properly. It's just like a man who has a dollar to spend for his supper and buys a hot dog and cup of coffee and spends seventy cents for dessert. You'd say the man was nuts. But it's all right for a man to spend seventy cents for dessert if he's got \$5 to spend for a steak dinner. Everything must be in proportion. We all agree that you've got to give the man who races a little better horse and has a little bit more money invested in the business a little incentive. You've got to give him a little more return on a \$7,500 investment than you do on a \$2,500 investment.

MR. CASSIDY: Don't you think the minimum purse is too high, most places?

MR. GUSHEN: I'm not going to quarrel with that. Yet by the same token you will find many racing associations who are reluctant to go below \$2,000. I was in Detroit, just as an instance, and Dale Shaffer during the time he ran, he said to me, "What do you think about it?" They had a \$2,000 minimum. He said, "We can't give you a graduated scale because we haven't got enough money to give to the better horses." I said, "I have no objection, cut it." I called in the president of the division down there, they had a meeting, and they cut it. I don't have any objection to that. But, of course, you must also take the other side. Is it bad for a man to cut his minimum instead of cutting his stakes? Is it bad, gentlemen, in your opinion, for a man to run a \$50,000 or \$75,000 stake race when he has only a certain amount of money to give and he has to cut his minimum instead of cutting from the top? That's the thing I'd like to get an expression from you on.

MR. CASSIDY: I'm not trying to justify that, but there are many cases where they have a \$50,000 stake where the track doesn't have a great deal of money and it is a promotional effort to establish the interest of racing in that section. It's the climax for his meeting. It is something he can build up to all during the meeting, with publicity and everything else. I don't think you can judge it coldly on the basis that it's improper to run a \$50,000 race when you haven't enough money to have your overnight purses any higher than the minimum. The graduations and proportions to the different class or quality or cost or value of horses would have to be very variable. You couldn't say that because you give a \$2,000 purse to horses worth \$2,500 that you would give a \$4,000 purse to horses worth under \$5,000, and go on up to \$15,000 or \$20,000. It can't be the same proportions. It has to be based somewhat on the money available so that you might increase the \$2,000 to \$2,200 or \$2,400 to \$2,600, in proportion to the value of the horse.

MR. GUSHEN: I agree with you wholeheartedly about that. I'm not trying to establish a precedent whereby a horse is going to get a certain percentage of his

value. That is impossible. It cannot be done. Nor can it be applied to all the areas. But there are certain areas, there's no doubt about it, where there is absolutely no distinction of any kind between top and bottom as far as claiming races are concerned—only a couple of hundred dollars. And by the same token there are stake races, what they call stake races, anyway—I'm not going to quarrel about the fact that stake races are necessary. I, myself, am a firm believer that there should be stake races, I think they're a wonderful thing for racing as a whole, they build up a lot of interest and everything else—but as I outlined before, there are some areas that overdo it. They say, "Well, the other fellow does it, and I've got to do it, too." By the same token we can prove, we have statistics to prove that in one area, where there are three or four race tracks who have been operating, the man who had no stake races at all outhandled the one who did. So that's not the answer, although as I say, I wouldn't want racing to be run without any stake races. But the distribution is such that it is not equitable in many instances.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Reineman?

MR. REINEMAN: I have nothing to add.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Bower?

MR. BOWER: I think Mr. Gushen has summed it up very well. I think so often the minimum can become the maximum too. I don't know whether the horsemen are stuck with the minimum or not. They fought for it a long time, they got it. I think if it does tend to become the maximum also, they may find themselves in difficulties.

MR. DUNNE: I'd like to say something about that. As Mr. Gushen said, I've had experience with it down in Tropical Park. The horsemen were always trying to get the minimum up a little bit. They say, "Well, what's a couple of hundred dollars. Make it \$2,200 instead of \$2,000." Then you find yourself in the position he mentioned, where you've got the horse worth \$2,500 running for \$2,200, and you've only got about \$100 to give a horse that's running for \$7,500. That looks silly. You've spent too much money on that high minimum. I think the minimum is too high in New York. You've only got so much money, no matter how you figure it, and you spend it all on that minimum. It makes you look silly.

MR. CASSIDY: In the minds of some people that seems to have become a standard of the quality of a race track to put a high minimum purse in effect rather than equality in purse distribution. Anybody else?

QUESTION No. 23. "IF A MARE IS REPORTED IN FOAL AND SHE SLIPS THE FOAL, SHOULD THE OWNER OF THE STALLION BE CALLED UPON TO RETURN THE FEE AND GIVE A RETURN SERVICE THE FOLLOWING YEAR?"

MR. CASSIDY: This question was brought up in Kentucky and at that time I think it was considered desirable to reduce the service fee a certain percentage—I think Mr. Reineman will be able to tell me what it was—and eliminate the guarantee for a dead foal or slipped foal, and return of service.

