



OFFICERS OF THE JOCKEY CLUB

L. to R. Louis Lee Haggin II, Secretary and Treasurer; Ogden Phipps, Chairman; Marshall Cassidy, Executive Secretary; George D. Widener, Honorary Chairman.



A general view of the Conference in session.

GUEST SPEAKERS



William S. Miller, President, The National Association of State Racing Commissioners.



J. Samuel Perlman, Editor and Publisher, The Morning Telegraph and Daily Racing Form.



Rex C. Ellsworth, Owner and Breeder



J. Elliott Burch, President, American Trainers Association

(PHOTOGRAPHS COURTESY OF MIKE SIRICO AND BOB MAYETTE)

TWELFTH ANNUAL ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION
ON
MATTERS PERTAINING TO RACING
HELD BY
THE JOCKEY CLUB
IN THE
NATIONAL MUSEUM OF RACING
AT
SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y.
SUNDAY, AUGUST 16, 1964

PARTICIPANTS:

- David Alexander, Turf Writer, The Thoroughbred Record
 Ted Atkinson, State Steward, Illinois Racing Board
 John A. Bell III, Cromwell Bloodstock Agency
 Toney Betts, President, New York Turf Writers Association
 Magistrate S. Tupper Bigelow, Chairman, Ontario Racing Commission
 Edward Blind, Starter
 Alex Bower, Publisher, The Blood-Horse
 *James Cox Brady, Vice Chairman of The Jockey Club, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of The New York Racing Association
 John L. Brennan, Executive Vice President, Thoroughbred Racing Protective Bureau
 J. Elliott Burch, President, American Trainers Association
 George B. Cassidy, Starter
 Dr. J. G. Catlett, Assistant Supervisor of Racing, Florida State Racing Commission
 John F. Chandler, Director of Press and Public Relations, Laurel Race Course
 *Leslie Combs II, Owner, Breeder
 Myron D. Davis, Steward appointed by The New York Racing Association
 Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., Chairman of the Executive Committee of the New York World's Fair
 Lou DeFichy, Turf Writer, Newsday
 Aimé Des Rosiers, Blue Bonnets Race Course
 *F. Eugene Dixon, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective Association
 L. P. Doherty, President, The Grayson Foundation
 Spencer J. Drayton, President, Thoroughbred Racing Protective Bureau; Executive Secretary, Thoroughbred Racing Associations
 James D. Drymon, President, Thoroughbred Club of America
 Dr. Edwin L. Dunaway, Chairman, Arkansas State Racing Commission; First Vice President, The National Association of State Racing Commissioners
 Francis P. Dunne, Steward appointed by the New York State Racing Commission
 Rex C. Ellsworth, Owner, Breeder
 William S. Evans, General Manager, Breeders' Sales Company
 Bryan Field, Vice President, The Delaware Racing Association
 Humphrey S. Finney, President, Fasig-Tipton Company
 John M. S. Finney, General Manager, Fasig-Tipton Company
 *Walter D. Fletcher, Steward of The Jockey Club
 Dr. Wilson Ford, Veterinarian, Ontario Racing Commission
 Dr. M. A. Gilman, Veterinarian, The New York Racing Association
 Joseph A. Gimma, Member of New York State Racing Commission
 *Louis Lee Haggin II, Secretary-Treasurer of The Jockey Club
 *John W. Hanes, Steward of The Jockey Club, Trustee of The New York Racing Association
 Charles Hatton, Columnist, The Morning Telegraph

