

THIRD ANNUAL ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION

ON

MATTERS PERTAINING TO RACING

HELD BY

THE JOCKEY CLUB

IN THE

CLUB HOUSE

OF

THE SARATOGA ASSOCIATION

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 21, 1955

PARTICIPANTS:

Eddie Arcaro, Jockey
Ted Atkinson, Jockey
S. Tupper Bigelow, Chairman, Ontario Racing Commission
*James Cox Brady, Owner, Breeder
*Carleton F. Burke, Director of Racing, Santa Anita Park
Dr. J. G. Catlett, Steward, Veterinarian
Everett A. Clay, Publicity Director, Hialeah and Garden State Park
Chuck Connors, Turf Writer, The Morning Telegraph
Spencer Drayton, Executive Secretary, T.R.A.
Ira Drymon, Breeder, President of the Thoroughbred Club of America
Francis P. Dunne, Steward, New York State Racing Commission; Racing Secretary
William S. Evans, General Manager, Breeders' Sales Company
John Gaver, Trainer
Irving Gushen, National President, H.B.P.A.
*A. B. Hancock, Jr., Owner, Breeder
*Amory L. Haskell, President, T.R.A.
James H. Inglis, Racing Commissioner, State of Michigan
Hirsch Jacobs, Trainer, Breeder
Robert F. Kelley, Publicity Director, New York Racing Associations
Edward L. Kilroe, General Manager, Aqueduct Race Track
Frank E. Kilroe, Racing Secretary
Wathen R. Knebelkamp, Owner, Breeder, President of N.A.S.R.C.
Bill Lauder, Turf Writer, New York Herald-Tribune
Pat Lynch, Turf Writer, New York Journal-American
Luke H. O'Brien, General Manager, Jamaica Race Track
Frank Ortell, Turf Writer, New York World-Telegram & Sun
*Ogden Phipps, Owner, Breeder, Vice Chairman of The Jockey Club
Calvin Rainey, Steward
Howard Reineman, Breeder
James Roach, Turf Writer, New York Times
Alex M. Robb, General Manager, Belmont Park Race Track
Sol Rutchick, Trainer
B. A. Tompkins, President, The Greater New York Association Inc.
*Alfred G. Vanderbilt, Owner, Breeder
*George D. Widener, Owner, Breeder, Chairman of The Jockey Club
Dr. J. G. Woodcock, Veterinarian

Moderator: Marshall Cassidy

GUESTS:

Dr. William Davies, Steward, Florida State Racing Commission
Major John Nethersole, Steward, Canadian Race Tracks
Pat O'Brien, New York Racing Associations Service Bureau
Evan Shipman, Turf Writer, The Morning Telegraph

*Member of The Jockey Club

INDEX TO TOPICS

Apprentice rule—100 vs. 40 Winners	47
Claims—Time of Effect	45
Fall Races for Three-Year-Old Fillies	39
Gelding Allowance	40
Graduated Purses with More Money for Better Horses	34
Jockey Engagements—Binding on Jockey and Employer	42
Naming Jockeys at Time of Closing	17
Racing Chart Programs	44
Racing Officials' Pool	54
Registration Certificates—Early Completion for Summer Sales	52
Sales Promotion Methods of Breeders	8
Scale of Weights—Increase	14
Stable and Training Area—Complete Enclosure	53
Stakes Closing Dates	28
Stalls—Limit in Number of Two-Year-Olds in Spring	51
Stalls—Limit in Number to One Trainer	49
Tax-Free Badges for Visiting Horsemen	53
Track Surfaces—Effect on Horse	9
Two-Year-Old Races—Frequency	52
Weight of Horse Relative to Performance	7

**INTRODUCTION BY
GEORGE D. WIDENER**

I am very happy to welcome you to the Third Annual Conference of The Jockey Club. This year, in addition to participating in the discussions, the Press have been invited to report on any subject they may wish, including statements made by any participant. As this meeting is being held here in the open it will be difficult to record. Therefore I hope everyone will remain very quiet while someone is speaking.

Mr. von Stade has asked me to invite you all to be the guests of The Saratoga Association for luncheon which will be served on the Club House mezzanine at twelve-thirty. He regrets very much that he is unable to attend, but he was called back to Southampton because of a serious injury to his wife.

Mr. Cassidy is the moderator, so Mr. John Daly, will you please start?

QUESTION No. 1. "A SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRY REQUIRES ALL HORSES TO BE WEIGHED JUST PRIOR TO A RACE AND HIS WEIGHT IS RECORDED FOR THE PUBLIC. THE PAST PERFORMANCES INCLUDE HIS WEIGHT AT TIME OF RACE. WOULD NOT THIS PROCEDURE BE WORTH A TRIAL HERE?"

MR. CASSIDY: Probably ten or twelve years ago at Hialeah, we installed a scale for the use of the horsemen, thinking that it might be of some value to them in training their horses to know just what they would weigh at the peak of their performance, and how much a horse might lose in being brought up to a race after he had been brought in from pasture. We also used it as an identification item—his weight could be of value when other factors might be equal, making it hard to tell the difference between two horses. The horsemen used it for a short time but then the weeds grew up around it and you could hardly find the scales. However, last year when I worked at Hialeah I found that the horsemen had started to use it again quite freely. I don't know whether all of you read the article that was in *The Blood-Horse*, reporting what a Doctor Rodolfo Retamales wrote about the Chilean procedure, but he speaks very highly of it and says they can tell within a margin of eight kilos, one way or the other, at what weight a horse is at his best performance. They post on the program the weight he scaled in his last three races. When he is weighed the morning of a race, that weight is announced so that everyone can tell whether he has gained or lost weight since his last start and can compare it with his good performance data. Dr. Catlett, you might know something about the value of weight in respect to the condition of horses. Would you care to say something about it?

DR. CATLETT: I think a horse definitely has a racing weight, an ideal weight for racing, but I think a great deal of research would have to be done on it before you could arrive at any definite ideas. I do believe if the scales were available and some trainers would take advantage of it, a great deal could be learned from it.

MR. CASSIDY: By research work or data you probably mean that a growing horse's weight would vary up to the time that he has matured and his bone structure and muscles have developed. John, have you ever weighed horses?

MR. GAVER: For about six years we have been weighing our horses. We try to weigh them about every six weeks and we have kept a record from the time they were yearlings until they left the racing stable. This year we haven't weighed the horses in the spring because, for one reason, the scales broke down. Over a period of five or six years we kept a record of the weights with the idea that we might be able to find some guide as to the quality of the horses according to their weight, and frankly I have gone over those figures to try to figure out something but I can't make heads or tails out of it or draw any conclusion whatever.

MR. CASSIDY: Sol, have you ever had any experience with weighing horses?

MR. RUTCHICK: No, I never have.

MR. CASSIDY: Has anybody here? Have you, Mr. Robb?

MR. ROBB: Yes, we weighed them, as John suggests, from the time that they were babies up until the time that they got to the races. We weighed them occasionally after that, but as John says, there's no real significance you can finally draw from the weights. Horses vary in size, and naturally they will vary in weight according to size. It seems to me that if they were putting in the weights they could also put in how many hands high the horse is. The structure of the horse makes a great deal of difference. As far as the public is concerned, unless there is a long string of weights alongside a long string of races, I don't suppose there is any significance that can be attached to it.

MR. CASSIDY: I don't think you quite understood the question. It isn't a question of identification, it is a question of the variation of weights in the training

schedule—not as to what a horse may weigh or his height, as a yearling, suckling, two year old or anything else.

MR. ROBB: As I understood it, they put the weight in the past performance chart.

MR. CASSIDY: Yes, that's a performance weight, rather than a structural weight. You may have weighed horses, I imagine in respect to the horse itself as he grows up. This I think is the variation due to the different conditions in training.

MR. ROBB: May I ask a question? You spoke about kilos. I don't know how much that is in pounds.

MR. CASSIDY: Two and two-tenths pounds in a kilo.

MR. ROBB: That would be a variation of about 16 pounds.

MR. CASSIDY: The article is quite long and it speaks rather authentically as if the system has been well tried. It has also been tried in another South American country.

MR. WIDENER: I may add that it has been tried and used in France.

MR. CASSIDY: Successfully?

MR. WIDENER: Apparently the trainers like it, but they don't keep any record for the program or the public. It's for the trainer's own information, as to what weight the horse performs best. I think what they suggest would be impossible to do here.

MR. CASSIDY: I think it would be worthwhile for a trainer to weigh his horse in the training period for his own information if nothing else. Is there anybody else here who would like to comment on this question?

MR. CONNORS: Mr. Cassidy, as far as the weight is concerned, it would be misleading to the public in this respect. Take a horse that is 15.2, and take a horse that is 16, you have a big variation in weights. It wouldn't mean a thing to the public.

MR. CASSIDY: There again, Chuck, I think that that is not the question. The fact that he is 16.2 or 14.3 would make no difference in this equation. If he was 16.2 and weighed 1200 pounds in the spring and in training he took off 40 pounds, it would indicate the difference between when he was out of training and in training, without relation to his bone structure, height or anything else. It would be a variable dependent upon his racing condition. It wouldn't be in relation to another horse.

MR. ATKINSON: Even so, what significance would it have until the horse was a mature horse? At a farm I might see how it might have some significance and some relationship, but up until the time he is four or five years old, in which case so many of our horses are through racing, it couldn't have any real significance.

MR. WIDENER: I think we might go on to the next question, Marshall.

QUESTION No. 2: "ARE THE PROMOTIONAL METHODS USED BY THE BREEDERS IN THE COUNTRY IN MARKETING YEARLINGS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF RACING IN THIS COUNTRY?"

MR. CASSIDY: I don't know what the promotional methods are that might be indicated in this. Do you know, Francis?

MR. DUNNE: I ought to know, I wrote the question.

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: Well, it hasn't any name on it, so I didn't know whose it was.

MR. DUNNE: It also says, "This question submitted by a racing secretary who puts on claiming races." Anyway, it was my question. I think "promotion" is a fair description, or "high pressure" if you like that better.

MR. CASSIDY: You mean in marketing yearlings?

MR. DUNNE: Sure. In selling yearlings. No stone is left unturned.

MR. CASSIDY: Well, that's done with all products that are sold. Everyone tries to present his product in the best manner he can.

MR. DUNNE: Well, I've seen an awful lot of high-priced yearlings, that's all I know. And people buy them and a couple of years later you don't see those people, and there are new people. What I'm afraid of, we might run out of people.

(Laughter)

MR. REINEMAN: What do you mean by "high pressure"? As it relates to public auction?

MR. DUNNE: Well, it's a public auction, of course, but there is a good deal of promotion done before the auction takes place. One man has his automobile painted red, with the name of the farm on it, driving it all around.

MR. REINEMAN: I don't think that helps to bring higher prices. A man has to go look at a horse before he buys him.

MR. DUNNE: And there's always somebody there to show you how wide he is between the eyes. I think it's a fair question. As I say, it's my own question.

MR. REINEMAN: Well, with respect to our farm I'd like to have you come down and look at a few horses, put on a false face so that no one knows you're Francis Dunne, and see how much high pressure we give you on our stock.

MR. DUNNE: I don't mean anyone in particular. I'm not throwing rocks at any one individual. But I think perhaps the whole thing is a little bit too much. People buy all these expensive yearlings, and that's the end. You never hear of them again, and next year there are some more fellows striking oil somewhere. They buy a lot of yearlings and then you never see them. I've been watching that process for a long time.

MR. REINEMAN: How are you going to stop people, when you have considerable people bidding against, say, the one man and he wants to stop because the horse isn't worth that much money. But he wants the horse. Or maybe his wife wants the horse.

MR. DUNNE: But why is he so anxious to get the horse. That's what I'm talking about.

MR. REINEMAN: Undoubtedly because of his pedigree, and a horse bred similarly has come up and been a good runner.

MR. DUNNE: Well, it seems to have turned out to be kind of a cheesy question.

(Laughter)

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Cassidy, may I just say something here? I've been talking since I've been up here with some of the Fasig Tipton directors, and it seems to be a complaint against the sales companies that their catalogs do gild the lily a bit. Perhaps something can be done where all the produce of the first mare will be listed in chronological order, exactly what they did, and what the class of the races were. If that could be done I think it would do away with some of the objections.

QUESTION No. 3. "DOES THE CURRENT VOGUE OF SUPER-FAST RACETRACKS REPRESENT ANY MENACE TO THE HEALTH OF THE HORSE AND WHAT CAN BE DONE IN GENERAL TO MAKE RUNNING SURFACES BETTER?"

MR. CASSIDY: It's pretty hard to answer that, with the wide variety of soil consistencies, and the various ways of treating tracks, preparing them. Definitely the cushion isn't always the answer.

MR. WIDENER: Marshall, that's due to track management, isn't it? They want to make records, they make tracks so that they can do it.

MR. CASSIDY: Yes, they try to make a fast track to get fast records. That's publicity. The amount of rain in certain localities makes considerable difference, and

of course different horses, different type trainers, different track managements and so forth have a great deal to do with it. Maybe one of our track managers might be able to help us. Mr. Robb?

MR. ROBB: Well, I believe you have covered the ground when you say that there is a variation in soil all over the country, and I do know that you can do almost anything you want with a track. If you want a training track on which your yearlings will show up especially well so that the owner will be delighted with his crop, you can fix it so that those yearlings come close to the world record.

MR. CASSIDY: This is for racing, not for raising yearlings.

MR. ROBB: Well, you can do the same thing with a racing track.

MR. CASSIDY: I mean you wouldn't do that for a specific purpose, the manager of a race track wouldn't do that.

MR. ROBB: I don't know what some managers would do. At Belmont Park we try to have a safe track. I do notice the time at some other tracks, and I do have an idea that the tracks may be a little bit too hard. I don't think it's good for some horses. I think the great majority of horses would be better off if they didn't have hard tracks.

MR. E. KILROE: I think a track should be kept safe. At Aqueduct we are not conscious of speed at all. I don't think any criticism can be leveled against any of the New York tracks. We try to keep the tracks safe rather than get some sensational speed out of the horses.

MR. CASSIDY: This isn't a question aimed at New York. It's a question of racing wherever the track may be.

MR. ROBB: Marshall, why not ask a couple of the trainers who have raced on tracks around the country whether or not they consider the hard and fast tracks detrimental to the health of their horses.

MR. GAVER: I think safety is the main thing. Whether the track is naturally fast or naturally slow, I don't think that is the main point. Some people have an idea because a track is very, very deep and slow it is safer than a track that is fast. I disagree with that. I think that the track itself should be kept in the safest possible condition at all times. If the track is naturally fast, the track man ought to know you have to have the proper cushion. I am inclined to think that possibly tracks are speeded up in certain areas for the publicity that will be gained when records are broken. When a big race is coming up you read continuously in the press that a track record may be broken. It seems that the associations or their publicity departments take great delight in having a record broken. Of course, we do most of our racing in the east, around New York, and as Alex Robb said, and so did Eddie Kilroe, they are safe tracks and not particularly fast. We do know that at certain times with a certain amount of moisture Aqueduct and Belmont Park can be extremely fast, but that is their natural condition.

MR. CASSIDY: Isn't it true that what a horseman would prefer would be a track with a cushion that is safe, a smooth sub-surface which doesn't have ridges or cupped out holes, and a track that is not so heavy so that it is difficult for a horse with a bad tendon to break down or become lame?

MR. GAVER: It should be for the general good of all horses, and no particular type horse.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Rutchick, have you any comments to make?

MR. RUTCHICK: My experience at tracks throughout the country is that a two inch cushion would make a track safe, and good horses would run as fast as they do now and cheap horses wouldn't break down. You see tracks all over the country where a horse runs three-quarters of a mile in 10. That's not a safe track. Tracks should be uniform all over the country. And if they all have the two inch cushion, you'll have a safe track.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Burke, isn't that true in California, the same as every place else—that that's what you strive for?

MR. BURKE: Yes, we do. Mr. Rutchick says "two inches deep." We go better than that, we go around two and one-half. Of course in some cases if you go deeper than that the track won't dry out for a month maybe, if you have cold weather. Weather I think is the determining factor more than the actual amount of rain itself. If it's cold, the track won't dry. The deeper it is, the more water it takes in. We try to have two and one-half inches, and now we've a new training track to keep the horses off the main track in the morning. Then it isn't all chewed up and they don't go through and hit the bottom. They've got something to hold them up. I think the weather will determine the depth of the cushion you have to maintain.

MR. LYNCH: It seems to me I write more obituaries about good horses that come off those speedball tracks and in the course of talking to trainers also they seem to complain a lot about hard tracks. They talk to newspaper men and they tell them these things off the record and quite a few times I tell them, "Why don't you make a squawk about it, try to do something. You have your HBPA and other mediums of getting on the record," but they seem to be reluctant to do those things from the standpoint of reprisal. A rider just came in here from another state the other day and I asked him how things were out there. He said, "Oh man, it's pretty tough. They've got a vet's list as long as your arm. I never heard so many trainers complaining as they have been there." He said, "The filly that I rode in the stake, she had absolutely no chance, she was so sore." Eddie Arcaro was telling me something interesting, too. He said there's a vast difference in the riding techniques employed, say at tracks in California than there would be right up here in Saratoga. Maybe Eddie would care to comment on it.

MR. CASSIDY: Eddie, don't you feel that the variable depth of the cushion, as it might be heavier on the rail than out further, or vice versa, would affect a jockey's way of riding?

MR. ARCARO: Riding tactics?

MR. CASSIDY: Yes.

MR. ARCARO: Well, I think most any rider knows that on a deep track, such as Saratoga was yesterday, very few horses get put on the lead and let run. Naturally it's more tiring than on a speed track. A speed track doesn't tire a horse. At all of our New York tracks, you will notice our riders have to ride in New York a while to learn to take hold of horses. Out west the horses don't come back to you. They take the lead and don't tire. I think the western trainers want a track fast. They don't approve of our tracks at all, the majority of them. I know in talking to trainers they'll all insist on what they think is the right kind of track. Ben Jones who has been a successful man in his life, he wants a track hard and fast. Hirsch Jacobs has been a successful man, he wants one about a foot deep. So I don't know how you are ever going to get the right answer to it. I've seen fast race tracks that I've felt were safe. Delaware one year was lightning fast and it must have had a six inch cushion.

MR. CASSIDY: You're stretching that now, Eddie.

MR. ARCARO: No, a horse would go clear up to its ankles walking to the gate on it. You wouldn't dream that a horse could run fast on it, but they could fly on it.

MR. ATKINSON: That brings up the point of the depth of the cushion, the consistency of that cushion makes so much difference. I've seen Tropical Park when they've had a six inch cushion on it, and platers were running in 10 flat. At the outer rim they hit right into the bottom.

MR. ROBB: That's true. In our place we are very careful about the composition of our cushion. Actually it is 86% sand, 4% silt, 5% organic matter and the rest, clay. We maintain that particular composition.

MR. CASSIDY: Dr. Woodcock, isn't it true that the physical condition of a horse would indicate whether he would run better on a hard track than on a soft track? A horse that might have a bad foot wouldn't do so well on a hard and fast track.

DR. WOODCOCK: I believe that is true. A horse that has bad feet, for example, it is very easy to understand that he would do better when the cushion is adequate and soft enough, and there too I would like to go back to the business of composition. I believe that if the cushion is composed of elements that would hold it together, such as the cushion at Belmont Park, a horse with bad feet would run better. I think horses with bowed tendons run better on a track that has a very shallow cushion. I know you can take a horse with a bowed tendon and exercise him on a hard road, the tendon will straighten out very nicely and become very solid. You take the same animal and work him in mud, you are apt to pull that tendon loose again very easily. I think you are absolutely correct in that different types of tracks help or hinder different conditions in a horse's health.