MR. REINEMAN: That was discussed, but I think Mr. Bower can tell you more about it.

MR. BOWER: That question was discussed rather fully and the consensus was that competition will take care of any situations where the stallion's price is too high or the terms of the contract are inequitable. The consensus was I think to just let the competition take care of it.

MR. CASSIDY: Does that take care of the question as to whether they should return the fee?

MR. REINEMAN: This question doesn't quite make sense to me the way it is written. In the first place there are three popular contracts: one is to guarantee a live

foal; another is a return, and the other is no return. Under the terms of the contract for a live foal you naturally return the money if the mare slips. But it doesn't guarantee the man a service to that same stud the following year. I don't know just how to interpret that question.

MR. PHIPPS: Some stallion owners feel that if their stallion has gotten the mare in foal, he's done his job, and why shouldn't he be paid? If the mare slips, it's not his fault. I think, as Mr. Bower says, the question of competition will take care of that. If the contract of a stallion owner is too high people are not going to breed to that stallion and therefore he will have to come down and meet his competitors.

MR. BOWER: These are really two different questions, one's a live foal and the other is a return.

MR. REINEMAN: The way I interpret this is that if a mare slips, and you return the money, then does the man get a service the following year to the stud? Naturally he doesn't unless it's in the contract, and it depends on how popular the stud is or otherwise whether or not he gets a return service. Now do you have any other interpretation of that, Mr. Cassidy?

MR. CASSIDY: No, this is the way the question was sent. I thought it implied that the fee would be returned or maybe has been returned, and the man felt that because the mare slipped the foal, he could have a service the following year just simply by paying the fee, that he would fit into the contract because he had a prior right over anybody else. That's what my interpretation is.

MR. REINEMAN: I think the main point there is that if he liked the stud so well, he would have already made an application to send this same mare back to the stud, which would take care of it automatically.

MR. CASSIDY: I have no idea what contract was involved or anything else. But that's my interpretation of it.

MR. VANDERBILT: Isn't there another form of contract by which the stallion owner is paid the fee, unless the veterinarian's certificate states the mare is not in foal? It limits the stallion owner's responsibility to getting the mare in foal.

MR. BOWER: A number of those contracts read, "Fee due and payable August 1st or September 1st, in lieu of veterinary certificate." Then if she's in foal, he'll pay.

MR. REINEMAN: There are two contracts now with returns, which means that you don't get your money back but you get a return to the stud. There is another one, but it's not very popular, that you get no return. You pay your money after the mare is served and that's it. The most popular contract of course is the live foal contract.

MR. BOWER: It's the most popular, and right now it's the most controversial, too, Howard. That's what all the discussion is about. Some stallion owners feel that if they stand their horse on a live foal basis, a man will send a mare to him that's difficult to get in foal, and then the whole onus is put on the stallion. He has to work like the devil to try to get the mare in foal.

MR. REINEMAN: That brings us right back to the other situation, the cheaper the stud the worse the mare.

MR. CASSIDY: This has nothing to do with the question, it's a matter of information for me, but what constitutes a live foal?

MR. REINEMAN: When she'll stand up and nurse.

MR. CASSIDY: Any other comments?

QUESTION No. 24. "SHOULD STABLES AND Paddock AREAS BE FOGGED DAILY?"

MR. CASSIDY: That's something I don't know too much about.

MR. REINEMAN: At some tracks I would say definitely, "Yes."

MR. CASSIDY: Dr. Catlett, what about it?

DR. CATLETT: I think that depends somewhat on the sanitation practice in the stable area. I don't think that fogging takes care of the situation alone. Removing the manure is very important, but I do think it is desirable to fog the stable area.

MR. ROBB: Of course, the money end of it comes into it, too.

MR. CASSIDY: Is it necessary under normal conditions?

DR. CATLETT: I think it's desirable.

MR. CASSIDY: Just to interrupt that a minute, Mr. Robb, you said it depends on cost. What does it cost?