Kent Hollingsworth, Editor, The Blood-Horse
 *George M. Humphrey, Trustee of The New York Racing Association
 A. G. Isbister, Secretary-Treasurer, The Jockey Club Ltd. (Ontario)
 Hirsch Jacobs, Trainer
 Howard Jacobson, Trainer
 Nick Jemas, Eastern Manager of the Jockeys' Guild, Inc.
 Dr. Alexander Kaye, Medical Adviser to the Jockeys' Guild
 Robert F. Kelley, Public Relations
 John F. Kennedy, Supervisor of the Racing Department, The New York Racing Association
 Frank E. Kilroe, Vice President and Racing Secretary, Santa Anita Park
 Haden Kirkpatrick, President, Record Publishing Company
 E. F. Klugman, Track Superintendent, The Jockey Club, Ltd. (Ontario)
 Wathen R. Knebelkamp, President, Churchill Downs, Inc.
 Pat Lynch, Turf Writer, New York Journal-American
 Jack Mann, Turf Writer, New York Herald-Tribune
 Landon C. Manning, Sports Editor, The Saratogian
 *Charles E. Mather II, Chairman of The Breeding Bureau of The Jockey Club
 Brigadier C. S. McKee, Member, the Ontario Racing Commission
 Donald M. McKellar, Member, Illinois Racing Board
 Edward T. McLean, General Manager, The Delaware Racing Association
 Warren Mehrtens, Steward, The Delaware Racing Association
 William S. Miller, President, The National Association of State Racing Commissioners
 John J. Mooney, Managing Director, The Jockey Club, Ltd. (Ontario)
 Ronald H. Mooney, Secretary-Treasurer, New York Division of Horsemen's Benevolent
 and Protective Association
 Joseph C. Nichols, Turf Writer, New York Times
 Patrick W. O'Brien, Director of Public Relations, The New York Racing Association
 Joseph M. O'Farrell, General Manager, Ocala Stud
 J. Samuel Perlman, Editor and Publisher, Triangle Publications, Inc.
 Harry Peterson, Secretary-Treasurer, Association of Official Racing Chemists
 *Ogden Phipps, Chairman of The Jockey Club, Trustee of The New York Racing Association
 Herve Racivitch, National President, Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective Association
 Calvin S. Rainey, Steward appointed by The Jockey Club at New York Racing Association
 Courses
 Dr. William O. Reed, Practicing Veterinarian
 Saul D. Rosen, Managing Editor, The Morning Telegraph
 John L. Rotz, Jockey
 Fred H. Ryan, Vice President and General Manager, Santa Anita Park
 Walter J. Salmon, Jr., Owner, Breeder
 Tom Shehan, Editor and Publisher, The Horsemen's Journal
 Mrs. A. E. Smith, Secretary-Treasurer, The National Association of State Racing Com-
 missioners
 Ben R. Steen, Canadian National President, Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective Associa-
 tion
 James D. Stewart, Vice President and General Manager, Hollywood Turf Club
 *E. P. Taylor, Chairman of the Board, The Jockey Club, Ltd. (Ontario)
 Whitney Tower, Turf Editor, Sports Illustrated
 Thomas E. Trotter, Racing Secretary and Handicapper, The New York Racing Association
 Joe Val, Turf Writer, New York World Telegram and Sun
 *Alfred G. Vanderbilt, President, Thoroughbred Owners and Breeders Association
 *F. S. von Stade, Steward of The Jockey Club, Trustee of The New York Racing Association
 *George D. Widener, Honorary Chairman of The Jockey Club, Honorary Chairman of The
 New York Racing Association
 Louis E. Wolfson, Owner, Breeder
 Moderator: Marshall Cassidy, Executive Secretary of The Jockey Club

GUESTS:

Charles Mayer, Publicity Director, Blue Bonnets Race Course
 Scott Osborne, TRA Scholarship winner
 *George A. Pope, Jr., Owner, Breeder
 William Robertson, Editor, The Thoroughbred Record
 F. George Tucker, Executive Vice President, Bowie Race Course

*Member of The Jockey Club

INDEX

Guest Speakers	Page
Report of development of new in-motion stall starting gate. Rex C. Ellsworth	7
The contributions by the Racing Commissions toward the betterment of racing	William S. Miller 13
Problems confronting horsemen in training and managing racing stables. J. Elliott Burch	16
Commercialism in racing.....	J. Samuel Perlman 18
 General Discussion	
Should boys that have been set down quite a few times be given increased penalties for additional offenses?.....	23
If a horse is barred from starting should this information be circulated to all racing authorities with information regarding the seriousness of the disability?	24
Recently several jockeys have been penalized for making so-called frivo- lous claims of foul. Is such a penalty justified?.....	26
Are longer seasons converting racing from a sport to a revenue-raising enterprise?	27
There has been a lot of talk about too many sprint races. With the tre- mendous number of races run at the various tracks in the country is it not logical and humane to try to spare the animal?.....	27

INTRODUCTION BY

OGDEN PHIPPS

Chairman of The Jockey Club

It is a great pleasure to welcome you to The Jockey Club's Twelfth Annual Round Table Discussion on matters pertaining to racing.

We have changed the format of our meeting this year and before presenting the topics and questions which have been submitted by the various groups in racing we will have the privilege of first hearing from our guest speakers, each of whom is outstanding in his field in racing. Following each item on the program there will be ample opportunity to offer questions or comments for general discussion.

Our first guest speaker is Mr. Rex Ellsworth who will report to us on the new in-motion starting gate. He has brought with him motion pictures of the gate in operation at his ranch in California and I am sure you are all as interested as I am in seeing this new development.

MR. ELLSWORTH: Under our present method of starting we have our horses going to the gate and going in the post positions which we draw, and then when they go to the gate, they go in according to the way the starter likes to have them put in. This is because of the way he thinks they are broke and trained. A horse that is a bad actor is held out and put in last while the horse that is a good actor is put in first. So you have your horses going in not according to post position, making the owner unhappy. The horses that go in first are usually good actors and they can stay there long enough to go to sleep. The others are put in and the gate goes immediately which is an advantage for them. But some horses are not settled down, and they get a bad break.