MR. CASSIDY: Dr. Catlett, didn't you keep a statistical record of the number of horses that broke down or pulled up lame over a number of years, and have some idea of just what caused it?

DR. CATLETT: Yes, we have for many years kept such records. We always keep a record of all the horses that pull up lame on the various tracks. I think it's very definite that you have to strike a happy medium. You take a real hard track, you get more fractures, more lameness, more soreness. On the deep tracks you definitely get more broken down horses. I think we need something more uniform, and not an extreme either way.

MR. CASSIDY: I agree with what Ted Atkinson said, and others have said, that the depth of the cushion definitely must be variable depending on the consistency of the soil. Two and one half inches deep basically may be the proper depth, depending on the amount of sand in it or loam. Would anybody else like to say something on that subject?

MR. GUSHEN: Mr. Cassidy, in my travels throughout the country visiting various race tracks, I've run into hundreds of complaints from horsemen about the race tracks being too fast. That applies more to the smaller or medium sized race tracks than it does to the larger race tracks. We've had complaints in my office from the various divisions, horsemen saying that this track was too fast. When you get a \$2500 horse that runs three-quarters of a mile in 10 and 2, that track is too fast, especially when a year, two years or three years ago the same horse used to run in about 12 and 3. So evidently something was done to that race track. I have had occasion to speak to management about that and of course you've got to be very careful about those things, some of these fellows are very touchy, as you know. The minute you mention race track to them they think you are infringing on their privileges and prerogatives, but it definitely is not so because, if you take a small or medium sized race track that has a 30, 40 or 50 day meeting, they cater mostly to the cheaper type horse, and they have a hard race track. By the time 15 or 20 days elapse, half of the horses are sore. I think it's for their own benefit and the benefit of all concerned that some of these race tracks shouldn't be so speed conscious. There's no doubt at all in my mind, gentlemen, that a lot of these race tracks are speed conscious. They see at a large race track some horse breaking a record, so they say, "We want to get in the headlines, too." But I think management should realize the type of horses that they have on the grounds. I think that they should consult with horsemen, take them into their confidence and at least find out what in their estimation would be the best policy for all, because I don't think that you can say that all race tracks should be the same. It is impossible. I do think that race tracks should definitely instruct their superintendents to make the race tracks as safe

as possible because undoubtedly that is uppermost in the minds of the horsemen, and I should think in the minds of management as well.

MR. CASSIDY: Is it possible that maybe the press might be somewhat at fault in emphasizing and publicizing these phenomenal speeds?

MR. CONNORS: Let's look at it this way. When a horse runs three-quarters of a mile in 10 it's news. A horse runs three-quarters of a mile in 14, it's not news.

MR. KELLEY: It goes back to the old principle, man bites dog, dog bites man.

MR. CASSIDY: Does it depend on what the horse is or what type race he's running in? It's still news if he runs fast, is that right?

MR. CONNORS: It's still news.

MR. LAUDER: It was news last year during the hurricane at Belmont Park when a horse named Vestment set a world record down the chute. I don't know whether Vestment has won since, I think maybe a couple of times, but Vestment had no business being in any record book with a world record. Vestment is not that kind of a horse. I don't know how it could be done, but racing should take into consideration how records are set, how horses run at certain times, and throw out certain performances from any consideration of the record. Now that record of Vestment's should have been thrown out automatically. That just shouldn't get in the book. The same way they do with racing with human beings. If a man runs a hundred yard dash in record time with the wind at his back it's not considered a record. It doesn't get into the book. I know that would cause all sorts of rhabarbs, and the man eventually I suppose will say, "Well, this is a filly by a horse which set a world record," and so on. Maybe some of that high pressure stuff that Francis was talking about at the yearling sales and these things all go hand in hand. But a record like that is ridiculous and anybody who was at Belmont Park that day knows it.

MR. CLAY: Concerning the publicity department and this speed thing, I don't think that you'll find any race track publicity departments in America that want the management to have a fast track for records alone. From the standpoint of the publicity department, we would rather have our box office horses remain sound, rather than have a few records broken.

MR. KELLEY: It doesn't do you any good to have a fast horse if he can't race.

MR. LYNCH: In relation to this publicity it is true that when you are writing what might amount to the same story, with the same standard cast of performers, the fast time becomes an added fillip and you can't help but put it in. But I wonder if there isn't something else that goes into it. For instance, a lot of race tracks are very conscious of mud. When you get mud, you get scratches. When you get scratches you get less units of betting. When you get less units of betting, you have a smaller handle. I read a lot about race tracks that when the rains are coming they seal them so that they have very hard surfaces and the water runs off. The health of the horse becomes secondary to keeping the ouija board registering the big numbers. I wonder how much nearer this is to the truth than the charge of publicity. I wouldn't know, not being connected with race track management. I wish somebody here could tell me something about it.

MR. CASSIDY: Pat, I think what you are talking about is a natural thing for any track operator to do. It's not looking at the ouija board or handle with any thought of that. You try to protect your track from being cut up too badly when it gets wet and ruined for such a long time for the horses that are stabled there. So it's natural to preserve it. I don't know anybody who would do it just thinking they are going to lose money. I know we don't in New York.

MR. ARCARO: You don't have to, you've got sand race tracks.

MR. CASSIDY: That's right.

MR. ARCARO: At Santa Anita last winter they had to do it. The winter before

last when they didn't seal it, the horses would stumble and fall down, it had gotten in such bad shape.

MR. CASSIDY: That's the point I was trying to get out. That it is necessary to protect the property for its operational value rather than to look at the cash register to see what difference that makes. Mr. Haskell, at your track there are no particular pains or particular efforts made to keep the track from getting heavy except to preserve the track, is there?

MR. HASKELL: As a matter of fact, the composition of our track is exactly the same as Belmont's. We have exactly the same formula at Monmouth as you have at Belmont.

QUESTION No. 4. "SHOULD RIDING WEIGHTS BE RAISED? IS THE SCALE OF WEIGHTS TOO LOW?"

MR. CASSIDY: Some years ago at the convention of the National Association of State Racing Commissioners, it was agreed to elevate the scale of weights throughout the country. New York, along with the others, adopted a rule which provided that there would be no race in which the weights were more than six pounds below the scale, and they also established a minimum weight that a horse could carry, even with allowances. I think it was 101, except where a two- or three-year-old met older horses in competition. We have maintained that standard very well. I don't know any other state that has, and I think there is a great deal of value in keeping the weights up, not only for the preservation of riders, such as Mr. Arcaro, who might be getting heavy and might not be able to perform as frequently as he does, except that he only rides top weight horses in handicaps. What do you think about it, Jim?

MR. F. KILROE: All I can remember is our experience with that resolution. Everybody got behind it before and they were all going to do something about it but nobody did. It doesn't do any good to say that you'll put a rule through that no race will start more than six pounds below the scale for allowances because you can always put in a couple of dummy allowances that everybody gets, and start from there. It's a matter of convention more than any rule that can be put in to be enforced. If the associations are willing to get behind it, I'm sure the secretaries would be. I know that out in the midwest, horsemen are much more weight conscious than they are here in the east. You see a lot of handicaps out there start at 118 pounds highweight and go down from there just because horsemen have it in their heads that if you get over 110 pounds you're sunk. I think it would be much better for racing to keep our good riders in action longer as they do overseas. You can make more interesting races and get better race riders.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Jacobs, is that true that the additional weight that he would carry in races would have no material effect on the horse, if he weren't run too frequently?

MR. JACOBS: I don't think the weight would hurt them. People have the boys in the morning that probably weigh about 140 pounds, work their horses fast and probably don't think anything of it. At Calumet, I don't think they have one boy who probably weighs less than 130 or 135. But I don't think they'd like to carry 135 in the races.

(Laughter)

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

MR. GAVER: I think sooner or later you are going to have to raise the scale because with each generation, children are bigger. Of course, that's due to modern medicine and the care that they get. I think you are going to have to do it because you are not going to have a group of boys who could ever possibly ride under the present weight arrangement. When that is going to be, I don't know. It certainly is

coming before too many years pass. There's just not going to be a supply of boys who can ride at these light weights. I would be in favor of raising the weight scale I think that was agreed upon at a meeting of the National Association of State Racing Commissioners. Everybody was enthusiastic about it. The first one to change was Kentucky.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Gushen, what do you think, as an owner, of the policy of raising the weights? Do you think it's of value?

MR. GUSHEN: I must agree with some of the previous speakers but I don't think that two pounds will make all the difference in the world. If raising the scale of weights means that we will be able to keep the older, better and more experienced jockeys riding for any greater length of time, I'm all for it. I certainly would much rather carry three pounds more and have a good rider than take three or four pounds less and have an inferior rider. Personally, I don't think I'm qualified to speak on that, but I honestly don't think it would make much difference.

MR. VANDERBILT: I don't think it would hurt. I think it might be a good thing, but I think that there is a sort of prejudice among horsemen that the thing that makes a handicap is the actual weight the individual horse carries rather than that the handicap is made by the spread of weights between two horses. If you took any handicap and said arbitrarily, before the race, "Let everybody carry five more pounds than is on the program," I think everybody would holler. I don't think from the point of view of soundness it affects the horse. I think it would affect the age of the rider, although it's hard to see how you can get them much older.

(Laughter)

I think a lot of handicaps would be better off if we could work out some kind of a way where your top weight automatically would be say 126 or 130, and if your top weights didn't go, you'd slide up and you'd let a lot of other horses in. You'd stop the necessity of having to put 135 or 140 on horses like High Gun or Helioscope to bring them back to the other horses.

MR. CASSIDY: What do you think of the effect in the cheaper races, the claiming races?

MR. VANDERBILT: I don't think it would matter much. You see a lot of short races where a lot of platers are carrying 118 and 120.

MR. CASSIDY: The two-year-olds seem to carry high weights. Ted?

MR. ATKINSON: I would like to point out that regardless of what bearing the scale has had on actual weights carried in races, looking at the charts of races of 50 years ago the average weight in the average handicap would be 104 pounds. Plenty of them went down way below 100. There might be one as high as 120 pounds. Well, obviously that isn't true today. So if they haven't raised the scale they have at least decreased the allowances for whatever system of handicapping the handicapper may use. Well, that can continue, and, as Mr. Gaver points out, with the growth of our young men through the years, you will need to raise the scale because of the fact that you can't get small men any more. I don't see one way or the other that a pound or two increase would make too much difference.

MR. CASSIDY: I think it's more than a pound or two that has been needed in the past, and it's needed in other places right now. I think there are very few places where the scale of weights is high enough to permit a boy to ride over any great period of time. I don't think the damage to a horse by carrying the extra weight is of any material value. Eddie, what do you think?

MR. ARCARO: I don't think there's anything wrong with the scale of weights. I think it's the handicapper and the allowances he gives in those cheap races. I was in Chicago one year, and I think Mr. Kilroe was out there handicapping, and in all those cheap races there wasn't a horse that I could ride. I got the riders together and

said, "Don't you think we ought to go to Mr. Kilroe and have him raise these weights a little bit?" They didn't want the weights raised.

(Laughter)

The reason wasn't because of me. They said they had the weights raised out there one year and everybody was using the apprentice allowance. Brooks and all those riders couldn't ride around there. They would rather have the weight low enough to get in the 110 pounds—they were struggling to do the weight, but they could get a lot of mounts that way. If they jump the weights the man is going to use the apprentice allowance.

MR. CASSIDY: Maybe that's the way to make riders.

MR. ARCARO: I don't know the answer, but they certainly didn't go for having the scale of weights raised.

MR. CASSIDY: I can see their viewpoint, but that also works the other way. It's retarding the development of younger riders if they don't have opportunities to ride. So as long as they were claiming the apprentice allowance, the apprentices could ride.

MR. ARCARO: I don't think any horse should run with less than 115 pounds.

(Laughter)

MR. CONNORS: Marshall, does the sweat box have any effect on the stamina of a boy compared to years ago when they hit the road?

MR. CASSIDY: I can't answer that very well. It's been a long time since I've been in a sweat box or hit the road.

MR. ARCARO: I can answer that because I've done both of them. If you hit the road, all it does is develop you. The modern way that these boys reduce, you last a lot longer that way. Steam baths make sense. When you hit the road to do 110 pounds, before the year is over you're fighting to do 112. It's natural, you develop your muscles.

MR. GUSHEN: Isn't it a fact though, Eddie, that by hitting the sweat box you take a lot of strength out, you lose a lot of strength and stamina? I know that a couple of years ago I had a boy under contract and he was struggling to do 112. Of course, I didn't know about it, but one day I was in the paddock to put the boy up and he nearly fell off the horse, he was so weak. Naturally I started investigating and found out that that poor kid was in the sweat box every day. He just got so weak he couldn't even sit on the horse. It developed that he had to take an extended vacation. There's no doubt in anybody's mind that if a boy has to struggle to do a certain amount of weight and he has to hit the box every day, it's going to take a lot of stamina out of him.

MR. ARCARO: That's the individual's fault. He has diets and things today so that he shouldn't be in that sweat box. I think Eric Guerin is a perfect example of it. If Eric Guerin didn't take care of himself he would have been through riding ten years ago.

MR. GUSHEN: That's true, Eddie, and I realize what you said before about their using apprentices when the weights get too high. If you can raise your scale so that you can ride a boy who's a good rider, I think you're doing justice to yourself, and justice to the public at the same time because you get the best possible ride that you can. I know the same thing happened with De Spirito. Tony rode for me for quite a while when he was in New England. But he's getting heavy. He can't do less than 14 or 15. The result is he's trying to stay within 14 or 15, he doesn't get too many mounts. But if the scale was raised so that he could do 15 and be strong—and we all know he's a good rider, and I'm not shilling for him—but he'd get on a lot more horses and it would be better for his health. I'm just using this as an example.

MR. ARCARO: A hundred and fifteen is low, I agree with him.

(Laughter)

MR. GUSHEN: I don't want to get unfriendly with Atkinson now.

MR. ARCARO: Ted doesn't care, he gets all the mounts he wants.

MR. CASSIDY: Does anybody want to comment any more on that topic?

QUESTION No. 5. "SOME HORSEMEN ARE COMPLAINING ABOUT THE RULE REQUIRING THEM TO NAME THEIR JOCKEYS BY ONE OR TWO O'CLOCK OF THE DAY BEFORE THE RACE. HAS THE RULE PROVED OF VALUE?"

MR. CASSIDY: Last year this question was discussed at our conference and we had reports of its success in California, by riders, owners, trainers and track operators. The request came from the press indicating that if riders weren't named at a reasonable time the day before the race, we couldn't expect type setters and others who work in the newspaper office to be kept on at considerable expense until such time as they could get these jockeys; that if they couldn't publish them in the evening papers, the public would not have complete information of the races for the following day; and that the handicappers, whether they be handicappers for the paper or people handicapping for themselves, would be unable to make accurate handicaps without a knowledge of what boy was going to ride each horse. We put the rule into effect in New York this spring with some modification of the California rule. We required horsemen to name their riders at time of entry but we permitted them to wait until two o'clock in the afternoon as the final deadline, giving them a chance to see what riders had been taken on the also eligibles but failed to get in. As far as the operation is concerned it has been satisfactory. The horsemen have obeyed the rule and it has been very satisfactory from that standpoint. However, we have had a great number of complaints from horsemen about the necessity of naming riders so early when they could get a better rider at scratch time the next day. As this question asks, "Has the rule proved of value?" Pat, since you were one of its strong advocates last year, maybe you can tell us how much racing has gained by using that rule.

MR. LYNCH: From the standpoint of the papers, even though it has been modified from the rigid stand that they have in California, it has been an outstanding success newspaperwise, and I would say that if it would be a success newspaperwise, and we're probably selling more papers as a result of it, it must automatically rub off in some way on to racing because it is a medium for more or less free advertising for racing. It has been a great help on the job when you have to handicap horses, and at the same time I think it's a help for racing. I think there's quite a range of difference between Parlo being ridden by Eddie Arcaro or Ted Atkinson or having Peter Boober on it or No Boy. I think a person might hesitate to go in to see a play if you had Hamlet with John Barrymore in it or No Boy. And from the standpoint not only of handicapping, but writing itself, Jim Roach here has to write a lot of advances on big stakes coming up. It's desirable to him and the Times to have that information in his stories, and those stories with the combined newspapers pushing them out, reach an awful lot of people and I think that the benefits rub off onto the racing people. In conclusion I would like to say that we are very happy with the arrangement, and I think Mr. Ortell, Bill Lauder and all the rest of us are in agreement.

MR. KELLEY: Mr. Cassidy, I have taken a good deal of criticism and many of the trainers have said, in a semi-jocular way, "You are responsible for this and where are the added people on the race track," and so forth. I'm not quite clear in my mind what the major objection is from the horsemen's standpoint. I think we

have had the newspaper side of it very clearly brought out, and I subscribe to that very strongly, but I'd like to hear a trainer tell me, more clearly than they have been able to do it yet, what the major objection is to the trainer.

MR. CASSIDY: You'll get your answer as we will hear from the trainers later, but I wanted to get the press first. Is there any other member of the press who has anything to add to what has been said? All right, we'll start with the trainer closest to you. John?

MR. GAVER: We have our own contract rider so it has been no problem for the stable for whom I work, but I think that any rule or regulation should protect or benefit more than one group. I feel the present rule of naming the rider the day before the race is a definite hardship on the owner. I think when the best riders are available, they should be allowed to use them. I think that same thing holds true with the trainer. I know a lot of trainers are under pressure from the owners—"Get me Arcaro," "Get me Atkinson," the entries come out, and those boys aren't riding. That might be a very minor thing, but it is true. I think it is unfair to the public to have your best riders sitting it out when they could be riding. And it is unfair to the racing association, because when your top riders are riding in a race, your betting increases. Of course, there are arguments to all questions, but that is the way I feel. As I understand it, and as Pat has just said, this should rub off on the public. It has not rubbed off on the public. Statistics show that Jamaica was below, in betting and attendance, the 1954 figure. Belmont Park, slightly above, but it was infinitesimal. Aqueduct was below. Certainly the attendance and the betting have not been improved by this rule. And, of course, we need not mention this present meeting which is obviously way below. I have just expressed my feelings and I think that I express the feelings of a great many trainers. I don't think there can be any compromise with mediocrity. You should always produce the best to present the best. If you don't, I think you are going backward instead of forward.

MR. CASSIDY: John, didn't Max Hirsch prepare some statistics he wanted to present?

MR. GAVER: I have them here. It just so happens that I have them right here. (Laughter)

At the Jamaica spring meeting, 1955, there were 20 days of racing as compared to 21 in 1954. To make up for that extra day, the attendance and the betting on Wood Memorial day, the great day of the meeting, were added to it, and the attendance decreased roughly 26,000. The percentage of the betting at Jamaica was off 4% or 5%. At Belmont Park there was an increase—two-thirds of 1% in attendance and in the betting .008 of 1%. Aqueduct had the same number of days in 1955 as it had in 1954, and they were off 6600 in attendance, and the total mutuel pool was off \$937,598. So as there was no great increase at Belmont Park and the decrease at Aqueduct and Jamaica were not great, but are still there, the fact remains that the attendance and the betting have *not* increased with the institution of this rule.

MR. RUTCHICK: I fully agree with Mr. Gaver. I also canvassed about 80% of the horsemen in New York, and they are all against the 1:00 o'clock rule. There were only a few people who were in favor of trying this rule, but they never asked the horsemen to find out whether they were for it or against it. I think the best way of doing it is to get the names of all the trainers in New York, send out cards and let them sign whether they are for it or against it, and the majority should rule.

MR. JACOBS: I don't think the horsemen like the rule. I would much rather if you have to put a boy on, wait until scratch time the next day, as we did before. There are too many good riders, who might be on a horse that is scratched, and you are stuck with a boy you didn't want to ride, but you have to ride him under the one o'clock rule.