MR. ROBB: It costs a great deal. All I can tell you is what our practice is and you can judge for yourselves. Ours is a very large stable area, our principal concern, and we have been working on it now for eight years, is to stop the flies from breeding. The best place to catch them is in the manure pits. So every time the manure is cleaned out of a pit, one of our men follows up, sweeps up the pit, and then it's fogged with a wet spray. We also use that wet spray before the horses come back to the stables, right through the stable, in the walk way, on the floors of the stalls. Then we follow up in the stables with a paraffin base, a thing which is terribly expensive, but which does knock them over if they're there. But we've found this, that if we catch them in the breeding stage, and that's before they get into the hard shell, we can control it to a certain extent. And the weather enters into it. We get cool weather, it helps us considerably. But the cost of it is tremendous. We have two spraying outfits, with four men working all the time on it, following up every single day. We estimate that each manure pit gets it three times a week. We also find that some trainers don't want the stables fogged, and we stand-by and fog whenever they request. Of course, while they're away and before they come back we do fog the stables. We've also discovered this, that in shade, as in the stable, the effect of the spray lasts very much longer than it does out in the sun. Now of course there are two new things being done. Alfred and Cain Hoy have a spray system set up in their own barns now. As far as we've discovered it has had no bad effect. We've also discovered this, and in the very beginning before Dr. Way died, we had to settle the problem by calling him and several other vets in to a board. Some of the trainers thought that spraying put something on the hay and feed, so that it would injure the horse. At that particular time they said, "No, it didn't." That was when we were using DDT which was terrifically effective. But within two years the flies had built up a resistance to DDT and we are now on our fourth insecticide. This last one which has been effective, principally because we have been able to get at the pits and because the weather has been good, has lasted two years. Whether or not the flies will build up a resistance to that too, I don't know. It's a problem that every stable area has to keep after all the time.

DR. WOODCOCK: I think, as Mr. Robb does, that the most important part of fly control and insect control is in the breeding habitat. I think that cleaning the manure pits out thoroughly is very, very important. So many times it is done in a slipshod manner that the truck will come in and the material will be loaded on it, and then there's debris at the bottom of it. I believe that the debris at the bottom of the pit is the most important place. There isn't too much breeding of flies in the large material that fills up in a pit, but the larva form I think is located in the bottom of the pit, and by using this liquid spray that Mr. Robb talked about, after the pit has been thoroughly cleaned, it has a tendency to soak down through what the ordinary man doesn't brush out. There, in my estimation, lies the secret to your successful fly control at Belmont.

MR. ROBB: It is successful this year. Of course, sometimes the flies become so terrible that even we can't cope with them. I think the year before last they were very bad, and we were just stymied. But we are keeping after it all the time.

MR. JACOBS: Many stables have the manure removed every day. That's the main trouble—it lies there for two or three days, and sometimes in some of the pits, a little longer. That goes for quite a few of the race tracks. If you clean them out every day, you've got a better chance. You don't let them get a foothold. But when they start breeding, you can't control them. That's the thing we've got to do. Try to find some way to make sure that those manure pits are cleaned every day. They might take it from one pit, but leave it in another pit. And then when you get a little rain, they breed like the devil. As soon as that manure gets wet, that starts them, and then you can't overcome it.

MR. WINFREY: I agree with Hirsch, if you could get that down to a daily thing, it would help a great deal. Sometimes those things get overloaded.

MR. E. KILROE: To get back to the question, I don't know as you need to establish a firm rule, because I think the situation varies with seasons and weather.

MR. JACOBS: In the spring of the year it doesn't matter much, until your fly season starts.

MR. REINEMAN: There's also the problem of the help not throwing the manure in the pits.

MR. ROBB: I didn't want to mention that, but it would help a great deal.

MR. JACOBS: I was talking to Eddie Hayward today, and I noticed it myself, he was telling me over at Belmont, he said it would lie there for days, two or three days, and he said, "The pit is full. And then where are you going to throw it?"

MR. ROBB: That isn't our problem. The problem is, when the pit is not full why don't they throw it in there?

MR. JACOBS: It should be thrown in, but I think if the place is kept clean, or you start to keep things clean, the others probably, if you keep after them, will cooperate too. It needs cooperation all around. It needs it with the help, the owner, the trainer and the track. It doesn't just go with one, it goes with everyone.

MR. CASSIDY: Anyone else on that?

QUESTION No. 25. "IS IT ADVISABLE TO HAVE A HOLDING BARN, UNDER DIRECT SUPERVISION OF THE COMMISSION VETERINARIAN, TO OBTAIN SALIVA AND URINE SAMPLES?"

MR. O'BRIEN: You're not talking of a receiving barn, are you?

MR. CASSIDY: No, we've had no complaints in New York about the system.

MR. WINFREY: We got Social Outcast's urine at eleven o'clock Saturday night. I thought the policy was they gave him a reasonable time, but perhaps in stakes you stick with them a little longer.

MR. DUNNE: They give him two hours, or something like that. Then if they don't get it, the next time that horse runs they stay till they get it.

MR. WINFREY: But that would be pretty bad in a holding barn to be there all hours.

MR. O'BRIEN: I think they're better off in their own barn.

MR. CASSIDY: I do, too. In New York we've had no trouble that I know of. Has anybody any other comments to make on that?

QUESTION No. 26. "SHOULD WE HAVE AN ISOLATION BARN WITH SCREENED STALLS SEPARATED FROM OTHER BARNs FOR THE PURPOSE OF HAVING A PLACE TO PUT SICK HORSES WITH CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OR THOSE SUSPECTED OF HAVING CONTAGIOUS DISEASES?"