You have your several types of horses, one of which leans on the gate. Another one is put into a "U" position; he has his head pulled around to one side, the jockey is trying to pull him straight, his shoulder hits the other side of the gate, his rear end is out in the middle of the gate and he comes out in a "U" shape. You have the horse that will come out leaning on the gate and he slides on the side of the gate. Then another horse, when he isn't ready and something happens, he jumps straight in the air when the gate comes open. Then you have another horse and he's backing up in the gate just as the gate is opened and he's going in the wrong direction. Now we have several things that the starters have to use in order to get a horse started which really isn't very good. Some horses have their tails pried down over the back of the gate when the front gate is opened; they have tongs on their lips and on their ears, and you have a starter holding the bit pulling a horse's head around sideways and holding his ear on the top. Then you have the apprentice boys who are not used to coming out of the gate and they fall against a horse's mouth. The horse throws his head in the air and loses his chances. Then you have the older boy who once in a while falls off balance trying to get his horse straightened around and can't get hold of the mane in time to keep from falling against the bit. You have all these things that interrupt a true start.

Sometimes at the start the boys are jerked over the horse's head because of stumbling and then the horse is loose in the race without a rider. This disrupts everything—you have the bettor who has his money on the horse and doesn't get a run for it; you have a loose horse in the field that all the boys are watching all the way during the race. The boy who is jerked over the horse's head is, besides being in danger of being hurt, taken off the rest of his mounts for the day. And since he may be in a \$100,000 race this displeases the jockey, the owner and all concerned.

You have all of these things that are happening to our starts now. We think we can stop all of this partially 100 percent, by this method of the walk-up starting gate. I think all this taking hold of the horses and putting them in this way and that way is going to be eliminated. With the walk-up starting gate, your horses go up to the gate, are put in the gate and then they know there isn't going to be any start until they begin to move, so you can load them in the gate anywhere you wish. When they start to walk they know that the start is going to come. Also it is equally as well for the jockeys.

(Mr. Ellsworth asked the projectionist to start the movie and he continued his comments during the showing.)

Now you are going to see everything that we saw. These are a bunch of saddle horses that have never seen a gate and never started from a standing start in their lives. They are just an old bunch of saddle horses. We used them to see what would happen. You are going to see all the experiments we made in the whole thing. That's the first time those horses ever went out of the gate.

The boys riding these horses have never been out of the gate before in their lives and have only been on a flat saddle about two weeks. Other than that they were on western saddles. These are the boys that are going to the Jockey School which we

hold year around. They've been there at the place for six or seven months. When they came they didn't know which end to get on.

You will also see these gates not all opening at the same time. We painted the gates and got a little paint on our gate mechanism and stopped the action so I wanted to see, if one gate opened and the other didn't, what would happen to the horse next to him. You see not one thing happened. He puts his nose right up in the gate and keeps it there until the gate comes open.

You don't see any leaning on the gate. Now you can see why nothing happened when one horse was turned loose and the other one was held there. The faster the starter pulls his control lever, the faster the gate goes and then you just punch the button on the top of the lever to open the gates.

You can put your horses in and if they don't get a start in the length of the distance you can back them up and go again, or you can stand them at a standstill at the end of the gate and start them just like we start now.

MR. PERLMAN: How far can you make it move?

MR. ELLSWORTH: 16 feet. You can make it move as far as you want to if you want to extend it on out but we never have taken more than 10 feet to start. That's the thing that surprised me.

MR. GEORGE CASSIDY: Who trained these horses?

MR. ELLSWORTH: These are just saddle horses, they haven't been trained. They never started out in a gallop in their lives except just in a gallop going down a lane or going after cattle.

MR. PERLMAN: Have you ever tried it with thoroughbreds?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Yes, the next film will be the thoroughbreds.

MR. BLIND: What about portability, moving from one track to another?

MR. ELLSWORTH: It moves just exactly like the other gates. There isn't a bit of difference in moving the gate around. It takes a tractor or horses just the same as the gates we are now using.

MR. PHIPPS: Do you think there would be a saving on horses' legs by having a moving start? There is a great deal of strain in a standing start.

MR. ELLSWORTH: Well, this has a real, real good effect. You have horses starting in what I'd classify in three different ways. You have the type of horses that stand there and start swelling up. When they move you can't tell where they are going to move—before the break or after the break or when; and you can't tell where they are going—straight in the air or whether they are going sideways or down. They just swell up and then rear, going whatever direction they are pointed. And then you have the horse that stands there and moves by impulse. When the gate comes open he goes back with his feet. When that happens, the dirt flies out from under his feet causing him to stumble and jerking the boy off over the horse's head. Then you have another type of horse that will stand there and tread and he usually gets the best start. Once in a while he stumbles but when he does he catches himself quickly. These horses leave the gate, and their feet are turned over and are digging desperately for the first few jumps, their ankles are cocked forward and you wonder why they don't break all their legs.