MR. CASSIDY: I think one of the arguments last year was that it gave the boys,

outside of Eddie Arcaro and a few other top riders, a chance to ride.

MR. GUSHEN: I don't think that as good a rider as Eddie Arcaro is, he can't ride all the horses in one race.

MR. KELLEY: Would the ideal rule be to name no jockeys until scratch time?

MR. JACOBS: No. I think you should put a rider up if you have one.

MR. KELLEY: Well, there have been a lot of statistics on how the naming of jockeys has reduced the take and attendance. Are there any statistics on the number of times that top riders have been kept on the ground by this rule? Is there any way of judging that?

MR. CASSIDY: You can rest assured there are times when that happens.

MR. LYNCH: I think it is unfair to bring out a bunch of statistics and say that attendance and handle are down because of this rule. I believe it is a national trend and I certainly think that there are much greater factors contributing to such a situation than whether or not a rider is named. Insofar as this continual "No Boy" as we used to have in the past is concerned, I think it's a reflection rather on a.) maybe a horseman's bookkeeping, and b.) an agent's finagling. A trainer has a condition book three weeks in advance and he could engage a rider. Instead at the last minute he is going to have to hustle around for one. I have no objections to maybe changing, but certainly on a future standpoint, he certainly must have some idea as to whom he is going to ride.

MR. GAVER: Pat, I don't think the statement was made that betting and attendance were down because of this rule. The statement was made that the betting and attendance have not increased because of the rule.

MR. KELLEY: John, the idea of this rule is not to increase attendance per se. Publicity or public relations or whatever it may be called cannot be put down in figures in black and red. You aim at the best coverage you can get and I think it is absolutely beyond argument that you have incomplete stories on the races. Horses don't go around the race track alone, like the dogs. Part of their equipment, just like blinkers on or off, weight carried, or anything else, is the boy who rides him. I am honest when I say I have tried to find some way where you could compromise and stop this hardship on trainers, but I do think it is obvious that complete coverage is impossible unless you know who is riding the horse. I think we have a feeling here of competition, favoritism, and I would like to say again, as I said at the first round table here, it would be very helpful and also very true if all of you realized that Pat Lynch, Jim and the rest of us are just as much in racing as trainers. They are not trying to gain an advantage or to work a hardship. I don't know if I am making myself clear, but their aim is for the benefit of racing as a whole, for the very calm, intelligent reason that it benefits themselves. That's their business. We should get away from an idea of favoritism for any one group, I think the job is to try to find a compromise that would work on all sides.

MR. GAVER: I can explain the reason for these figures. I was one of a group of trainers who met with Marshall during the Belmont Park meeting, and during the discussion the things that I have said here were brought up, the trainer's point of view. Then Marshall said that the racing associations were in favor of the rule because they felt that because of it there would be an increase in attendance and betting. I had said, "Well, certainly the racing associations will not be helped by the top riders sitting out a race," because it is too obvious to repeat that there will be more money bet if the top riders are riding in a race than if an inferior rider is riding. And I agreed that there would be some statistics gotten up. And here they are.

MR. LYNCH: Just that one point, John. If you do get the riders, on the program it will have a reflection on the people that are already in the race track, but suppose somebody picks up the paper and decides not to go to the races because, if the rider

is such a strong thing in the betting as you say, "No Boy" is listed. A lot of people might stay at home or go to the ball game.

MR. LAUDER: I think that there's one thing that might be overlooked a little bit. Everybody is talking about one group's point of view. The trainers are fighting for themselves, which is fair enough. Newspaper men are fighting for better coverage so they can do their work better, so Pat, Frank, people who handicap daily can do a better job of handicapping. And through all this, we seem to forget that if we don't have racing fans, we don't have racing. This rule as it was put in last year, or discussed last year, wasn't, as Bob said, to increase attendance or betting but it was put in because it was one thing more New York could do to give a little more something to the fellow who goes racing, the racing fan, give him something more to work with. You are giving the fellow who is going to come regardless of "No Boy" or Arcaro, Atkinson, or Guerin, a little more information and he feels that he maybe has a little more head start. I think that the trainers naturally are trying to get the best man, but when the entries are closed they all have had the same chance to get a rider. The jockey agents know what races they are going to ride in, and if they are not alert and they get shut out, that's their own fault.

MR. CASSIDY: I think if the press is going to answer everybody who speaks, we are going to be on this subject a long time. I would like to ask the owners what they think, whether the rule is a hardship to them or whether they think it is a practical rule for racing. Mr. Widener, you wouldn't have much knowledge of this operation, would you?

MR. WIDENER: I know my trainer is very close to it. I personally am in favor of what Mr. Lauder has just said.

MR. PHIPPS: My trainer of course is rabid on the subject. I think he's so rabid he doesn't really understand the rule a great many of the times.

MR. CASSIDY: How do you feel yourself?

MR. PHIPPS: As an owner, I think it is a sacrifice to have the rule. But it is a question of whether racing gains more through this sacrifice. If so, then the owners have to take it.

MR. BRADY: I think it is a good rule. I think from the point of view of the public it is very important. I don't think it is as much a sacrifice for the owners as it is a battle between the trainers and the press.

MR. CASSIDY: I don't think it's quite a battle between them.

MR. BRADY: I also think you just increase the scramble for the few riders that we've been talking about, but putting on a deadline for them would solve it, I think.

MR. VANDERBILT: I think the importance of it to the press is a little exaggerated. I think the thing is being treated as if the entry comes out with no riders on it. From a practical point of view it can't affect more than three or four horses in a race. From a practical point of view I don't think it affects the stakes at all. Generally whether the riders are officially named by one o'clock the day before or not, it is known and usually put on the overnights who is going to ride the horses. It seems to me what we are talking about is whether a few horses will go out with "No Boy" on them. I think it was a couple of years ago that we stopped listing a rider on two horses, so we don't have that to cope with. I think that there is no doubt that at some times with some owners it would work a hardship. Consider the fellow who has second call on Eddie on a horse. The fact that he cannot wait and take a chance on getting Eddie after scratch time, and has to settle for a second grade or inferior rider, puts that fellow more at a disadvantage than the slight disadvantage to the press in letting that horse go out with "No Boy" on him. As far as I am concerned, I have a contract rider and it doesn't make any difference. But I think it probably is one of those little extra services that would be an extra service to the press, but not enough of one to warrant giving in on.

MR. CASSIDY: What do you think from a manager's standpoint, Luke?

MR. O'BRIEN: Personally, I like the rule for the reason I believe it is important to the papers. It is more coverage for your track to give them an opportunity to handicap the horses. There are a good many of our patrons who do their own handicapping and do not depend on tip sheets or information from the paddock. I think it's important to them. I think one purpose of the rule was to give many more jockeys an opportunity of gaining experience, it would keep more of them around. As far as the increase or decrease in attendance is concerned, I don't think it's relative at all. I think there are too many other contributing causes to the decrease in attendance.

MR. E. KILROE: I feel as Luke does. I'm glad we are discussing this point because last year when the matter was discussed I think we all agreed that someone was going to be hurt a little bit by it and we weren't quite sure whether it was going to be the jockeys and the trainers. I'm just wondering if the trainers aren't magnifying the harmful effects they feel from it. I haven't been aware of many instances where a race went off with good riders on the ground. It may have happened occasionally, but I don't think it's a major consideration. To speak from the standpoint of management I think it's for us to listen rather than to make our own decision arbitrarily. I think we have to find out whether the trainers are really suffering or whether they just think they are suffering. I think we want to know whether the jockeys feel that they are getting pushed around. I think generally it is a good idea to have the jocks go out with the entries so that the serious fan that Luke was talking about knows, when he starts to do his homework the night before, who the jockeys are going to be in tomorrow's races.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Burke, in California were there complaints from the horsemen about the rule? Was it accepted completely without objection?

MR. BURKE: I think it has been of great benefit to many, many more horsemen than have ever been hurt. I can't remember any particular cases right now where one of the top boys has been on the ground and left out of a race or of any owner or trainer who was penalized on account of it. We have had so many complaints under the old system that we studied it carefully and felt that the best protection for all of the owners is to have this rule adopted. Everybody has a chance there, and also the jockeys—it gives more boys a chance to ride. So it has been very satisfactory with us.

MR. CASSIDY: Jim, when you were out there, did you hear of any complaints from the horsemen?

MR. F. KILROE: Well, the thing was pretty well established out there and they were accustomed to it in recent years. They have a special problem in California because they had two or three outstanding riders who rode there all year round who had very skillful agents so the agents kept everybody tied up in a knot, didn't declare themselves until they knew exactly who the best horse in the race was, which is really their business. They are supposed to get the best mount for their rider. It made an unhealthy situation because those agents were in a position to farm out second calls for other riders. In other words, an agent would have a couple of jocks under his wing, really, or some other agent under his wing, and he could sort of go along like the fish that follows the other fish, and take what was left, which gave two or three individuals too much control. That's not a factor here in New York, but I think it is a factor to concede a certain amount to mediocrity, as John Gaver says, and give the second flight rider more chance to ride so he can make an honest living.

MR. ROBB: I think it is a toss-up. I think it is important to the press to be allowed to have the line-up the day before. I also can see where it is a hardship occasionally on the trainers. I do know this, that if a list of entries is published, with the majority of horses with "No Boy" on them, that's bad. If the list were published and out of twelve starters only two had "No Boy," I can't see where that is going to

stop anybody as far as the public is concerned in coming to the track. As Mr. Vanderbilt said, in all stakes races which are the important races and the things which draw a great many people to the track, they usually list the jockeys anyway and they know who the jockeys are even though they are not listed. I don't know how you could modify a rule like this so that you could help both.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Cassidy, I'm a small owner and it has worked a hardship on me. The little stable I have makes about fifty starts a year. Already twice this year I have bumped into this rule where it has been to my detriment. I think there are many more small owners who are hurt, and I think it is the small owner whom you have to protect. As far as the public is concerned, I don't think any member of the press will try to say that the favorite with jockey X on him is going to have as good a chance to win as he would with Ted or Eddie. I know that I don't like the rule at all, and I haven't heard any owner or any trainer, until Jim Brady has just spoken for it, say a good word for it this year.

MR. REINEMAN: Most of the discussion has been about New York racing, and I understood that under the old rule a jockey wasn't put on more than one horse. Is that correct? Well, now, if you will take racing outside of the State of New York, this is just a general statement, you will find that the entries come out with Arcaro on three horses, Atkinson on three, Brooks on three, and the rest are "No Boys." From the standpoint of the public that is bad. I assume that's the reason for changing here.

MR. KNEBELKAMP: Of course, being privileged to look after the public first, as a racing commissioner, I don't think near enough stress has been placed on the importance of the public here this morning. I have heard various groups in racing state their side as it affects them. I think we ought to take a much broader view of its effect on the individual who comes to the races and who makes racing, whether you are an owner, trainer, jockey or no matter what you are. I don't know if there is any way of getting an opinion from the public but just as a race fan and having one or two horses running, I think I might get the worst of it once in a while, I don't know. But certainly it has been my business and from the outside, looking in, I would say that whatever you can do to give information to the public, you not only should do, but you are obligated to do.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Bigelow, do you have that problem in Canada?

MR. BIGELOW: We have had it for about five years. I've been trying to get your rule approved in Ontario but our commission has consistently outvoted me. I was in favor of it all along and I was particularly impressed with Mr. Lauder's statement. Mr. Knebelkamp pretty much dealt with it along the same lines. After all, it is the public who supports the sport. And if you're going to give the public better information and give them that information faster, then the handle obviously has to go up. Mr. Gaver's statistics only proved to me that if the rule had not been in effect the handle in New York would have been still lower.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Inglis, in Michigan have you had any experience with the rule?

MR. INGLIS: We made an effort to put this rule into effect this year, but it met such overwhelming opposition from the horsemen that we decided we would let New York and California try it for another year. Personally, I am very much in favor of the rule and I hate to see New York give it up, because if you give it up here some of the other states will have a much harder time ever adopting it.

MR. ATKINSON: I think that possibly from the standpoint of public relations perhaps it's a good rule. I see no reason why it must be so completely hard and fast. I am inclined to agree that two horses in a 12 horse field with "No Boy" on them wouldn't cause any particular hardship. At the same time there are many, many cases where it is an unfair situation, such as a trainer entering two horses and naming

the rider that more or less works for him, although he may not be under contract to him, on one, and another boy on the other. His own jock winds up on the also eligible list and he waits until scratch time to see if he will get in and he doesn't get in. Now you don't allow that boy to ride the stable horse, inasmuch as the outside rider has already been named on him. I don't think that's a bit fair, and there certainly should be some allowance made in a situation like that. It could happen every day. There are a great many boys in that position, who gallop horses for trainers every day, and then when it comes to riding them, they have to sit the race out.

MR. CASSIDY: There's something you said, Ted, that I find difficult to agree with you. You speak of a modified rule under which only two horses go out with "No Boy" on them, or three or one. You can't have a rule which is tolerant to some and not to all. If somebody doesn't have to name a rider, then everybody else should have the same privilege. To be effective the rule has to embrace everybody it affects. The rule, to operate efficiently, should be specific. There can be certain concessions, and we have made concessions. In a stake we permit a change of rider if a trainer can get the rider he wants and couldn't get him before because he had an engagement. We permit them to put the same boy on two horses in a stake because they didn't know which horse they might want him to ride. In overnight races, we have permitted them to put the same boy on both of them or only one boy, if he was only going to start one. He might put two horses in, thinking it might rain, and one could run in the mud and the other in the dry. We make concessions and we try to make them from a practical standpoint. As long as that rule is in we keep it as efficient as possible.

MR. ATKINSON: That concession has already been made in respect to two horses in a race?

MR. CASSIDY: Yes.

MR. CLAY: This is speaking not as from the publicity department but as from management. We have the old system in Florida and management feels it puts too much power and control in the hands of a few jockey agents, who shop around and pick their mounts and leave owners hanging on the hook.

MR. CASSIDY: You don't mean the rule in which they have to name them, do you? Because the new rule can be circumvented, too.

MR. ARCARO: I don't know, I was one of the rooters for the rule last year, but I don't think the rule has gained us any great value publicitywise. New Jersey hasn't the rule and they haven't done very badly. Many a time it has kept me off the favorite and I've wound up on a 20 to 1 shot in the race. The favorite doesn't have to win, but I'd rather be on it.

MR. ORTELL: With reference to the statistics which Mr. Gaver read, I would like to mention that we had adverse weather conditions at Jamaica. Later we also had Monmouth Park in opposition. Now as you know, we have Atlantic City in opposition to Saratoga. Under the old rule I remember distinctly, not once but numerous times, in overnight races we had as many as three jockeys on two or three horses in a 12, 13, 14 horse race. The trainers were required to name their jockeys, but some prominent stable, when the entries would come up, would have "No Boy" on, and we'd say, "Look at that, we know so-and-so is going to ride him, why didn't he name the jockey?" But he didn't. And they'd go out "No Boy." I would like to know what real hardship it is for trainers. The condition book is out two and three weeks ahead of time. An alert trainer knows his horse fits this race, he will then shop around for a jockey. I don't think a fellow like Hirsch Jacobs, who doesn't have a regular jockey, has a great deal of difficulty in getting a boy. I've seen Hirsch walk into the secretary's office with 42 agents running after him and I've often wondered how does he say "No" to this one and that one until the proper one comes along. He knows whom he wants to ride, and knows if the jockey he wants is open. I think

for public relations, and I'm one who thinks the public should be supplied with all the news that is possible, jockeys on horses make a big difference. It makes a big difference to us. I'll cite you an instance. A week or so ago, we had a horse called Piecesofeight here. The time before the horse was beat 57 lengths or 54 lengths if I'm not mistaken. I don't know who was on him in the beaten race, but here come up the entries, "E. Arcaro." What's happened? As a result you don't try to mislead the public and neither does the man who makes the prices on the program. You say, "Well, I'll have to take a guess at this. I'll make it 6 or 8 to 1." The moment that a horse is quoted at 20 to 1 as the opening odds on the board and he drops to 6 or 7 or 5, then 8 to 5 or 2 to 1, the public say, "What happened?" They don't realize the difference in jockeys. The change in jockey has made a big difference. Now I say again, it does not work a real hardship on the trainers. I am surprised at their opposition to it. We are all a part of racing. And I think the public is entitled to all the information possible. We don't complain if there are a few changes in jockeys overnight. As you say, the rule permits it when reasonable. I don't think a man should be forced to ride jockey Fall-off, if he can get jockey Bailey, Atkinson, Arcaro or Guerin. Let him change, but if you investigate that particular case maybe the trainer was negligent and he did not try to get a boy and is using the rule as an excuse. I believe the rule, as it is, is a good rule. It is a good rule for racing, it is a good rule for us and it is a good rule for the trainers, if they will just be alert and get out and get a jockey. They know when they are going to run. In cases of an extra race, that's excusable. We understand you can't name a rider for a race like that. We're not obstinate nor do we demand 100% jockey billing.

MR. LYNCH: Just one other point. A lot of men sitting here at the table and many other trainers are in a very good bargaining position when it comes down to shopping for a jockey. When you go shopping for him, the rider makes himself available, if it is a trainer of a powerful stable. He might be thinking of some little filly that he would like to ride in a stake, and he makes himself available. Now, talking about hardship in one case or another, when the top rider gets the late mount, he's making a little hardship, too. He's bumping another rider off, and he is also making a hardship for another owner or trainer in that race, by getting an extra edge. A man should be entitled to get the best rider possible, but every benefaction that is argued for, on the other side may also create a hardship, too.

MR. BIGELOW: I would just like to add this in rebuttal. I wouldn't like the horsemen or the jockeys to think that I am unmindful of their problems, because I do realize that this rule imposes a slight hardship on the both. But if you will accept my original hypothesis that this rule would increase the handle, then that temporary sacrifice will be reflected by subsequent betterment for the horsemen and the jockeys. To prove my point, if I may, in Ontario our handle in five years is up 100%. That has been immediately reflected, season by season, to about the same extent in horsemen's purses, and of course the jockeys' mount fees have gone up in the five years, too. So if the trainers, the horsemen and the jockeys would be good enough to accept this as a temporary expedient, and a slight hardship, I think they would find in the end that their accepting that slight hardship would be justified as time goes on.

MR. HASKELL: We don't have the rule in New Jersey, but I'm just thinking on behalf of the New York papers, and feel this is bad for them and the handicapper. Is there any way of compromising on scratch time? For Saturdays, we make scratch time 4 o'clock Friday afternoon. That's so we can print our program. That wouldn't take care of a last minute change in weather. It might be too late for the press, and it might be too early for the horsemen, I don't know.

MR. CASSIDY: I would think it would be a considerable hazard to an association to make it a common practice. We do it, and it has been done in New York for a great many years. On a big day when we couldn't print the programs we had the

scratch time at 4 o'clock the day before. But if you were to establish that as a standard policy you would be subjecting yourself to quite a hazard. The following day, if rain came up overnight, and you had small fields, such as we do in New York—we close a race with six or seven entries—if five of those horses couldn't run in the mud, you've lost the race. So an association has to protect itself. It might help the press, although I don't know whether it would at four o'clock, that's a late time for them for the evening papers. That's one of the reasons why they want to get it by one o'clock so they have it for the evening papers.

MR. HASKELL: Most of the evening papers give their selections in the morning editions of the next day. Mr. Ortell is in the morning edition, the early edition of his paper.

MR. ORTELL: Yes, that's right, Mr. Haskell. I was going to point out to Mr. Cassidy that it is also adopted in Florida where they have the scratches at four o'clock in the afternoon—mostly just on Saturdays.

MR. CASSIDY: It's only for printing the program.

MR. ORTELL: That's the problem, the printing.