MR. CASSIDY: I think definitely it is always advisable to have an isolation barn

for any contagious diseases, as an isolation hospital for human beings with contagious diseases. I question the value of having an isolation barn on the property of the track, not knowing what may be transmitted through the air or by insects. It would seem to me that if you had a horse with a contagious disease, or who was suspected of having a contagious disease, there should be some horse hospital where the horse could be sent rather than to a barn on the grounds. Dr. Catlett and Dr. Woodcock would have more knowledge of contagious diseases in horses, let's hear what you have to say about it, Dr. Catlett.

DR. CATLETT: I don't believe there's any horse hospital. However, it would be very, very rarely that anything like that would even be needed. But if you do need it, if you happen to be suspicious of a contagious disease, you would need it very badly, and very quickly. It's very difficult, if you have a horse which you might strongly suspect of having swamp fever or whatever it might be, to get someone to accept this horse, even on their farm or any place else. So it's my thought that probably one or two stalls, screened stalls, fairly isolated, be used for that purpose if you needed them.

MR. CASSIDY: You mean in a regular stable?

DR. CATLETT: Well, it would probably be preferable for it to be away from the track, but yet where are you going to move him if somebody says, "We don't want this horse on our farm, we don't want him out here. That's your problem." I think it would probably be safer to have one on the track than not have one at all.

DR. WOODCOCK: I think the same as Dr. Catlett does. I believe that we should have provision, let's say, that we could call upon at the time such an emergency arose.

MR. CASSIDY: A tent?

DR. WOODCOCK: No, hardly, because of the fact, mainly, that you'd never be able to have it screened properly the way an isolation ward would necessarily have to be constructed. And as far as having such a thing available off the race track I don't think it would be practical because I think the first thing you'd run into would be, if a horse were reported with a contagious disease, they wouldn't allow you to ship it any place. It would have to stay right in the area. I think in all the years that I have been associated with racing we have had the occasion arise only once and that of course was during the swamp fever scare. Of course it is strictly something to be desired. As you all will agree, it is one of those things, that as long as you don't need it you're glad you haven't got it, but when you want it you need it in a hurry. That's the big problem about it. I'll say this, I think if we had one available at every track, we'd probably find it would be used a great deal more than we anticipated by the practicing veterinarians. They'd send a horse over there merely for observation for a couple of days, just to make certain that he doesn't have a contagious disease.

MR. CASSIDY: Wouldn't it be possible to construct a stable, say four stalls, which could be used basically for the ponies of the pony boys, and then if there is an epidemic or a questionable case, you could take those ponies out and turn it into an isolation ward? It's something that would be useful for some other purpose year in and year out.

MR. DUNNE: Kilroe would have four horses in that barn.

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: Does anyone have anything to add to that?

QUESTION No. 27. "DOES A STABLE REQUIRE COUGH AND FEVER MEDICINES, ETC., ON HAND IN ADDITION TO MEDICATION PRESCRIBED BY A VETERINARIAN FOR A PARTICULAR HORSE?"

MR. CASSIDY: I suppose this means for any case of emergency. Is it essential? Do you keep fever medicine, Hirsch?

MR. JACOBS: I keep some of those sulfa drugs. We used to years ago, but we got away from it all. They might use them, though, they have their favorite remedies.

MR. CASSIDY: But is it necessary?

MR. WINFREY: It's an individual thing. We used to keep it on hand. We have maybe some sulfa tablets. If a horse gets a temperature we might mix them up and give it to him, and probably would. Especially when the vet is out and it might be a matter of a few hours, you can get a start on it. I believe if a person wants it he should have it.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you have any ideas about it, Doctor?

DR. CATLETT: I agree it's purely a matter for the individual trainers. I don't think it's necessary, however a lot of them do it.

MR. CASSIDY: Doesn't the average fever medicine or cough medicine contain ingredients that are forbidden?

DR. CATLETT: Not necessarily so. Some do, some don't.

MR. CASSIDY: Would that make any difference? What do you think, Francis?

MR. DUNNE: I don't see why they shouldn't have it if they want to have it. It's obviously not necessary to have it, but it doesn't even matter.

MR. JACOBS: That doesn't mean it's not necessary. They start coughing and they'd probably get over it in ten days if you give them something and they'd probably get over it in ten days if you don't give them anything.

MR. CASSIDY: It's four o'clock, and there are four or five other questions here, none of which is too important. Ed has to catch a plane, what do you feel about adjourning?

MR. PHIPPS: I think we might adjourn unless anyone has any question he might want to bring up.

MR. CASSIDY: Thank you all very much for giving up your Sunday to participate in this conference. I feel that already a few of the problems discussed seem to have been solved and it will not be surprising to see some of the suggestions made here today carried out in the near future.