MR. CASSIDY: One thing that was an important problem at one time, and it may still be, is that all the information you may give out early you're giving to pool rooms and handbooks.

MR. ORTELL: Are there that many pool rooms around?

MR. CASSIDY: I don't think there are many pool rooms as such, but there are plenty of handbooks.

MR. ORTELL: Well, you're never going to stop that.

MR. JACOBS: I remember John Campbell saying at one of the round table discussions that he thought it was better if the public didn't know who was riding the horse.

MR. O'BRIEN: I think Jack suggested closing the entries the morning of the day of the race.

MR. JACOBS: He also said when there was a paper strike one year, we had a bigger attendance, when there were no newspapers on the streets.

MR. LYNCH: Well, in a think like that it would be a fine thing for racing to keep the entries secret and not have them in the papers at all—you wouldn't know who was going to run in the Saratoga Handicap.

MR. F. KILROE: It seems to me this rule was sort of an experiment here after it was modified from the California practice and it might be subject to a further modification. It seems to me the big complaint around here is the fellow who has a chance to get Eddie Arcaro in a race, and Eddie has a first call in the race which scratches out, and the fellow is not now in a position to get him. If it's an authentic second call, how about carrying two calls on the same rider in a race, numbering them as such when you put out the overnights?

MR. CASSIDY: One of the objections to that is, when you take a boy off a horse and substitute another rider, you are casting a reflection on that boy. When you take one boy down and put another one up you are damaging his record.

MR. F. KILROE: I was suggesting that no other boy be named. In other words, you could name Arcaro on two horses in the race with the first call so numbered in the overnight.

MR. CASSIDY: What is the reaction of the press to that?

MR. CONNORS: We are all talking about Arcaro, Atkinson, Guerin, and so on. What about the time that Arcaro, Atkinson and Guerin get sick and take off. What then?

MR. CASSIDY: If he's sick, he can't help it. What we try to do is require a boy to live up to his contract the same way that we expect other people to live up to their part. When a boy appears on the program, it's public notice that Mr. Chuck Connors

is going to ride No. 4 in the fourth race, and then before the fourth race they take him down and put Marshall Cassidy up. Chuck Connors is going to suffer for it.

MR. ARCARO: You're talking about the program?

MR. CASSIDY: Yes.

MR. ARCARO: Well, they're talking about the overnights.

MR. CASSIDY: You mean changing at scratch time?

MR. ARCARO: Where you have a first and second call on the overnights.

MR. ATKINSON: It still wouldn't hurt the boy who had perhaps second call to the second call of Arcaro.

MR. CASSIDY: How does the press feel about those changes?

MR. LYNCH: From my own standpoint, for our paper and my feelings about it, it's not our purpose to create any hardship on horsemen. We want to help them but at the same time we'd like to get a little break too and know what goes on. If there can be a compromise without vitally affecting the information that we are getting now, which we think is important, why I'm a party to it.

MR. LAUDER: How would this first and second call thing work when you send the overnights out? Arcaro would have first call on No. 1, and then on No. 7 he would also be listed, but with a "2" behind his name as second call? Then Atkinson would have 2, Guerin would have 2, Bailey would have 2. If they were allowed to have a second call on Arcaro they would take it, rather than take Joe Falloff to ride, wouldn't they?

MR. ATKINSON: We're allowed second calls still.

MR. LAUDER: But I mean put them on the overnights. Instead of sending out Joe Falloff on No. 7, you would have Atkinson on No. 7 with a "2" behind his name meaning second call. Then if you got your mount on your first call and that horse went in the race, Joe Falloff might get on this one, or somebody, but nobody would know until the program was printed the next day, and you could wind up practically with having six or seven "No Boys" in a race, because you would have a second call Arcaro, a second call Atkinson, a second call Bailey, a second call Guerin.

MR. ATKINSON: It couldn't happen too frequently. After all, look at the number of races that have throw-outs in them, your first call could be a throw-out. After all, look at the time when they may have as many as 146 entries in one race, which brings up the point of shopping around for a jockey.

MR. LAUDER: But how many throw-offs have we had here in Saratoga? Many?

MR. ATKINSON: Well, no.

MR. LAUDER: Well, let's talk about the situation right here in Saratoga, or in New York as it has been this year. There haven't been, with the exception of a few races, many long, long lists of "also eligibles."

MR. CASSIDY: In the "also eligible" list we permit certain concessions. It's only when they have drawn in the race that we require them to name the riders. If Atkinson was on a horse that drew in with a second call, he could still be on a horse in the also eligibles with a first call, and if that horse drew in he would get the boy. The man who had second call would have to get another rider. That's been in operation since we have had the rule.

MR. GUSHEN: I think this compromise suggested by Eddie is a good one, in this respect, I don't think it is going to happen as often as Bill Lauder thinks it is going to happen. I think it is going to happen in isolated cases. But I think you would get away from the objection of the trainers and the owners because if I could get second call on Atkinson, and if he rode the first horse, I'd put some other rider on. I'd at least be satisfied in my own mind that I had an opportunity to get him, but I didn't because he had first call. At least that would satisfy me to that extent. But the other way, speaking from an owner's viewpoint, I think that owners are involved in this a lot more than trainers, because after all the difference in winning the purse

means a lot more to the owner, especially a small owner, than it does to a trainer. I know this, that trainers naturally run into a lot of difficulty with some of their owners when they see a race being run and they say, "Who have you on this horse?" And he says, "So and so," and the owner says, "Why didn't you get this boy, or this boy?" "Well, I couldn't get him, he had a call." "What do you mean he had a call? He isn't riding." Those things happen all the time, and it's not good for the relationship between a trainer and his owner. But I think this way, you could eliminate a lot of the objectionable features and still be able to serve the press to a certain extent.

MR. CONNORS: You are serving the public through us.

MR. GUSHEN: I consider you as part of the public, as a representative of the public.

MR. KELLEY: Would it be possible to appoint the stewards and a committee of newspaper men, and the racing secretary, a small group to get down and work out some solution?

MR. CASSIDY: I think we are getting at this a little bit the wrong way. This isn't a compromise for the newspaper people. It is to determine what is best for all factors in racing. Certainly the trainers and the owners have a large stake in it.

MR. KELLEY: That's what I mean. When I said "Stewards" I didn't mean to end with Stewards, but to have a small group of trainers, owners, seriously sit down and try to work out a way where all hands can be happy or reasonably happy with the rule.

MR. CASSIDY: I think that's what we are going to have to do anyway. We are going to have some kind of a meeting with the horsemen. It certainly is very important to them and I for one would not want to do anything without getting a general opinion from them. Mr. Dunne, you haven't said anything about this; what do you think?

MR. DUNNE: I agree with Mr. Knebelkamp that we should take some interest in what I would rather call the customers than the public. Everyone calls them the public, I'd rather call them customers.

MR. CONNORS: Marshall, some years ago the entries closed at 3 o'clock in the afternoon for the next day. When the mutuels were established here, or at least before the mutuels came in, there was a request made to close the entries at 10:30, and we had a hullabaloo and a general rhu barb. Well, now the entries close at 10:30 each morning and it's just a matter of routine. I believe naming the jockey question will finally be settled in the same routine, and will be just a thing of the past.

MR. O'BRIEN: Why not try this system suggested by Eddie Arcaro here at one of the fall meetings coming up?

MR. CASSIDY: I think it would be very good if it met with the approval of the horsemen in advance. I don't think we should experiment at a meeting with something unless we are moving a step forward with the general idea of what is indicated by all groups.

MR. ARCARO: There are very few cases where you can even get a second call in New York. You've got a pretty good selection of riders in New York. They know that I'm in pretty good demand and so is Ted, and they refuse to take a second call. I don't think you are going to have a lot of that "1," "2" on the overnights.

MR. CASSIDY: I think we have another problem there, too, Eddie. Second call on you is very indefinite. Only a scratch would make you eligible.

MR. WIDENER: I would advocate, after all this discussion, that a committee be formed to study this problem.

Recess for luncheon.

Mimeographed copies of Mr. J. P. Ebelhardt's proposal for stakes closing dates were distributed to all participants, together with an explanation of the proposal and

comments on the proposal received from various breeders, owners, track managers, racing secretaries, etc.

QUESTION No. 6. "DISCUSSION OF STAKES PROPOSAL OF J. P. EBELHARDT."

MR. CASSIDY: This subject has to do with the closing dates of stakes, future closing and later closing. I think Mr. Drymon may have some more definite information from Mr. Ebelhardt, or maybe you could start the discussion off with your thoughts as a breeder.

MR. DRYMON: I do represent the Thoroughbred Club of America at this meeting, but I don't know how many of you have fully digested this schedule that Paul Ebelhardt has made. I haven't. It's a pretty big subject. I appointed a committee of the Thoroughbred Club to investigate this thing and Paul Ebelhardt is on the committee. Charlie Kenney is chairman and Mr. Hancock is on that committee. That committee to date has not made its recommendations. From a personal standpoint, the standpoint of a small breeder, I don't think this whole thing can or would be adopted by the race tracks and secretaries, but I think there are some points in it that are worthy of consideration. For instance, the Pimlico Futurity closes in December. The mares have been bred and are pronounced in foal. The Belmont Futurity closes in January, as does the Breeder's Futurity at Keeneland, all three on different dates. I think Paul's suggestion here is that those three Futurities close on March 1st. It so happened this year that I nominated mares in December for the Pimlico Futurity, two of them had twins and the other had a foal that died. Naturally, no one knows whether you will have a colt or filly or anything, and I just wonder if it is very important that they have to be closed before the mare foals. If that could be held off until we know whether it is a colt or a filly, then we'd know which stake to nominate for automatically. I just wonder if we wouldn't save a lot of time, especially those breeders who don't have big office staffs, to simplify this thing a little bit without hurting the race tracks, and help us breeders a bit. As is pointed out here, we have to make payments. The breeder who doesn't race doesn't have the problem of the breeder who does race. He has to keep up these payments. We make the first payment and then we're through with them, but even we, who are just breeders and do not race, still have to make nominations practically every month in the year. I know Belmont made theirs to suit their convenience and the other tracks did the same thing, probably without any thought of whether this fits in with the others. And I don't suppose that it is necessary that they do correlate those with other race tracks. But from our standpoint, selfish, yes, we think maybe it could be simplified somewhat without adopting this whole thing, and without hurting anybody it would be helping us.

MR. HANCOCK: This is a rather big problem and I've been over it quite a few times. May I say my own feeling is that we are running for too much of our own money all the time, anyway. Racing's good, racing's pretty big and I don't think the early closing stakes, in the amount that there are now, are justified. We have the Garden State, that's an early closing race; the Pimlico, the Westchester Futurities, and we have a race down in Kentucky, too. There are about six of them that we have to nominate for. I think they are all right—that many. But these other races, I think the Delaware Oaks is an example, you nominate in them when they are yearlings. That's a hardship on the breeder. It's no hardship on the fellow who is going to race because if he wins he gets it back. But it strikes me that it would be better to close your stakes not earlier than 60 days ahead of time. The way it is now the American Thoroughbred Breeders Association tries to get a complete calendar to our members, but we can't make it complete. We wire and write to the racing associations

and some of them don't even bother to answer. We put out a calendar that is incomplete as a result.

MR. CASSIDY: In all of those early closing races, isn't there a breeder's award?

MR. HANCOCK: Yes.

MR. CASSIDY: So you really do have an interest in the racing qualities of the horse, don't you? The same as an owner, in much less a degree?

MR. HANCOCK: I'm not opposed to them at all. I say that they're all right. But let's take the Arlington Lassie Stakes. I think last year the association added \$50,000 of which \$20,000 went to second, \$12,000 to the third and \$6,000 to the fourth. Breaking it down, the association gave \$12,000 in that race to the winner. The race was worth, I can remember it very well, \$63,000 to the winner. I don't think that those races have a real place. As you know, we keep mares on the farm, and the outlay for stakes for us, that we make for different owners, is a big sum of money, a very big sum of money.

MR. CASSIDY: Isn't it true that the breeders are subjected to considerable expense because of sales? If the horses are not eligible for certain races they are not worth as much money?

MR. HANCOCK: That may be so somewhat, but not always. I saw a colt bring \$35,000 at Keeneland that wasn't eligible for a single race.

MR. DRYMON: May I inject this? We breeders who do sell, most of us do feel that it would help us in nominating for those stakes. The general opinion is that if we don't nominate for those stakes, the buyer will think we don't think the horses are good enough.

MR. CASSIDY: On the other hand, if there were no such nominations necessary, there wouldn't be a distinction between them, would there? As an operator of a race track, Mr. O'Brien, what do you think?

MR. O'BRIEN: I do not think we are involved as much as Belmont Park is. I personally think that our stakes are big enough, but you've got to meet competition from the tracks. I think any stake for three-year-olds and upward, with \$20,000 added, and for two-year-olds with \$15,000 added, should be closed only a short time before the actual running of that race. For race meetings commencing from the first to the 14th of any month, nominations should close on the 15th day of the month preceding that meeting. For race meetings commencing on the 15th to the 31st of any month, stakes should close on the first of that month. Stake races of less value than these amounts should close five days before the actual running of the race.

MR. CASSIDY: You favor that?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.

MR. ROBB: We could amend our practice. We close a little bit more than a month ahead for the simple reason that we—I don't think any other track does it—get out a little stakes nominations book which takes some time to print and get together, to collate the information. What we could do is to cut a week off our time for ordinary stakes, by doing what most tracks do and putting the stakes nominations in the condition book, and I'm all in favor of that, getting it closer to the meeting. But as far as the Futurities are concerned, I agree with Ira that nominating in December, or even as we do, in January, is entirely too early. I do think that it should be either March 1st or even April 1st. Paul Ebelhardt recommends March 1st, but he recommends uniform closing dates and declaration dates on either March 1st or October 1st. Now, in the case of the Futurities, where there is a declaration date when the colt is a yearling, I think that October 1st is too early. I mean for the benefit of the man who has the yearling. Very often he hasn't tried his yearling by October 1st. I think it would be better if that date were either November 1st or even December 1st. And then for the final payment of Futurities, he recommends October 1st again. But in our particular case the Futurity is usually run about October 9th,

and I think there are two reasons. First of all you couldn't even print the nominations by October 1st, but secondly, if it were made as we have it now, June 15th for the fillies in the Matron and July 15th for the colts for the Futurity, those are very much better times because then the owners will know whether or not they are going to race at Belmont, or whatever track they are engaged for. If their horses haven't developed as well as they thought they might, they can go somewhere else. Now they can do that in July or in June, but if they wait until October 1st it's too late. But I agree that early in the year that rather than December of the previous year is best for nomination dates and I do think that later than October 1st for declaration dates on yearlings is better.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think there is any value to these early closing dates, closed before the colt is a two-year-old, to anybody except the association in increasing the value of that stake? Is there any particular value to any other interests?

MR. ROBB: Yes. I think that they should not be too valuable. In answering the question of whether or not denoting that a horse is entered for the Futurity when he is sold through the sales ring, there was a time when that was terribly important. As Ira said, it indicated that the owner of the yearling thought something of the yearling or he wouldn't have nominated him. But I do think that has lost its value and the buyers of today don't even bother very much about it.

MR. CASSIDY: But who gets the value out of these early closing stakes besides the association?

MR. WIDENER: The monetary value, you mean?

MR. CASSIDY: Yes.

MR. ROBB: The owner gets the monetary value. And the breeder gets value out of it.

MR. CASSIDY: If he wins, he gets the monetary value.

MR. ROBB: And I think they are good sporting propositions as far as the breeders are concerned.

MR. HANCOCK: I don't know about nominating these mares, as was suggested, after they produce their foals. I think it adds a little sport to it to nominate your mare before she's had it, after she's been bred.

MR. REINEMAN: March 1st doesn't work too much of a hardship because most of your foals haven't been dropped by that time anyway.

MR. HANCOCK: I think it adds a little bit more sport to it, that's the gamble, anyway.

MR. ROBB: I think this, too, that it is not so good to have uniform dates on both nominations and declarations on these Futurities. There's likely to be confusion, for one thing. I also think that spreading it throughout the year, the times for payments, makes it a bit easier on the nominator than having the whole gang come together on either March 1st or October 1st.

MR. CASSIDY: I think that's a question that really the nominators would know more about. Most of them would prefer to have it at one time so there is no confusion or chance of forgetting to declare or nominate, if you have such standard dates. I don't know, that would be entirely up to those who do the nominating or declaring.

MR. ROBB: Another thing comes up in connection with what Luke said, the set dates for the closing of nominations, depending on the calendar. For instance, a closing date might come on a Saturday, which is a bad day to close. Where it happens with us, we try to adhere to the 1st and the 15th for our closings, but if the 15th were to be on a Saturday, we close on a Monday, which is a very much better day.

MR. E. KILROE: From the standpoint of having good races on the track instead of in the book somewhere, it is a good idea to get your closings as late as possible. There certainly is a place for the early closing futurities, just as a sporting proposi-

tion, but I think it is limited to that. I think it is desirable to make the closings late and it would seem to me that it would be easier for the breeders who have to make these early nominations, not to have to put it down all in one lump sum, but as you say, they know more about that than I do.

MR. F. KILROE: I think that it would be a tremendous factor, even to a big breeder, with a substantial bankroll, if he had to pay all his future nominations on one day. It would be a great financial drain and I think it would add to the detriment to the stakes involved, because if he is going to have to do that, he is going to be a lot more selective in the horses he nominates.

MR. CASSIDY: But there again don't you agree that that's a problem of the nominator?

MR. F. KILROE: It's a problem for the association, too. If nominations fall off as the result of such a thing they are going to have fewer horses run.

MR. REINEMAN: In some cases, like mine, we would have to have two paydays in the year anyway, so what difference does it make when they are?

MR. DRYMON: From a bookkeeping standpoint, we would have a pattern or system, rather than every month in the year, or twice a month sometimes. The financial drain doesn't mean anything, you'd have to have two paydays in a year anyway.

MR. HANCOCK: It's not a question of having a steady income when you are breeding horses for sale. You get your summer sales money and your fall sales money. Just as long as you get it in front of the closing date you're all right. That's the reason I suggested the 15th of November instead of the 1st of November, because the yearlings are sold, the mares are sold, the breeder has got his money in his pocket.

MR. DRYMON: I doubt if our committee will go as far as Paul. I don't know, I can't speak for the committee, but I think as was mentioned this morning, a compromise would work out to advantage.

MR. WIDENER: It would simplify it if the horsemen's association and the trainers get together, and see how they feel about it. They have a better chance to get around and get opinions.

MR. JACOBS: I think we have too many early closing stakes in all categories to start with. Mr. Wack had an article in *The Blood-Horse* that covered the subject pretty well. I know, I'm breeding and I have about sixty mares now. I put very few in stakes. If you want to go broke quick, all you have to do is nominate everything in stakes. That was all right years ago when there were no purses. Years ago we had guaranteed stakes here at Saratoga, but that finally was cut out, too. The horsemen were running for their own money. I don't think the horsemen should run for their own money today.

MR. BURKE: At Santa Anita we have our early payment stakes, our breeders' stakes, of course, that only interest people out there. Those dates are pretty well established and we don't have much difficulty with them. Then in the Maturity, of course, our payments are on January 1st, and as far as I know it has been satisfactory so far. As far as having an early closing stake for that much money we have the Santa Anita Handicap for horses three and up, and those nominations don't close until December 1st, that's not an early closing stake. The horses that are not in the Maturity get a chance to run in that one. Our idea with the Maturity was that it would be an incentive for people to keep good stake horses for a big purse like that, get a chance to run him before he gets in the hands of the handicapper. We thought that would be an incentive for them.

MR. EVANS: As far as the mechanics of the sales are concerned, we have quite a bit of confusion over the stakes nominations and stakes eligibilities. This year for our summer sales catalog the breeders could have nominated their yearlings to eleven stakes races. It has gotten to the point now where the stakes nominations as they are

included in each pedigree, are beginning to take up as much space as, say, the second or third dam. For that reason we are going to change our catalog beginning this fall, so as just to name the actual race and put a reference page in the front part of the catalog. I would have to say this, though, from my experience the breeders who consign horses to our sales, the summer sale primarily, place a great deal of stress on stakes engagements. It boils down to keeping up with the Joneses, I think, primarily, whereas in the fall sale, where you sell anywhere from 600 to 700 yearlings, you see very, very few stakes nominations. Of course, that is vindicated by the difference in blood lines, I presume. But we also have great difficulty with our purchasers who will buy a horse and a horse is listed in the catalog as being eligible for the Kentucky Jockey Club Stakes which closes June 15th, and it turns out that the consignor had given us that information prior to June 1st, when we went to press with the catalog, and he forgets to make the nomination. So Mr. Hooper buys a horse and next year he wants to start in the Kentucky Jockey Club Stakes and he is not eligible, or he hasn't been advised by the race track as to when the next payment will be due. So it is quite confusing to us. We make the effort of obtaining from all the race tracks for these yearling nominations complete listings of mares, and in the summer we are able to check those fairly closely, but in the fall we don't have an opportunity to do it because of the time element and the number of horses involved. But I think definitely all of your major consignors place a lot of stress on these stakes engagements.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Drayton, doesn't the T.R.A. have some circular which they get out containing the information in respect to the stakes?

MR. DRAYTON: Yes, as a result of Jimmy's suggestion, we started in last June and we put out a list of all the stakes, with payments and closings.

MR. CASSIDY: How has it been received?

MR. DRAYTON: Well, I think pretty well. We send a supply to each race track, or any breeder, owner or trainer who wants to be put on the mailing list. We have sent sufficient to every race track so that they can distribute them to anybody who has a stake horse. Jimmy might be able to tell how it has been received.

MR. F. KILROE: I think it might be possible to improve the circularization of the information. There are a lot of breeders, for instance, that I doubt are on the mailing list. I am sure they could use the information as well as anyone, because it does include future stakes. The group I would like to hear something from are the people who breed their own horses for racing. They were the people I was thinking of in terms of the financial problem, of nominating all their home bred yearlings. Mr. Jacobs has touched on it, I wonder what Mr. Phipps thinks?

MR. PHIPPS: I think as far as making payments goes, it is very much better to have it at a set time of the year, for the bookkeeping. That really is the trainer's problem, the bookkeeping, not missing on any of them, so I think it would be better to have it a few times in the year as possible. As far as the early closing stakes are concerned, I think we ought to have less and less of those. In the old days, as Hirsch says, we had to run up here for our own money, they were guaranteed, and there were early closings in order to make the stake figure. I think that now, the tracks put up the money, we ought to have as few as possible. I personally think that Garden State has made this big stake, and has gotten a little embarrassed about how big it is and has said therefore it is the horsemen's money. I don't think it should be the horsemen's. I don't think the stake should be that big, either.

MR. WIDENER: I'm in favor of having uniform closing dates perhaps twice a year. And I also agree with what Mr. Phipps has said about the rest of it.

MR. BRADY: I agree with Mr. Phipps also.

MR. CASSIDY: There's something that isn't particularly in this but I wonder has anyone considered whether it might not be well to have the Triple Crown one nomination for the three races.

MR. HANCOCK: That's going to be a recommendation of our committee.

MR. CASSIDY: I would think that would have considerable merit. How do you feel about that, Mr. Widener?

MR. WIDENER: I think it might be a good idea. It was done with the idea of Swaps this year, wasn't it? He wasn't eligible for the Preakness or the Belmont?

MR. CASSIDY: That has happened several times.

MR. WIDENER: I think if a man has a horse he thinks is good enough to enter for the Derby, he must be good enough to enter for the Belmont and the Preakness. I don't think, except for the convenience of it, you would get any more horses for the other races. The Derby gets the horses and unfortunately they are used up by the time we come around at Belmont.

MR. CASSIDY: Don't you think that maybe the odd horse, who maybe didn't want to enter in all three of them, would run if he were eligible.

MR. WIDENER: What would you do about entry fees?

MR. CASSIDY: There would be subsequent declaration fees.

MR. WIDENER: You'd have one nomination for what it would cost for three, it would have to be that.

MR. CASSIDY: I don't know, I think that amount could be absorbed finally in the starting fee and probably partially in the declaration fee.

MR. GAVER: Since geldings are eligible for the Derby and Preakness and are not eligible for the Belmont, wouldn't that complicate matters?

MR. PHIPPS: Don't you think this Swaps thing, this California horse, wanted to come and take a shot at the Derby to prove himself and then he wanted to go home and race where he lived? I don't think it's a question of not having made nominations. I think he wanted to go back where he came from.

MR. HANCOCK: I think they stated in Kentucky that he would have stayed east if he could have become eligible for the Belmont or the Triple Crown.

MR. PHIPPS: Wasn't that a nice way of saying it instead of saying, "I don't want to run in those races up there, I'm going home."

MR. LAUDER: After the race he said he would make the supplemental nomination for the Preakness if he could also do it for the Belmont, and keep his horse here all the way through, but he wouldn't stay just for the one race.

MR. O'BRIEN: Wouldn't the late closing of stakes cover what we are getting at?

MR. CASSIDY: Yes, of course. Except that these three races are important enough to close early, earlier than a late closing stake. And my thought, and it is just thinking right here, is that if the first nominations for the three of them were a low figure where it would not be prohibitive to keep them eligible, then there might be a declaration due some time when they have some knowledge of their horse's value.

MR. WIDENER: I think John Gaver's statement on that, that geldings are not eligible for the Belmont, settles it right away.

MR. CASSIDY: How many are gelded at that time?

MR. WIDENER: There might be a whole lot.

MR. CASSIDY: Suppose it didn't cost any more to nominate for the three than it would for the two?

MR. PHIPPS: What is the cost for the Belmont?

MR. ROBB: One hundred dollars, I believe.

MR. F. KILROE: I know that in this year's Derby and last year's Derby, the winner came from California and in both cases the trainer and the owner had talked the matter over, had been urged to think the matter over very carefully before the Belmont closed, about keeping their horses eligible. In the case of Determine, Mr. Molter has a very large stable running in California, and could not contemplate coming east and staying east for a month and a half during the most profitable racing

there is in California. The Hollywood meeting is now the richest meeting in the country. A man with a big stable of horses just can't afford to turn them all over to the foreman and stay east with the top horse. They have so much money to be made out there, they have so many horses training out there I don't think in either case it would have been a factor. That's just my opinion. But I do think we should do everything possible to get the horses that run well in the Derby back in the other stakes.

MR. JACOBS: I think low nominating fees should be one subject to discuss. High nominating fees are bad. I know we had a Wood Memorial close with a \$250 nominating fee, I think it was the year before last. I think that's a joke. I know I had a couple of colts, they wouldn't have run in it anyhow, but I wouldn't nominate them, I wouldn't take a chance that early. I wasn't going to pay \$250 to take a chance.

MR. PHIPPS: Alex, how much money do you get from your first closing at \$100?

MR. ROBB: Well, we average around 115 nominations.

MR. PHIPPS: It really would make very little difference in the value of the stake, if you went down to \$50?

MR. ROBB: That's right.

MR. JACOBS: I think it means a whole lot to the man who is paying it.

MR. PHIPPS: No, I meant from the value of the stake, not from the cost to you.

MR. JACOBS: It doesn't mean much to the stake. But if you are nominating a lot of horses it means a lot to you.

QUESTION No. 7(a). "WOULD NOT RACING BE BETTER SERVED BY LOWERING THE MINIMUM PURSES AND GRADUATING THE OVERNIGHT PURSES, GIVING MORE MONEY FOR THE BETTER HORSES?"

MR. F. KILROE: I'm convinced that our minimum in New York is too high for the amount of money we have available for overnight distribution. We worked out some figures on that. Just take a sampling of the month of May at Belmont. We checked every horse that finished in the money and found that horses that ran in allowance races in that month averaged \$1778. Horses which ran from \$12,500 down to \$10,000 made \$1733, and the cheapest horses we had, which ran for \$5,000 or less, made \$1390 in that same month. There's a difference there of \$380 a month between the horse that runs for \$3500, and the horse which is worth \$35,000. In an eight month year that isn't a very big differential. I am not sure just how much we would gain, say, just by slicing \$500 off the minimum, but that's another question and maybe we have to find some more money somewhere else for the better allowance horses.

MR. PHIPPS: Would you, as a racing secretary, have trouble in keeping horses and filling your races if you lowered your minimum?

MR. F. KILROE: No, because the cheap horses in New York are running for the most money that they run for anywhere in the east. New Jersey has a \$3000 minimum, I believe. The neighboring tracks are all lower, and actually our \$3500 horses, as Hirsch Jacobs and Sol Rutchick will agree, are probably as bad as anybody's.

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: We've gone over statistics of meetings this past summer, and found that where Jersey does have a low minimum, one track operating there is doing just what this question advocates. They were able to draw horses from New York because they gave additional money to the better grade horses. I remember one day they had a race at Garden State for horses of the same caliber that were running in New York. Their purse was \$10,000, and our purse was about \$5000.

All the horses which started in the race in New Jersey came from New York, and I don't think our race filled. Do you remember that race, Jim?

MR. F. KILROE: That's right.

MR. CASSIDY: Well, that's proof that the way to have the good horses run is to give them a sizable purse to run for.

MR. WIDENER: Jimmy, is that true of our purses at Belmont? Don't we give more for the better type horse?

MR. CASSIDY: I think it's particularly applicable at Belmont. You have the \$3500 minimum, and you don't have as many races of that type. The better horses can get more in Jersey than they can at Belmont.

MR. ROBB: I'd like to go into that and see those statistics because as far as Belmont is concerned, Jim has authority to do almost anything he wants with the purses. He is given a certain amount of money at the beginning of the year.

MR. WIDENER: And he returns some of that money each year. Isn't that right?

MR. F. KILROE: We were staying up as close as we could this year, Mr. Widener, with it, but even so, there just isn't the money on a 4% take. We figured out that during the Arlington Park meeting in the 36 days they raced, they gave away almost \$300,000 more than the comparable meeting in New York, for those dates. And yet they kept \$750,000 more just out of their mutuel revenue. So they gave away \$300,000 more and still had \$750,000 more left. Since we have a limited bankroll I think we should think about using it more effectively.

MR. ROBB: Isn't there another thing that enters into it? That is the percentage of horses in the different age classifications that stay in New York. At Belmont Park for the spring meeting we had something like 40% of our stalls filled with two-year-olds. And of those two-year-olds about one-third of them run during the meeting. But they have occupied stalls which could very well be occupied by three- and four-year-olds, which are the ones which really do the running. We have a peculiar problem in New York and especially at Belmont. Jim has just a certain number of allowance horses, and I'm quite sure that he cards all of the races that he thinks he can card for the horses on the grounds, is that correct? As far as the value of the races is concerned, he has leeway to make the value whatever he wants. As a matter of fact, Mr. Widener's instructions have always been to make the purses for those horses \$10,000 and \$15,000 if necessary. So I think the other problem enters into it, too.

MR. CASSIDY: I know Mr. Widener's instructions very well, that is, to give more money to the better horses, but I think our limitations in revenue prevent us from offering competition in that field, because we are using up a lot of money with a high minimum on cheap horses.

MR. GUSHEN: I am a little interested in the amount of money that Mr. Widener said that our friend Kilroe returned.

(Laughter)

MR. WIDENER: It wasn't anything to account for, I'll say that.

MR. GUSHEN: Wouldn't it be better, instead of returning it, to give it to the better horses?

MR. ROBB: In spite of the fact that a little bit is returned, the average amount spent at Belmont and New York is very much higher than anywhere else.

MR. GUSHEN: I don't quarrel with that at all. I know that is definitely true because I have statistics to prove that in my own office. But what I can't understand is when Belmont Park announces a program, they announce so much money for overnights and so much money for stakes. Anyone who can read figures knows Belmont Park gives just as much as can be expected and somewhat more. Mr. Widener has always been very generous and we appreciate it very much, but seriously speaking I want to say this to you. I have knocked this thing around for several years now

since I've been connected with the HBPA. As far as purses are concerned, I am on record wherever I have spoken as being for graduated purses, but you can say that a minimum purse is satisfactory in one division whereas it is not satisfactory in another. I think every division has to work out its own problems because, as I said in California when we had the round table discussion, I believe that a \$4000 minimum at Santa Anita and Hollywood Park is in order, because they have a sufficient amount of money to distribute for better horses. They distribute somewhere around \$60,000 a day and they certainly can afford to have a \$4000 minimum. Yet in areas where there is a \$2000 minimum, I personally recommended that the minimum be cut to \$1800 because there wasn't enough spread between the minimum and the maximum. You've got to take into consideration the amount of money that each racing association has to distribute and if you've got enough of a spread, why I think it is all right, but if you find that the maximum and the minimum are not far apart, why naturally (I am sure) even the horsemen would go along with any organization to see that the better horse gets a little more money.

MR. WIDENER: Jimmy, don't you dare return any of that money.

MR. GUSHEN: I'm still anxious to know what he did with the money he returned.

MR. DUNNE: The distribution in New York is more than 50% of the revenue from the mutuels and I don't think you can say that about many other parts of the country.

MR. GUSHEN: No, you can't, but remember, when you only get 4%, you try to keep up with Jersey which gets 5½%, and some states get as high as 8%. Nevertheless you've got to do that in order to compete and get that kind of horses. If you were paying percentagewise the same amount of money they are paying anywhere else, you would be running for a \$2000 or \$2500 minimum but you wouldn't get the kind of horses that you would like to see run at Belmont Park.

MR. CASSIDY: Irving, we did this before the competition was there. New York has always given a greater percentage of money to the horsemen in purses than any state in the Union.

MR. GUSHEN: We have no quarrel with that, Mr. Cassidy. But you must realize that now, with all the competition you get from New Jersey race tracks and everywhere else, you've got to keep up a certain minimum and you've got to keep a certain amount of distribution in order to be able to get the type of horses that you want, otherwise you will be getting the same type of horses that we get in New England.

MR. CASSIDY: There's another part to this question:

QUESTION No. 7(b). "WOULD NOT RACING BE BETTER SERVED BY ELIMINATING A FAIR NUMBER OF THE MINOR STAKES AND SPREADING THE STAKE MONEY AMONG THE BETTER GRADE OVERNIGHT RACES?"

MR. O'BRIEN: What would be a minor stake?

MR. CASSIDY: I should think it would be anything for \$15,000 probably or something like that.

MR. O'BRIEN: I think we are talking about the older horses, because the minimum for maiden two-year-olds is \$4000 in New York.

MR. CASSIDY: I think the question is correct. You get better fields, better competition in an overnight than you would in a stake because of the value. I think you would have more active horses. What do you think about it, Jim?

MR. F. KILROE: At the moment our purse pattern makes the top and bottom

horses get too much of the money and the very handsome horse which a man would not sell for less than \$20,000 or \$25,000, is a pretty big risk unless he can get in on some stakes. We made up some figures on that. At Arlington Park in the month of July, the average earnings of horses running in stake races was \$19,000. The average earnings of a horse running in allowance races was \$2000. That's pretty near ten times as much. And they aren't ten times as good horses. I think we are handing too much of our money to the same horses, putting on too many of our races for the same horses, and as they wear out we wind up with small fields and yet the very good allowance horse is starving to death.

MR. GUSHEN: Jimmy, didn't you have a lot of \$7500 and \$10,000 and \$15,000 so-called overnights in Illinois?

MR. F. KILROE: Certainly in California we did, where we had more money.

MR. GUSHEN: But I mean in Illinois. When the stake policy came out, I remember that there were about 20 listed anywhere from \$7500 to \$12,500.

MR. F. KILROE: But this is the Arlington Park meeting I am quoting to you here and those would be counted as overnight races, and yet the horses which ran in them—and there were three times as many of them, three times as many horses ran in those races than ran in the stake class—made about one-tenth as much.

MR. GUSHEN: After all, if you get one horse that wins a \$100,000 race and another wins \$75,000 in a race, that's probably more than all the cheap horses are going to win there in two weeks. It figures that way. But I feel that if you have overnights that run \$7500, \$10,000 or \$15,000, I feel that answers the question very well.

MR. CONNORS: The penalties accrued by a horse that has won, say, one of those minor stakes, might have a deterring effect on the number of entries made for some of those overnight races. If those penalties were eliminated, do you think you would have more horses in an allowance race? What do you think, Jim?

MR. F. KILROE: How about the horse who did not win a stake, he wouldn't be so anxious to run against the fellow who just won the stake last Saturday.

MR. CONNORS: In other words, I think stake winners are penalized.

MR. F. KILROE: My own feeling is that right across the country we are giving too much money to a handful of horses and not enough to the horses just below them in ability. For instance, we have a problem in New York, when a man gets a decent allowance horse, some rich oil man flies in from California and buys him because he can win that amount just running him in overnights out there, whereas the fellow here would spend all summer trying to get the money.

MR. PHIPPS: Isn't it true that after you've won two races in a year with a horse that isn't stake caliber, he can't run in New York?

MR. F. KILROE: We have a number of classified handicaps, we have open classified races, but the trouble has been that those horses can make so little money around here there has been a tendency to sell them.

MR. GAVER: Jim, your theory is, then, that if you would cut out some of the less important stakes, you would be able to hold what is now the forgotten horse here in New York and the races would fill for that type of horse?

MR. F. KILROE: Yes, I think if we did have a \$10,000 race every day we don't have a stake, and could afford to do that, we would be able to hold a lot of horses we are losing now.

MR. PHIPPS: I'd like to hear from the trainers on this subject.

MR. JACOBS: My opinion is that every time we lower the minimum there will be another stake added and that will take care of all that money and then the middle class horse is in the same state he was in before. Every time a stake is added, or raised, the only place you can take it from is the better grade horse, the middle class horse, and he is the one that is suffering.

MR. CASSIDY: What do you mean by "the stake is raised"?

MR. JACOBS: If you raise the stakes at any one of the New York tracks, you've only got a certain amount of money for the purses and we all know it is high enough right now, and if you raise the stake a little higher, where are you going to get the money? You only have a certain amount of money and you've got to take it from somewhere. Your minimum is at \$3500, so you've got to take it from the middle class horses.

MR. ROBB: We've been talking about reducing the number of stakes.

MR. JACOBS: It doesn't matter. You take a race that is \$15,000 or \$20,000, what difference does it make? The only thing I can see is that some of our stakes close a little bit too early. In California they had a \$100,000 race, they closed it a week ahead of time, and there were about 15 starters in the race. Most of the stakes close a week ahead out there. And you have big fields in nearly every one of them. I don't see why we don't do it around New York.

MR. CASSIDY: There's a big difference in the competition.

MR. JACOBS: It would help competition if they would close a week ahead of time.

MR. CASSIDY: I mean opportunities in competition. At Santa Anita there isn't any competition in big stakes with the possible exception of Hialeah and they only run 40 days. But here in New York, if you have a \$100,000 stake today, you might have one in New Jersey the same day and one in Chicago the same day and one some place else the same day, and you have considerable competition.

MR. JACOBS: I think we are all making a mistake in putting on too many big races. Some time ago I think Mr. Widener said we shouldn't have any stake above \$50,000, and I still think he's right. Fifty thousand should be the top stake. One is trying to compete with the next one and I think we are going the wrong way. Every time the legislators see that \$100,000 they think the race track is a gold mine.

MR. GUSHEN: The thing that horsemen are concerned about is the fact that too much of a horseman's money is involved in a purse. You see a great big purse advertised months and months ahead of time; \$275,000 and \$175,000 of it is the horsemen's own money. What's sportsmanlike about that? It's like buying a raffle. You could buy a \$2.00 raffle ticket and you have just as much chance. They have hundreds and hundreds of entries in there. Why should the horsemen contribute \$175,000 to a pot like that? Twenty years ago the racing associations couldn't afford to put up any purses, because they didn't have the income. Now the racing associations can do it because they have revenue from the mutuels. Why should the horsemen have to do it months and months in advance? Some people nominate six, eight, and ten horses for a race, and may not run one. I think that's unfair.

MR. CONNORS: Well, they can read the conditions six and eight weeks ahead of time. They don't have to go in them if they don't want to.

MR. GUSHEN: Yes, but the horse you don't nominate will probably be the best one. How are you going to know which one is the best horse?

MR. CONNORS: You take that gamble.

MR. GUSHEN: There's nothing sportsmanlike about that, in my estimation. If you want a sportsmanlike race, you want to run them like they run here at Saratoga. Winner take all. That to me is a sporting proposition. But if you are going to ask the horsemen to put up \$175,000 and the track put in \$100,000 more, what is sportsmanlike about that? No wonder all the politicians throughout the country are trying to lower the take for the race tracks. They say if they can afford to give away \$275,000, they must be coining money. I agree with Mr. Widener. If we made stakes with a \$50,000 or \$75,000 top it would be plenty, then we would have enough money to take care of just what Jimmy Kilroe said about giving it to the

middle class horse instead of letting one horse win \$700,000, \$800,000 in one year. Maybe I'm mad because I haven't got that kind of a horse.

(Laughter)

MR. CASSIDY: What would you do if you were running a race track, say in Rhode Island, and you wanted to operate with no stake over \$50,000 and Massachusetts, right next door, would offer \$100,000 to attract your horses. Then in some other near state they would go up to \$150,000 or \$200,000, what would you do?

MR. GUSHEN: I'll tell you what I'd do. Here's an example: A certain track had a \$50,000 stake on and they cancelled it because the entries did not justify a stake of that caliber. I'm not against stakes, you know that. But if a small track runs a \$100,000 race, they haven't any business doing it.

MR. CASSIDY: How are you going to stop it?

MR. GUSHEN: Sure you can stop it. Horsemen can stop them. Why should they run a \$100,000 race at a race track where there is only a \$2000 minimum?

MR. CASSIDY: Don't you think that a man with a horse that qualifies for a \$100,000 race would be foolish not to start him if he had the opportunity?

MR. GUSHEN: Sure, but don't forget there are a lot of these races throughout the country and there aren't that many horses. Look at all these \$100,000 races that are being run. How many horses do you get in there? Three, four, five, that's all you get.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Cassidy, there seems to be a question in Mr. Widener's mind we ought to answer for the record. We are exactly in accord with him on the \$50,000 races. I think it is all right to have your championships \$100,000, and I think all breeders feel that way. I think also all breeders would be opposed to cutting out the small stakes, because that unquestionably depreciates your yearling values. People who go in the racing game want to win a stake. They don't buy a yearling to win a race, they buy it to win a stake and they ought to have a chance to win one of some kind, somewhere.

MR. JACOBS: On the subject of stakes, a man can win a \$15,000 purse, and if it is not a stake, he doesn't feel good. But call it a stake, if it closed one day ahead of time, and it is known as a stake, he's as proud as can be to have a stake winner. And if he gets a trophy with it he likes it even more.

QUESTION No. 8. "WHY IS THERE NO OPPORTUNITY IN THE FALL FOR THREE-YEAR-OLD FILLIES WHEN IT IS AN ACCEPTED FACT THAT THEIR FORM IS MORE STABLE AT THIS TIME OF THE YEAR?"

MR. F. KILROE: When I first heard that question I sort of resented the fact that it was putting all the responsibility on New York which already runs most of the filly races, at least a good proportion of them. When I looked it up I found that last year was the first year anywhere in the country they ran a race for three-year-old fillies in the fall of the year. They resumed the California Oaks after a 45-year lapse and they started a stake at Garden State called the Jersey Belle. There are 13 filly and mare stakes run in the fall of the year in the United States and New York ran seven of them. In the principal ones, like the Beldame, three-year-olds won 11 out of the last 19 runnings, and three-year-olds won 12 out of 16 in the Ladies Handicap. But that figure in itself is not conclusive. The big factor is the number of three-year-old fillies which ran in those races. But fillies below the top haven't much chance to run. I think there is a good deal of merit in the suggestion. Rather than run all seven of our fall stakes for fillies and mares, I think one of them probably ought to be for three-year-olds. Last year out of these 13 three-and-up races, three-year-olds won four of them, were second in seven of them, and third in four of them,

which looks like they have a fair chance, but the thing that impresses me more is the fact that so few five-year-old mares are in there.

MR. HANCOCK: The question is mine, and it did seem it wasn't quite fair to the three-year-old fillies.

MR. ROBB: As Jimmy has said, the three-year-olds have been winning most of the stakes for fillies and mares in the fall.

MR. HANCOCK: That's true, but if you would break that down to the number of three-year-olds that have competed, it wouldn't be very much. It is always the same fillies.

MR. ATKINSON: I was just going to ask, you say 11 out of 19 were won by three-year-olds, the chances are the remaining eight were four-year-olds. You very seldom see a good five-year-old mare. They are in the stud by that time. So it's almost a fifty-fifty proposition. Chances are there are a great many more three-year-olds racing, so it is perfectly natural to assume they would win the greater number of races.

MR. F. KILROE: But a greater number do not start in those races, Ted. It's just those top mares like Parlo. The other three-year-olds just don't feel up to running against them.

MR. ROBB: Ted, you'll be interested to know that since 1921, in the Ladies Handicap, four four-year-old fillies have won.

QUESTION No. 9. "SHOULD THE GELDING ALLOWANCE BE REIN- STATED?"

MR. CASSIDY: We discussed the topic here last year, and probably did in California. The argument at the time was to eliminate the breeding of a great number of low caliber horses. The thought was that if a person had a horse that wasn't fashionable, and it was the only horse he had, he was going to breed to him whether school kept or not. Also the number of registrations of foals over the years hadn't increased nearly in proportion to the number of tracks that are operating and the number of races that are run. Other comments were that they didn't think it was proper to give an allowance to a horse that was not a whole and natural horse. Other comments were that it was not good for racing to have a gelding ascend to be the top horse of the year like Exterminator. I've forgotten some of the other arguments. The subject has been revived for discussion again. Jimmy, what do you think of it?

MR. F. KILROE: I don't think it would serve the purpose and would give an unfair advantage to a high class gelding in a big race if he is going to get three pounds from the entire horses. I had thought that maybe what we ought to think of is over a period of time to establish a rule that no entire horse can run for less than \$5,000. I think we ought to make people cut horses, make sure that they don't decide to breed Old Joe just because he won a couple of claiming races. With existing stock it could be established as a custom, say, starting with a two-year-old year, that when those horses became three they couldn't run for less than \$5,000, if they were still horses.

MR. CASSIDY: That would take national approval, though.

MR. F. KILROE: Yes.

MR. CASSIDY: You could not do that locally. Francis, as a racing secretary, what do you think about the gelding allowance?

MR. DUNNE: I used to think it was a dreadful thing, but I find that it has a lot of things in its favor. Along the lines you were discussing I don't see why they couldn't have a stallion's license. They've got a license for everything else now. If I want to breed a horse I'd have to get a license from The Jockey Club before I could

do it. And if it's Old Joe, say "No". Eliminate these class H stallions now. Now a fellow gets a couple of mares and a stallion and he's in business. You have to take the registration of the foals. I don't see why that should be. I don't see why there shouldn't be some restriction on it.

MR. GUSHEN: How are you going to determine which stallion is to have a license and which stallion is not?

MR. WIDENER: I think we are out of bounds on that question.

MR. DUNNE: The Jockey Club can determine it.

MR. GUSHEN: How is The Jockey Club going to determine it? How are they going to know a horse is going to make a good stud or he isn't going to make a good stud unless he's given an opportunity to serve?

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Widener, is there a gelding allowance in Europe?

MR. WIDENER: I couldn't answer that.

MR. JACOBS: The last time I was up in Canada they had a gelding allowance.

MR. CASSIDY: Is it still up there, Mr. Bigelow?

MR. BIGELOW: Not in Ontario.

MR. DRYMON: From a breeder's standpoint, I don't think we ought to try to tell a man he must cut his horse, or he can't register his foal. That would be a rule or regulation nobody would like. But I think if you make a little incentive for a man to want to cut his horse, put on a few gelding stakes, that might do the job without telling him what he has to do or can't do. Make an incentive for him. Have gelding allowances, or stakes for geldings only.

MR. CASSIDY: They would be cutting a pretty good horse if they were cutting him for stakes, though.

MR. HANCOCK: Another way to handle it might be to increase the registration fee to The Jockey Club and turn that money over to public relations. It seems to me that if a horse is worth breeding and raising, he is worth \$50 to register. That will stop an awful lot of this. In Kentucky now you can hardly sell a beaten horse for \$500 any more.

MR. CASSIDY: I liked the first part of that, but what did you say to do with the money?

MR. HANCOCK: There are a lot of horses, and even in Kentucky, which is better than most of the states, that probably shouldn't stand and they're giving away the services. I think if you charge them \$50, or even \$100, to register every foal—I don't want to give my money away—but I believe it would be a help that way.

MR. CASSIDY: I'm sure it would be of some value in that respect, to stop promiscuous breeding.

MR. REINEMAN: I want to go along with that. I believe in higher registration.

MR. EVANS: Has The Jockey Club discussed that recently?

MR. CASSIDY: This question has been discussed, yes.

MR. EVANS: And also raising the registration fee?

MR. CASSIDY: Yes, but they've been reluctant to think of anything like that unless it was absolutely necessary.

MR. WIDENER: We didn't think the breeders would take to it so kindly.

MR. BURKE: What would be the legal complications if The Jockey Club were to raise the registration fee?

MR. CASSIDY: No legal complications.

MR. BURKE: A man who had a thoroughbred horse, say out in California, raised him. He wanted to race him at the race track. The race track would say, "No, he's not registered with The Jockey Club."

MR. CASSIDY: Isn't that true today, Mr. Burke?

MR. BURKE: Yes, but of course the fee isn't so great. I was just mentioning that as a possibility.

MR. PHIPPS: I don't think we'd go as high as \$50.

MR. HANCOCK: A fellow who has a horse going to a race and he thinks he's going to win it, he will pay \$100 to register him.

MR. CASSIDY: There isn't any question that if it went to \$50, the money they paid for it would come back to them in one way or another. It would come back to them through a service from The Jockey Club, and it would come back to them in the elimination of the poorer horses.

MR. HANCOCK: The main thing that is depressing your horse market now is the stall situation.

MR. GAVER: On that gelding allowance we were discussing, if geldings were given an allowance as they used to have, in your opinion would that help fill races in any way?

MR. F. KILROE: I don't think so. It might have the effect of raising weights in races because it would mean one less allowance you could give in a race, if they are going to stay within the 101 pound minimum.

QUESTION No. 10. "COULD NOT A RULE BE FORMULATED THAT WOULD MAKE A JOCKEY ENGAGEMENT BINDING ON BOTH EMPLOYER AND JOCKEY UNLESS CANCELLED BY EITHER PARTY BY 72 OR 48 HOURS BEFORE A RACE (EXCEPT IN CASE OF EMERGENCY ACCEPTABLE TO THE STEWARDS)?"

MR. CASSIDY: I think this question was submitted because of the fact that a man may engage a jockey for a stake, maybe to go to another state or track, and 24 hours before the race he will cancel it and get some other rider without having put up any money to compensate the boy for giving up all of his other mounts on that day. In overnight races frequently they change a rider and the choice is with the trainer or the owner, whereas if a jockey doesn't fulfill an engagement in a race, unless he has a reason acceptable to the stewards, he's going to be punished. Eddie, what would you think?

MR. ARCARO: It doesn't happen to me very much.

MR. CASSIDY: I know, but you must know boys to whom it has happened.

MR. ARCARO: Well, of course the only thing the trainer has to pay for is the jock's mounts. He can take you off in the middle of the day, if he wants. That's the only unfair thing about it.

MR. CASSIDY: What about a stake?

MR. ARCARO: It doesn't happen in stakes, does it? Although it just did happen to Westrope.

MR. CASSIDY: The reverse is true in the case of an agent who has Eddie Arcaro. I've got an engagement on Eddie in a race. All of a sudden Native Dancer pops up, the agent comes to me and says, "You don't mind if Eddie rides Native Dancer, do you? There's a chance for him to ride in the stake," and so forth, and what can I say? I say I don't care, but I do care.

MR. ARCARO: But if you did care, though, I couldn't take off of your horse.

MR. CASSIDY: I know that, but I wouldn't want you to ride if you didn't want to.

MR. ARCARO: I wish you had some horses, I'd like to ride for you.

(Laughter)

You're different than most people. He's talking about letting you off. I don't know anybody else who'd let you off. Oh yes, Mr. Widener did.

MR. ATKINSON: Well, a situation is unlikely to happen between the same jockey and the same owner twice.

MR. CASSIDY: You'd be surprised how many complaints come to us from the

same rider and the same owner. They make up and try again. But it does happen.

MR. CASSIDY: Would you, Eddie, as a jockey, think a rule such as that would be valuable to jockeys, owners and trainers? That an engagement be binding unless cancellation is approved by the Stewards?

MR. ARCARO: I think it's a very good idea.

MR. ATKINSON: If it's agreeable to the trainer and the jockey's agent, why must it clear through the Stewards?

MR. CASSIDY: Just to prove that it did. We might not believe you.

MR. ARCARO: What could you do about what happened yesterday?

MR. CASSIDY: It depends on what the rule said. If the rule provides that if an owner cancelled a stake engagement within 48 hours of the race, and the boy cancelled all his mounts somewhere else, the rule might provide that he would be entitled to 25% of the 10% as well as the jock's mount in case the horse won. It would depend on the rule.

MR. GAVER: Would this apply just to stake races?

MR. CASSIDY: I don't know, probably it would apply to all races, whether stakes or otherwise.

MR. F. KILROE: We had an owner out in California once who had to scratch his horse out of the Santa Anita Handicap because he had so many riders engaged there weren't going to be any left.

(Laughter)

MR. E. KILROE: In the case of an out of town engagement, what jurisdiction would the local Stewards have?

MR. CASSIDY: The same jurisdiction they would have in any violation of a contract made on the grounds.

MR. E. KILROE: You mean on the telephone. I just wonder if you wouldn't have a question of jurisdiction there.

MR. CASSIDY: I think you'd have jurisdiction, if you had such a rule and there had been a violation of it, if it occurred in your territory it would give you jurisdiction even though the race was someplace else.

MR. BIGELOW: You could frame your rule that way in any event.

MR. GAVER: I think the contract should be binding on both parties. And I think that probably 5% of the net value to the winner be paid to the jockey if he was taken off the horse without good reason.

MR. CASSIDY: What about the jockey who takes himself off?

MR. GAVER: Then he wouldn't be permitted to take himself off.

MR. DUNNE: He could give you the 5% then.

MR. ATKINSON: I certainly think it should be binding on both parties. As far as punishment is concerned, the jockeys are under the jurisdiction of the Stewards, and there could be some comparable penalty against the trainer.

MR. CASSIDY: They're under the same jurisdiction.

MR. ATKINSON: But there never has been any penalty.

MR. CASSIDY: That's probably why this rule was suggested.

MR. DUNNE: Suppose a trainer is out in Chicago and he gets Atkinson to ride his horse, and then the day before, he takes Atkinson off, what have we got to do with that trainer in Chicago? He probably hasn't even got a license here.

MR. CASSIDY: If the Illinois Racing Commission had the same rule it would be effective there.

MR. JACOBS: Hardly anyone around here signs a contract to ride a boy. It's all verbal. Then when there is disagreement, it's just one person's word against the other's. Plenty of times someone will say, "I might want you to ride that horse," and put the word "might" in. Then they always have an out.

MR. CASSIDY: Well, if they wanted security, they should have it in writing.

MR. CONNORS: What about a situation like this, it happened in Chicago a couple of years ago. A boy got on a horse, and was thrown three times before he got to the starting gate. He said, "The hell with him, I'm not going to ride him, let them get somebody else." What about that?

MR. CASSIDY: Did they put somebody else on?

MR. CONNORS: Yes. It was Bailey, when he was thrown three times going to the post in Chicago and he wouldn't ride the horse.

MR. CASSIDY: You can't blame him.

MR. PHIPPS: That's a good reason.

MR. ARCARO: No rider should be forced to ride a horse he doesn't want to ride. I'd hate to be the guy who forced you to ride, if you fell and something happened.

MR. CASSIDY: They wouldn't force him unless it were capricious.

MR. ARCARO: If he doesn't want to ride, he has a reason. Either he's scared of the horse, or something. He just doesn't take off. I tried to take off a horse in Florida one year, and I tried to get them to scratch him, but they wouldn't scratch him. The horse was about a 6 to 5 shot, and was positively lame.

QUESTION No. 11. "WHY DON'T ASSOCIATIONS OR COMMISSIONS ENGAGE MEN TO MAKE OFFICIAL CHARTS SO THAT RACING, LIKE BASEBALL, MAY KEEP ITS OWN RECORDS? (EVENTUALLY THE RECORDS WOULD BE COLLATED, SHAPED INTO PAST PERFORMANCES FOR THE PROGRAM AND THE PUBLIC WOULD GLADLY ABSORB THE EXTRA DIME CHARGE.)"

MR. CASSIDY: Not so long ago this was discussed and proposed in New York. It was for the purpose of providing charts for the papers without any cost to them. The associations would employ a crew to make the charts and give them to the Racing Form, the Times, Tribune and so on.

MR. CONNORS: I know one thing you are going to do—throw a lot of guys out of a job.

MR. CASSIDY: That was simply to give a free service to the press. Then it also would provide past performances if you wanted to use them for a program. That wasn't thought of at that time.

MR. ORTELL: We did that a number of years ago. Supplied papers with shorts. At one time there were three crews of us working here.

MR. CASSIDY: That right, U.P. and A.P.

MR. ORTELL: I think under the present system it has worked out very well.

MR. CONNORS: Any papers can get the charts from our organization at nominal cost.

MR. CASSIDY: Yes, but the programs couldn't get them, could they?

MR. DUNNE: They get it in Mexico City. They have a race track there and the program has the past performances.

MR. LYNCH: They do it in other sports.

MR. CONNORS: They do it in Ontario.

MR. CASSIDY: The only place they have the past performances is in the Form and if it would be sold on the program it would cost the Triangle Publications considerable.

QUESTION No. 12. "SHOULD A CLAIM BE ALLOWED OR VOIDED IF A HORSE IN A CLAIMING RACE IS SCRATCHED ON THE TRACK OR AT THE STARTING GATE FOR REASONS SUCH AS LAMENESS, RUN-

NING OFF, INJURY, ETC., AND A CLAIM HAS BEEN DEPOSITED FOR THAT PARTICULAR HORSE? AT WHAT POINT SHOULD OWNERSHIP TRANSFER WHEN THERE IS A CLAIM IN FOR A HORSE IN A CLAIMING RACE?"

MR. CASSIDY: This was brought up, I am sure, by a press article, which says, "Bill Mills pressed the button which opened the gates. The horse reared so suddenly and so high he fell backward, spilling Rogelio Trejos, and then, plunging, he fell forward, flopping on the ground, finally regaining his feet in front of the gate opposite the sixteenth pole. Immediately the race was over announcement was made on the loudspeakers that Sun Deck would not be considered a starter and money wagered on him would be refunded. Obviously it was a popular decision with those who had backed the horse and, though it meant reduced odds in the payoff on the winner, those holding such tickets were glad to be en route to the cashiers' windows, so no one objected. Old-time racing people, however, shook their heads at the flouting of custom. There seems to be no question that the horse, by every rule of race track jurisprudence from the time of Admiral Rous down to modern times, was, officially, a starter. Though the stewards have discretionary powers in such matters, etc." They are objecting to what the Stewards did.

MR. GUSHEN: Did the gate open?

MR. CASSIDY: Yes.

MR. GUSHEN: Did the horse get out of the gate?

MR. CASSIDY: Yes.

MR. GUSHEN: That's got nothing to do with the question.

MR. CASSIDY: I know it, it provoked the question, because it came with it. Actually, the point at issue, I think, is the fact that in different sections of the country they have different rules which determine when a horse is a starter, as it affects a claim. Or, as a matter of fact, as it affects jocks' mounts or nominations in a race. Years ago, a horse was a starter when he left the paddock for the post, no matter what happened. If he got killed right outside the gate, he was still a starter. The owner was liable for jocks' mounts and he was liable to be claimed at that point. Then with the advent of the mutuels, every time a horse was scratched and there was the slightest excuse, they gave the money back to the public, so they wouldn't create a disturbance or a riot. Tracks throughout the country gradually changed the time when a horse was considered a starter. In New York, for purposes of claiming, the horse is considered a starter when the time for claiming closes, which is 15 minutes before post time, so that if he were injured in the paddock or on the track after that 15 minutes, the claim would be good. In California, I believe, and correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Burke and Jimmy, a horse is considered a starter when the stall door in front of him opens to start the race. Is that correct?

MR. BURKE: I think so.

MR. CASSIDY: In other states a horse is considered a starter at different times before a race. He becomes the property of the claimant at that particular time. It would seem to me, and I am giving an opinion rather than presenting a question, that we should have a standard rule throughout the country on that, and I believe the rule in California is fairer both to the prospective owner of a claimed horse and the man who owns the horse. If he is prevented from racing by the stall doors not opening and the owner is prevented from having any reward from his entry in the race, it doesn't seem fair that he should lose the horse. I may be wrong, but that is my opinion. In the case of a jockey it is different. He is entitled to the jock's mount even though the horse doesn't leave the paddock. He is prevented from riding any other horse, and it is an engagement he has to keep. He could be injured going to the post or injured in the paddock, it is a hazard he has to assume, and therefore

should be paid. I think the nomination to a stake is a contract, and the man who wins is entitled to all the nomination and starting fees after the horse has been considered a starter which the state recognizes as at the time his number is displayed and the jockey has been weighed. But I think this is worthy of serious consideration to get the thoughts of everybody in respect to when a man becomes the owner of a claimed horse.

MR. DUNNE: I remember when that rule was put in, by the Stewards of The Jockey Club. They discussed it and I recall they said they thought the man who claimed the horse ought to take a little chance, too. Suppose I claim a horse from Hirsch, and the horse is going to the post and becomes dead lame. They would let me have the dead lame horse instead of Hirsch. I think it is pretty fair the way it is now, 15 minutes before post time, he is my horse, instead of he doesn't get to be my horse until he is off and running.

MR. LYNCH: Don't speak to Hirsch. He claimed a dead one named Character one time.

MR. JACOBS: When the horse leaves the gate, I think is the fairer rule, because a man may put a horse in that might be lame, and thinks he can stick somebody on him, and then finally when he is going to the gate the veterinarian scratches him.

MR. DUNNE: I think this is the only place where they have that 15 minute rule.

MR. INGLIS: At the meeting we had in Kentucky two years ago we gave that particular rule a pretty good going-over, and it was agreed at that session that the rule ought to be when they leave the paddock, that was the rule that most of the states in the middle west, which were represented at that conference, agreed to and did adopt. One of the important arguments that was given for changing from the time the starting gate opened was the fact that there might be a chance for connivance between the man who knew his horse was going to be claimed and the veterinarian at the starting gate in order to get him scratched so that he wouldn't be claimed.

MR. CASSIDY: Do you think we should ever have a rule that would have to protect us against our own employees?

MR. WIDENER: I would just like to ask something here. I didn't know a person knew he had the horse until the race was over.

MR. CASSIDY: A claim is not supposed to be opened until after the race.

MR. INGLIS: A lot of people who put in claims do a lot of talking about it.

MR. PHIPPS: That's their own fault then, isn't it?

MR. INGLIS: All I can say is that as far as I know most of the states, and I think there were 10 or 12 states represented at that conference who adopted that rule and it seems to be working out fairly well.

MR. WIDENER: Have there been any objections to what we've got?

MR. CASSIDY: Not official objections. We have had comments. Just as Hirsch says, a man would put his horse in and send him to the post, and the veterinarian would recommend that he be withdrawn because he may have rapped himself on a nerve, or show some disability at that time that he didn't show in the morning when he was examined, he would call up and recommend that he be scratched. The man could lose his horse without getting a chance to run him, and tests later might fail to show anything the matter with him.

MR. JACOBS: It is only in recent years veterinarians have been at the gate where they could scratch a horse. They have a better chance to see horses that might be lame. There are a lot of horses that, before the races, owners hope that somebody will claim. They want to lose them. But when the veterinarian finds them so sore, he scratches them. It sort of protects the man who is going to claim the horse, too. I think the best rule is when the horse leaves the gate.

MR. LYNCH: It's also pretty good protection for somebody who is betting on that horse, too.

MR. CONNORS: Suppose you have an entry, suppose you have a 6 to 5 shot entry, the good one gets over to the gate and gets scratched. You don't get your money back on the 100 to 1 shot.

MR. DUNNE: Nobody knows the answer to that one.

MR. CONNORS: I happen to remember that Whitney ran an entry at Aqueduct one day, one was 7 to 10 and the other was 3000 to 1. The 7 to 10 shot got scratched.

MR. CASSIDY: Don't tell me the 3000 to 1 shot won!

MR. CONNORS: No, sir. He finished 18th in a four horse race.

MR. GUSHEN: Why can't it be worked out in an emergency like that where people bet on an entry, to give them five minutes' time to get their money back?

MR. DUNNE: You couldn't do it in five minutes.

MR. GUSHEN: It's been done. At some race tracks they do it.

MR. DUNNE: Lou Walger said he wouldn't want to try it in five minutes.

MR. GUSHEN: It has been done and it is being done at some race tracks. It works out all right. I don't see any reason in the world why anybody should bet \$10 or \$20 on a 6 to 5 chance, then have one of the horses kicked or withdrawn, and then have his \$20 riding on a 50 to 1 chance. I don't think that's fair.

MR. WIDENER: May I interrupt? I think we are all way off the question.

MR. CASSIDY: Does anybody else have any other idea as to when a claim should be considered in effect?

MR. KNEBELKAMP: I would just like to add to what Mr. Inglis said. We tried to get together on the uniformity of many rules at this particular conference he's talking about, but actually the uniformity of all rules is not even desirable, no matter how much people talk about it, because certain rules cannot be uniform on account of different localities. But this one particular rule was discussed quite a bit, and they all finally decided that it should be when the horse leaves the paddock. Of course, that could be changed, and no commission would want to be arbitrary. We had all kinds of people at this particular meeting, some of them were breeders, some were owners of race horses, some were business people and some were doctors, but we do have it uniform in the midwest and, as Mr. Inglis said, it has been in effect in Louisiana, Chicago and there haven't been any complaints about it.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Knebelkamp, was that conference attended by representatives from the whole country or just locally?

MR. KNEBELKAMP: It's what they call midwest, although it wasn't actually midwest. It was states that had things pretty much in common like Louisiana, Kentucky, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Arkansas. I mean by that where there were the same owners and trainers who might move from one state to the other. The purpose of the meeting was to try to make uniform some of the rules for the trainers' and owners' benefit so that they would know what they were going to do from one state to the other. And as a whole, as an exploratory meeting, I think it worked out very well.

QUESTION No. 13. "ARE PRESENT THINKING AND RACING RULES A HINDRANCE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG RIDING TALENT? WHAT ARE THE RELATIVE MERITS OF THE NEW 100 WINNER AP- PRENTICE RULE AND WHY, IF GOOD, CANNOT IT BE ADOPTED NA- TIONALLY?"

MR. CASSIDY: I have some notes about the 100 winner rule. It's an incentive to large stables to make riders because of original contract employer allowances for

the duration of the entire contract. The contract may be bought before the boy wins his first race and the owner still be eligible as the original contract employer. It gives many more young riders an opportunity to make good after having exhausted 40 winners. Never more than five or six boys ride over 100 winners in the first year whereas the big majority ride until they have won 40 winners and then have no more allowance. It should produce more able jockeys. The large percentage of those who have won 40 races and do not have the further apprentice allowance, are never heard of again, whereas if they could continue on until they would win 100 races, they would acquire experience enough to be acceptable certainly as second rate riders, and may eventually develop to be our top riders. Did either one of you ride 40 winners in your first year? Ted, you didn't ride 100 your first year, did you?

MR. ATKINSON: Oh, no.

MR. CASSIDY: So you were slow to come along on that basis, weren't you?

MR. ATKINSON: Something like 92 or 93% don't ride 100 winners their first year.

MR. CASSIDY: The five-pound contract employer allowance after 100 winners for the remainder of the year encourages the owner to get the rider mounts so he can quickly win 100 races because it doesn't take away from him the privilege of having five pounds that first year. What do you think of it, John?

MR. GAVER: I don't think I am qualified to express an opinion.

MR. JACOBS: I was just wondering how it has been working out.

MR. LYNCH: I have no answer to this thing, but just as an observer, I wonder why stables like Greentree, Mr. Widener's, Mr. Phipps' and many other people in the past who developed riders, and always seem to have some bug riders around, I wonder why they don't have them these days and what the answer is to it. I don't know myself.

MR. CASSIDY: The only answer I can give you would be that it is so much easier to buy a rider than it is to make him. It is so much cheaper in the long run. If you make a rider it costs you a lot of money, particularly where you have valuable horses. If you have to ride a green, inexperienced boy on high priced horses it is going to cost you a lot of money. They have need for professional, qualified services and they are willing to pay for them.

MR. LYNCH: Is there some legislation that has stopped the incentive for making it worthwhile?

MR. CASSIDY: There isn't any that I know of.

MR. GUSHEN: As you know, the HBPA discussed this matter thoroughly in California with the Jockeys' Guild and we went on record favoring it, and in fact it has been adopted in quite a few states. I know that Mr. Inglis adopted it in his.

MR. INGLIS: How many states have adopted this new apprentice rule?

MR. GUSHEN: I don't have the record here. It has been adopted in Michigan, it's operating in New York. California adopted it, isn't that right?

MR. ATKINSON: California hasn't adopted it yet.

MR. GUSHEN: They were supposed to have it. But in the places where they did adopt it, it has been working out very nicely. The thing that I can't understand is that you find some horsemen object to it. I argued this point with Harry Trotsek not long ago in Kentucky, and he said, "What incentive is there?" He couldn't understand it. I think it's a great incentive for a man to make a rider, because right now a boy rides for one year and he's through. The contract holder doesn't get any more during that year than anybody else does, especially if he is a small owner and has six or eight horses. What benefit does he get out of him except that he rides his horse? But under this rule I think it is a great incentive for anybody to make a rider. First of all, the man who holds his contract when his maiden is broken is called the original contract holder. So you can buy a boy before he breaks his maiden and still

be his original contract holder. If you see a boy and like the way he sits on a horse and you think he will make a good rider, you can buy him and then you're the original contract holder. After that, he rides 100 winners. Then after the 100 winners, you, as contract holder, still get five pounds for the balance of the year providing he won 100 races say in eight months. That is something that nobody else gets. After that, you get two pounds for the balance of the contract. It's a great incentive to make riders, more so than ever before.

MR. INGLIS: Mr. Gushen, you also mentioned that he gets seven pounds until he has won 100 races.

MR. CASSIDY: That's for his contract employer.

MR. GUSHEN: And then he gets five for the balance of a full year. And two pounds after that. And of course statistics will prove that it is the smaller stable that makes the riders, rather than the large stable. As Mr. Cassidy said, the large stable with good horses can't afford to fool around with a bug rider, because they have good horses and they can't afford to take any chances. If a man has a rider under contract and isn't going to ride him, then nobody else is going to ride him. But a small horse owner takes a chance and makes a rider.

MR. LYNCH: Would it be worth the while of an organization, like The Jockey Club, to have a small school for riders and have about 10 or 12 candidates? You certainly have the best teachers around you could possibly have.

MR. CASSIDY: Where are you going to get the horses?

MR. LYNCH: I don't know anything about those angles.

MR. CASSIDY: That's the problem.

MR. LYNCH: Well, they could go through various stages, and then get hired out possibly as exercise boys. Possibly to pay for all this The Jockey Club might get something from the sale of their contracts when they've decided to graduate them or somebody wants one of them. It at least would give them a chance to learn better methods than they do now.

MR. CASSIDY: What we try to do now is encourage and develop riders by motion picture instruction and by having the cooperation of such boys as those two sitting over there who are a tremendous value in educating the younger riders. Even the boys who have never ridden races are eligible to come in and listen each day to the discussions and the reviews of the motion pictures, and they have the advantage of listening to the good, top riders point out the faults and errors of the boys who have ridden. I think that's about the greatest extent to which we can go without horses. You can't make a rider by reading out of a book. It is awfully hard to conduct a school without a stable of horses.

MR. PHIPPS: There used to be races years ago the conditions of which stated they were to be ridden by apprentices. That's been stopped.

MR. CASSIDY: That's against the rules. Do you think it is fair to the boy who is a graduated rider, to exclude him?

MR. PHIPPS: I didn't mean every race, or too many.

Remainder of discussion on this topic not clear on tape recorder because of thunderstorm. Recess called for duration of storm from 3:35 P.M. to 3:50 P.M.

QUESTION No. 14. "IN THE ALLOTMENT OF STALLS, SHOULD THERE BE A LIMIT IN THE NUMBER ALLOTTED TO ANY ONE TRAINER?"

MR. F. KILROE: I don't think this is a question you should expect me to answer. But I think probably from the association's point of view it does help to have the horses in as many hands as possible. You have evidence of what happens to a game that gets too closely held in the steeplechase business. There are about six

trainers who train all the horses, and they have three-horse entries for every race. There's not enough variety of ownership or trainers. I think the number you might limit the stables to would depend on 1) The number of stalls you have to give out in the first place, and 2) The character of the racing. In California, the public stable is a tremendous factor. McDaniel, when he was around, had 60 or 70 horses in training.

MR. CASSIDY: Are you implying that that is bad or good?

MR. F. KILROE: Well, it's a condition you can't deal as drastically with in a place such as Chicago where you can't keep over 20 horses.

MR. CASSIDY: Which is better for racing?

MR. KILROE: Twenty, I would say.

MR. CASSIDY: It is always very difficult to tell a man, if he has 50 horses, he can only bring 30 to a race track, particularly as in New York we race through an entire season with pretty nearly the same personnel. It also should be true from a racing secretary's standpoint that the more horses in one person's hands the less they are of different quality. It limits the number of entries you are going to get from that stable. As you say, a lot depends on the number of stalls available. If you had 5000 stalls, it wouldn't make any difference, because if you had 100 stables with 50 horses you could do pretty well with that. So it is, I think, particularly a local question that might change according to the track which is involved. Hirsch Jacobs has a lot of horses and he's very good for a racing secretary because he races them all. There are stables which have a lot of horses from which you don't get much value. It would be terribly hard to discriminate and say to one owner or trainer, "You can't have as many stalls as that man, even though he doesn't contribute as much to the program," and still give Hirsch Jacobs as many stalls as you tell him he can't have. It's a difficult problem.

MR. GUSHEN: I think that situation could readily be solved by racing associations themselves. If a fellow is sucker enough to have 40 or 50 horses, by all means let him have them. But if Hirsch Jacobs has 40 or 50 horses, he races them. How about Hialeah when a stable moves in there with 30 two-year-olds, and they probably don't race three of them during the entire meeting? That's a different thing, that's up to the association. If they have material that is good for the racing association, I don't think the stalls should be limited at all. By the same token, if you are going to give a man 30 stalls and he is going to use the track as a training ground, that's an injustice to horsemen who want to race. So I think it's strictly an association proposition.

MR. E. KILROE: I think it is a matter of evaluating stables. In respect to a limit, I don't think you can make a hard and fast rule because there are so many factors that are important—the quality of the horses, whether they are useful and fit in with the sort of racing you are going to have. I think generally speaking it is a good idea to have the game spread out rather than have it in the control of a few people.

MR. CASSIDY: Of course, if a man has Swaps and 35 other horses, the track is going to want him to get Swaps no matter what the other horses are.

MR. E. KILROE: That depends on other conditions, too, because in trying to get a horse like Swaps they might handicap the rest of their program.

MR. CASSIDY: That's true, but they would still want Swaps.

MR. RAINEY: It's pretty hard to limit the number of horses, I think. You have to think of the future. Many times a man may have 20 horses, and only 10 of them are ready to run. What can you do with the other 10? He has to keep them in training, and it is very difficult and expensive for him to put those horses in someone else's hands. I realize the association's problem but a man doesn't like to split his stable up, it's quite an expensive proposition.

MR. JACOBS: In New England they don't want to give you any stalls for two-year-olds, and their game is slipping, maybe because they have so many old, broken down horses.

MR. GUSHEN: I resent that.

(Laughter)

I resent that, first of all because it is not a fact that in New England they don't allot stalls to two-year-olds. They certainly do. And whatever two-year-olds Hirsch shipped down there, there are stalls for. I have had two-year-olds every year and also many others have never had any trouble in finding stable room for them in New England. But what I was talking about is privileged people, the man who takes up 25 or 30 stalls, and doesn't race much. They are of no service at all to the racing association or the racing secretary. I mentioned Hirsch Jacobs, and I could mention a lot of people's names, Bishop, for instance. There's a fellow who probably has 40 or 50 horses all the time, yet the racing secretary would probably rather have Bishop than anybody else, because he runs his horses all the time. He's good for the race track. He's got all kinds of horses. It all depends on what you've got.

QUESTION No. 15. "IN THE ALLOTMENT OF STALLS SHOULD THERE BE A LIMIT IN THE NUMBER OF TWO-YEAR-OLDS IN THE SPRING OF THE YEAR?"

MR. HANCOCK: If you want good racing you've got to give your two-year-olds a chance to develop. A man who has two-year-olds generally winds up with a good horse. Someone mentioned Hialeah before and I always notice that there are more throw outs at Hialeah than any other race track in America.

MR. CASSIDY: Of course, Hialeah draws from two other race tracks that don't permit two-year-olds to come in. But the two-year-olds offer a problem to our racing associations from a monetary standpoint. They are not normally good betting races in the spring.

MR. DRYMON: Mr. Knebelkamp, don't you have those figures?

MR. KNEBELKAMP: No, I don't have them but I think Grant Dorland made up something for the National Association of Thoroughbred Breeders one time which disproved that statement. It even included California, I think. Mr. Burke may know something about that. But I know on a national scale, the figures that he had, and I assume they were correct, disproved that statement.

MR. BURKE: Our two-year-old races are only three-eighths of a mile and there's not as much bet on those, naturally, as on the others.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Burke, I think these figures took your two-year-old races as opposed to your other first races of the day. I'm speaking purely from memory and I could be wrong, but I think Dorland took the first race when it was not a two-year-old race, and the first race when it was a two-year-old race, and they got more play on the two-year-old races than they did on the others.

MR. BURKE: That's probably on a Saturday when we have a bigger crowd.

MR. HANCOCK: It was a bigger percentage of play that day. He broke it down. If you handled \$100,000 on the first race and there was a million dollar handle, that would be one-tenth and the two-year-old races stood up better than the other races.

MR. KNEBELKAMP: Isn't it true, Mr. Burke, and I'm just taking this on what I read, that in California they have made name horses by having more two-year-olds and are in a better position now to have name horses than they were four or five years ago when they hadn't as many two-year-old races the first three or four months of the year?

MR. BURKE: We have a whole lot better horses, better blood.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Knebelkamp, when I was Director of Racing at Hialeah I

kept records of the money bet on races, the size of field, the distance, two-year-olds as against older horses, and although I don't have those records here, I am positive the two-year-old races certainly handled less money than any other type race. They are three-eighths of a mile, however, and you couldn't expect a large handle.

MR. EVANS: Doesn't that go back to your scheduling of those races, though? They give them the most undesirable positions?

MR. CASSIDY: No, I figured them in relation to their position on the program, as I did with all races, so that we would put on a program of distance and quality races in a manner in which we had the best results. You had to evaluate all the races to determine their relative worth. I am sure that in the figures at Hialeah, you would have to take into consideration the fact that these races were a mad scramble and were over in seconds. Also these races were run in the winter. Spring racing in New York starts April 1st and that's a different matter entirely.

MR. RUTCHICK: I believe the problem could be solved, if the managements in New York would build a training track, with stables, where trainers can train their two-year-olds.

MR. CASSIDY: You're not asking New York to spend any more money for race tracks, are you?

MR. RUTCHICK: It would solve the problem, I believe, because at Belmont Park, they have 40% of the two-year-olds.

MR. DUNNE: Mr. Hancock said something a little while ago. He said stabling was the trouble. I think it is, too. That would be a solution. If you have so many two-year-olds, build some more stalls.

Due to failure of the tape recorder, the balance of the discussion on this question was lost.

Following are summaries of the comments on questions 16, 17 and the beginning of question 18, which were lost due to failure of the tape recorder:

QUESTION No. 16. "SHOULD THERE BE TWO TWO-YEAR-OLD RACES A DAY BEGINNING APRIL 1ST?"

The comments on this subject were to the effect that the number of two-year-olds on the grounds would determine how many two-year-old races should be carded.

QUESTION No. 17. "BREEDERS COMPLAIN THAT THEY HAVE DIFFICULTY IN OBTAINING REGISTRATION CERTIFICATES FOR YEARLINGS FROM THE JOCKEY CLUB PRIOR TO THE ANNUAL SUMMER SALES AT KEENELAND AND SARATOGA. WHAT CAN BE DONE BY THE JOCKEY CLUB TO EXPEDITE DELIVERY OF CERTIFICATES, ASSUMING THAT ALL DATA SENT IN BY THE BREEDERS IS COMPLETE AND CORRECT? IF THE JOCKEY CLUB DOES NOT HAVE ENOUGH PERSONNEL, COULD NOT THE FEES BE RAISED AND THE FORCE ENLARGED?"

Mr. Cassidy suggested that all breeders intending to sell their yearlings at the sales should make a notation to that effect on the registration application; then before sending them in, they should have the sales company or some other competent agent check the applications for accuracy in making them out. Mr. Cassidy agreed that The Jockey Club would then place them on a preferred list and complete them in ample time before the sales.

QUESTION No. 18. "WHAT ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF ISSUING TAX-FREE BADGES TO OLD-TIME TRAINERS? THIS, OF COURSE, TO BE AT THE DISCRETION OF THE STEWARDS IF THESE TRAINERS ARE IN GOOD STANDING."

Mr. Cassidy suggested that all currently licensed horsemen be admitted free and without tax, regardless of what state they may be from, and of course always subject to the Stewards' approval.

It was also suggested that the old timers' list, which had heretofore been approved by the state, be enlarged to take care of those owners and trainers who were made inactive because of age or infirmities.

It was then suggested that the racing associations could issue a badge on which the association would assume the tax payments.

MR. O'BRIEN: I think if you did make up a list of such old-time trainers, it would be much larger than you expect.

MR. CASSIDY: We have a list of those which have been approved by the state.

MR. O'BRIEN: But that list has never been amended and there are very few left on it. I think there are only about five left, but when they started the list it was way up in the hundreds.

MR. CASSIDY: What I meant was people who are currently licensed in some other state and come to visit us. There wouldn't be many.

MR. ATKINSON: An old-time rider of some considerable standing, Eddie Ambrose, came to me the other day, and he had to pay his own way in. That doesn't seem right to me.

MR. CASSIDY: That's Ambrose's own fault. He came in to see me and I asked him how long he was going to be here, and he said, "Just today." He could have had a badge, and would have been perfectly welcome to it.

MR. ATKINSON: He didn't say he wanted a badge, he just said he had to pay his way in.

MR. GUSHEN: For your information, about ten days ago I went to Monmouth Park and I paid my way in!

MR. CASSIDY: What do you think, Luke? I'm coming back to you about that.

MR. O'BRIEN: It's all right with me, but I'm always dubious about assuming additional expenses no matter how small they are. We are at the limit of our expenses right now.

MR. CASSIDY: Would you be willing to say that if there were a maximum of 25 a day, you would be in favor of it?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, I would.

MR. E. KILROE: I think it would be better, if these people were at the track on legitimate business, to take a strong stand with the state authorities and get them approved. I think that would give us a cleaner deal. If they are entitled to come in on business, there's no reason why anyone should be taxed.

MR. JACOBS: How about letting the HBPA take care of something like this? I think they can take care of it probably as well as the next person. Let Sol see the tax people about it.

MR. CASSIDY: That suits me.

QUESTION No. 19. "WITH RECENT FIRES AND THE DISCOVERY OF MARIJUANA USERS ISN'T IT OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE TO ENCLOSE THE STABLE AND TRAINING AREA COMPLETELY SO THAT ONLY PROPERLY AUTHORIZED PERSONS ARE ADMITTED?"

MR. CASSIDY: Santa Anita and Hollywood do it already, don't they, Mr. Burke? Remember the time Mr. Langley and several of us went out there, and you

were showing us around? When we got to the stable gate, we couldn't get in. You had to get credentials to get us through. I think it is wonderful if it could be done, but of course this isn't the time to do it. When changes are made I think it might be done.

MR. O'BRIEN: Closing the stable area is not going to cure it. The horsemen must come to the definite realization that they must pick up the identification cards from the men they discharge. Every case we have where there has been a fire or anything else, investigation showed that the men who had been discharged still had their identification cards.

MR. GUSHEN: I'm going to tell you from practical experience that the horsemen are not going to do it. They are very lax about it, because they think you are challenging their integrity, and feel insulted if they are stopped. A couple of years ago, I think it was at Suffolk Downs, when things got so bad, I finally went over there and said to the horsemen, "Let's stop all this. I don't want anybody to come on this race track tomorrow until he shows a badge. Owner, trainer, I don't care who he is." Well, there was darn near a riot, but I said, "Don't let them in." A badge isn't heavy, they can carry it. But a horseman feels that way about it. He can leave his house, he'll lock the door. He gets out of his car and locks it. Then he goes into the stable area and he wants everything free so somebody can go in there and do whatever he wants to his horses, which are his life's blood. So the next day, they got so mad at me that 60 of them marched into the office and they had the badges around their necks like lavalieres.

(Laughter)

That's a fact. Of course, it didn't change the situation any. You can't get a horseman to do those things.

MR. RUTCHICK: I've tried to pick up badges, and the man will say he lost it, or he left it home. I believe that it should be reported if the man refuses to give up his badge.

MR. KELLEY: Whenever a working press badge is lost, the number is given to the admissions men, and I think that something like 95% of them are picked up.

MR. CASSIDY: There's only time for one more question, and although it means eliminating some that have already been sent in, Mr. Inglis, the racing commissioner of Michigan, handed me this one when he came in.

QUESTION No. 20. "WHAT ARE THE NEXT LOGICAL STEPS THAT NEED TO BE TAKEN TO WIN ACCEPTANCE FOR THE STEWARDS' POOL PLAN?"

MR. CASSIDY: Of course, Mr. Inglis refers to the proposal, and if I'm wrong, correct me, made originally by Mr. Vanderbilt, subsequently endorsed and I think unanimously approved by the horsemen, that stewards be furnished by a body independent of tracks; that a steward in working for an association would be independent of association influence. At times it is unpleasant for a steward to scratch a horse that is lame going to the post. That would take quite a little money out of the pool and out of the association's pocket. The association might not think the horse should have been scratched. Or a scratch in the morning where you have a rule under which they may only scratch down to eight, without legitimate reason. If the steward feels it is legitimate but marginal, and reduces the field to seven, six or five, he may feel that he won't be employed there the following year. That suggestion I think was brought up before the National Association of Racing Commissioners and a committee was named by Mr. Knebelkamp, who is president of the National Association of Racing Commissioners, and he named Mr. Inglis as a member of that committee.

I'm just giving you background, and the question is thrown out in the open. Maybe Mr. Inglis would like to further explain his thoughts on the matter.

MR. INGLIS: I'm one of those who believes very strongly that such a plan would be good for racing and I'd like to commend Mr. Knebelkamp on having appointed a good committee of the National Association of Racing Commissioners on it. I know Mr. Miller will do an excellent job as chairman. The point that I would like to bring out here is exactly what has to be done to bring this into being. This is a plan that most everybody is in favor of and yet we have to work out the mechanics of it and try to figure out who is going to be included, if it should be approved. Does it include state stewards, or only track stewards? What qualifications need to be set up for the stewards in the pool? What kind of preference should be given to stewards in places where they are presently working? There are all these points that I think should be discussed and I think we should all have enlightenment on it. I think it is an excellent plan but I am forced to admit that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about it throughout the country. I know one of the objections that I hear is that it is The Jockey Club plan and that The Jockey Club does not extend over all parts of the country. For example, Chicago racing or Detroit racing isn't adequately represented. There is also the problem of who is going to pay for the plan. When you talk about raising money to operate the plan then you immediately think the TRA ought to contribute or help the plan but then you run into the objection that that is track management and they shouldn't have anything to do with it. Those are some of the questions that are going through my mind and I would like to hear what anyone else might have to say about it.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Inglis, I can give you the answer to some of them. As far as I know there should be no financing. I think that for it to operate properly the pool of stewards need not necessarily be from New York or any place else. There are a great many well qualified stewards throughout the country who could serve very well. To make the stewards independent they should be appointed and paid by a separate body which would charge the association for the salary of the stewards and pay the steward exactly that amount. I am sure The Jockey Club would feel if they were selected to provide stewards that no service fee should be paid. It would be a contribution by The Jockey Club. It means a great deal of work not only in analyzing and determining the qualifications of the stewards throughout the country, but also in training and improving them where needed; keeping the records that are necessary on the assignments and who might be available. So far it has been the policy of The Jockey Club to offer at least three names and let the track that wants an official select one of the three. I think those who are serving presently at any place with satisfaction to the locality and racing should continue to serve there. You speak of racing commission stewards, whether they should be included. I would say emphatically that the commissions would be better off but I don't think it would be proper or legal. If racing commissions could select trained stewards it certainly would improve racing in that locality. The custom in some places has been to select stewards for political or friendly reasons. I think that's more prevalent with racing commissions than racing associations. I don't mean any particular place but I have worked where the racing commission steward hasn't been a racing man at all. I think that in the interests of their state they should try to get men who are qualified, irrespective of where they were born or where they live. You don't ask a horseman when he comes to race in a state, "Do you live here?" He has to go where he can win races and he is going to your state if you have the proper races for him and you need him. Racing cannot be on a local basis. In the selection of stewards or the selection of horses, you can't exclude non-residents, or give preference to residents. You've got to treat racing as a national sport and the people in it have to be treated the same way.

MR. INGLIS: You say that finances are not a problem. It seems to me that as far as your qualified stewards who are now serving are concerned, there isn't a problem there, but you've got hundreds of young racing officials who are coming up through the ranks all over the country, serving as patrol judges and so on, at the present time. They are all going to want to be part of this pool some day. They're going to have to be sifted out, given examinations and that's going to be quite an operation. It seems to me that it is going to cost some money.

MR. CASSIDY: Knowing The Jockey Club as I do, I am sure that they are and have always been willing to contribute money, if necessary, for the benefit of racing. And whatever these normal costs amount to, I see no problem.

MR. WIDENER: That ties in with what we are already doing now in training officials.

MR. PHIPPS: We made that offer and no pay was expected.

MR. CASSIDY: I think there has been a general feeling that The Jockey Club might be seeking laurels or control or something like that. Of course, I don't need to tell you that that is not true.

MR. WIDENER: We made the offer for the benefit of racing throughout the country.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Inglis, what else was it you asked that I didn't answer?

MR. INGLIS: The other thing I mentioned was that although everybody recognizes the wonderful service The Jockey Club has been to racing, some of our friends in the middle and far west don't feel that they are enough a part of The Jockey Club to entrust such a great responsibility to them. They are developing a lot of their own good young officials and they are apprehensive they wouldn't be treated fairly or given the proper recognition under a plan that was administered by The Jockey Club. I don't say that's a valid objection, but I do say it is one of the misunderstandings which has to be overcome.

MR. CASSIDY: I don't believe there is really any national organization other than The Jockey Club. The members come from most states where racing is conducted, as well as from Canada. They register all the horses throughout the country. No horse can race in any state unless it is registered with The Jockey Club. I know there is this feeling and I could name a couple of states where the officials feel that way, but it's all wrong. It isn't a question of what state they come from. If they are qualified, there isn't any reason why they shouldn't be just as serviceable as men from New York or from any other place.

MR. INGLIS: My only other question, and it's a big one, is how do we go about convincing track management to participate in the plan?

MR. CASSIDY: That is a problem that is yours, and I'll be glad to give it to you. Who has the answer to that?

MR. PHIPPS: Let those who don't want it see how it operates at the other tracks.

MR. GUSHEN: Everybody knows how I feel about it, I've spoken about this situation for a couple of years now and before the T.R.A. I believe it is one of the finest things that can and certainly will happen to racing. It's only a question of the delay. I've spoken to dozens of people and nobody could give me a valid reason as to why they object to it. They say, "Yes, it's a good plan," but yet I can't get a commitment from them to go along with it. Because somebody doesn't like Mr. Cassidy, or Mr. Widener, me or somebody else doesn't mean that the plan isn't any good. This is something that has to be worked out and it must be worked out because racing is the only sport in America today that operates under this antiquated system of officiating. Just picture to yourself what would happen if the National League baseball umpire was paid by a home club.

(Laughter)

There'd be a riot every day on the ball field. That's what we are doing. How are we

going to go about it, Commissioner Inglis wants to know. It's very simple. It is now before the National Association of State Racing Commissioners. They are supposed to bring in a report. I sincerely hope it will be a favorable one. The TRA has appointed a committee to investigate it. I think Jimmy Stewart of Hollywood is the chairman. I talked with him only a couple of weeks ago. I think it is something that is going to create a tremendous amount of confidence in the sport. In the estimation of most all my membership, and I speak for 16,000 people, gentlemen, The Jockey Club is a very fine organization. It is not one that is interested in making money for itself, and it does everything it can to promote the best interests of racing. This is a burden, a tremendous burden that they are willing to undertake. It's going to cost them money and it is going to take up a tremendous amount of time. As for these fellows losing their jobs, I think that's silly because I venture to say that 95% of the officials officiating today will still be officiating under the new plan. The only thing is that you will make better officials out of the same ones that are officiating today because they will not be beholden to somebody who is going to dictate as to what they should do in the stewards' stand. There's your problem right there, as simple as A.B.C., if the state racing commissioners will go along with it, if the TRA will recommend it, it will go through. I'd like to take issue with Mr. Phipps on only one thing. I don't think this will be a success unless it becomes mandatory, unless every race track that is a member of the TRA will accept it, because if you are going to let people choose, then you will have chaos. This is something that should be put through and if the majority of the TRA membership votes for it, being a democratic organization, I think they should go along with it. And if they know what's good for racing and will forget the fact that they may want to control some steward or tell him what to do, and if he doesn't want to do what they tell him then next year he hasn't got a job, if they will forget about that, they will vote for it, and I certainly hope that the TRA at their next meeting will do something constructive about it, the same as the State Racing Commissioners are doing.

MR. LAUDER: May I ask Mr. Inglis or Mr. Knebelkamp a question? Maybe this is a little bit revolutionary, but if the state racing commissioners are in favor of this idea, which I judge . . .

MR. KNEBELKAMP: No, they're not. At the convention this spring in Baltimore it was brought up, Mr. Inglis' resolution was brought up, and discussed and there was a great deal said on both sides. There was nothing finally decided except that I, as president, appoint a committee this year to look into the plan. In appointing a committee I tried to get people on both sides who had discussed it at some length at the convention, so that the committee would have both sides of the question before them, and maybe one side could convince the other side in the course of time. I also attempted to get commissioners from different parts of the country. We have one from the far west, one from the east, two from the midwest and one from the south. Now is the time when those fellows will need all your help. There wasn't any overwhelming decision one way or the other at the convention. It came up there for the first time.

MR. LAUDER: What my idea was, which may be a little revolutionary, is another rule. If the commissioners decided after hearing the report of the committee that it was a good idea, could a rule be made by the various state commissions that Stewards had to be appointed through this pool?

MR. KNEBELKAMP: You'd have to know the laws in all the different states to know how much power the commissions had, I would think.

MR. INGLIS: I don't think you could pass an ironclad rule to that effect because generally speaking the lawyers don't like public bodies to delegate authority to a private organization. However, as a matter of policy, any racing commission, and nearly every racing commission not only has the authority to appoint a state steward

but also has the power of veto over track stewards, could as a matter of policy say, "We won't approve a track steward unless he comes from the pool." And states that went along with this plan might adopt such a policy.

MR. LAUDER: That would give it an impetus, anyway. As Mr. Gushen said, in baseball they do the same thing, the club owners have absolutely nothing to say about the appointment or assignment of umpires, that's all through the commissioner's office. Well, it could be worked out some way like that.

MR. LYNCH: Just as a spectator of the sport from state to state I go to some places where it would be my judgment that racing had better do something about the caliber of stewards they have. I will say frankly here, that in New York I think the work of the stewards is outstanding, but I just want to talk about some other places. There are several people right around this table who were at a gathering one night where a state steward got up and made a little speech. Everybody howled him down several times, but he finally said his piece, and his words made everybody wonder how he got to be a steward. But he told everyone that a certain relative of his was a power in the politics of the state and he had contributed a great deal of money to the success of the incumbent governor. It was just a disgusting situation. If you are going to have competence in the sport, it's got to be in the administrative end of it.

MR. DRYMON: I would like to have in the records that following Mr. Vanderbilt's talk the year the Thoroughbred Club honored him, and as you know, this was his topic, the Thoroughbred Club unanimously approved the plan in general. Of course, we breeders don't have very much to do with racing, but a lot of us race some, too. The Thoroughbred Club voted unanimously for the plan.

MR. GUSHEN: I would like to ask the press, and respectfully so, if they feel that this thing we are talking about is good for racing, and from my observations I think they are in favor of it, that they give us some publicity and maybe we can wake up some of these lax TRA directors that this is something that is badly needed. One other thing I would like to say as far as state stewards is concerned is that I never felt that this new agency should have supervision of appointing state stewards. I think the state steward should be appointed by the state because I don't think anybody should infringe on the privileges and prerogatives of the state. If they feel that they can serve the best interests of racing by asking the agency to send them a state steward, all right, but they should have the last word.

MR. WIDENER: That all fits in with what we've done so far. Gentlemen, it's getting late, and I think we might call it a day. I want to thank you all and particularly those who have come from a long distance at a personal sacrifice. You've contributed a lot to the interest and the good of this conference. Thank you all very much.