In talking with the jockeys in England you get more of a true picture of what happens; that is, when you start a horse from a standstill it seems like the horse is trying to break his back. When you start him from in-motion he goes just as smooth as silk. Notice these inexperienced boys coming out of the gate and you will see that they do not fall against the horses' mouths. They go out very smoothly. These boys are just as green as they can be. Some have just been in the flat saddle one or two weeks; none of them over three weeks and they don't even know how to stand up in their stirrups or do anything other than what they were doing in stock saddles galloping around.

MR. GEORGE CASSIDY: Mr. Ellsworth why use a starting gate then? Why not have walk-up starts without it?

MR. ELLSWORTH: If you walk up and start you have your horses unruly going sideways, rearing with nothing to hold them from kicking each other. You're going back 50 years there.

MR. SALMON: I think I can speak about the other type of gate. We had a horse called Display who had to be turned backwards and swung around without the gate and quite frequently with the gate. He was very unruly if you remember.

MR. ELLSWORTH: Yes. Even if you do that you've got a better deal than going straight from a standstill. In other words, the horse will start smoother with a walk-up start than he will by standing and starting. In all my experience in punching cattle I never did start a horse straight from a standstill. I always turned him a little one way or the other or start him out on a walk and give him a break. You can't imagine the difference when you do. When you do a lot of riding you can find out a lot of difference. I can remember when the trotting horses used to stand and start—I don't know what they were doing here but in California we predicted that there would be no more racing because of bad starts. Then this other starting method (in-motion before starting) came along and they progressed and became more popular because of the improved starting.

MR. GEORGE CASSIDY: You have trained these horses the way you want them trained. If a horse is not trained properly, do you think it is less dangerous for him to be pushed from the rear when the break comes than to start from a standing start?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Well, you don't push him except for one time. What you do have now where the horse's tail is over the back end—the whole of his tail is wrapped around the back end of the tail gate. He's pushing there and sitting on the gate. Many of them start sitting on the gate right now and their feet are up, and their hind feet are up next to their front feet and they have practically no weight on their hind feet.

MR. GEORGE CASSIDY: I have started for 30 years and I have never seen just what you're saying happen. Do you still think that pushing a horse by mechanical force is less dangerous than starting from a standstill?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Yes. You don't push him. You might push him one time. I'll tell you what we did the first time we started a horse and we had the newspaper reporters from the Los Angeles Times with their cameras. It was the first time anything was ever put in this gate. We put three horses in: one had never been out of a gate before in his life; two of them had been out of a gate about eight or nine months previous and we started all three at the same time. We put them in the gate and moved the gate forward and then stopped it. Then backed them up and moved the gate forward and then turned them loose. They did not make one bobble. All three horses started even. I had boys in there holding them acting as assistant starters, and not one of them had ever had hold of a horse in the gate before in his life. Not one of the riders had ever been on a horse before in his life out of a gate. You will find that pushing a horse from behind with your gate will happen very seldom and I doubt if it has happened over once. We didn't have it happen except for one time.

MR. GEORGE CASSIDY: Because you trained the horses.

MR. ELLSWORTH: Anybody can train these horses and they will do the same.

MR. GEORGE CASSIDY: Has this been tried before?

MR. ELLSWORTH: You mean the walk-up starting gate? It was tried, yes, before when they moved the whole gate. The tractor was hooked up to the side of the gate and all the frame and the whole thing moved forward.

MR. GEORGE CASSIDY: What is the difference?

MR. ELLSWORTH: There is quite a bit of difference. This is just your stalls holding the horses that moves forward and the other way your whole frame work including wheels and everything moved forward. It was a bouncing up and down, moving sideways, you couldn't go in the wet weather with it and they had all kinds of trouble with it.

MR. GEORGE CASSIDY: In other words you think that with the gates we have today if we could make walk-up starts we could solve the problem.

MR. ELLSWORTH: Yes.

MR. GEORGE CASSIDY: Well it can be done.

MR. ELLSWORTH: If you can move your gates, not the wheels, just the gates that hold the horses, if you can move it forward, it will be a success.

MR. TROTTER: Is there any chance of the horse falling down when the gates move?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Well, we've never had one fall down. Now if they do, that's the advantage you have over your old gates. If a horse falls down in the present gate you have to almost drag him out from under there, or he has to work himself out the best way he can. You can move these in-motion gates off of your horse backwards or forwards or in any way you like to get the gates off the horse.

DR. REED: From the standpoint of soundness of a horse it appears that this would be quite an advantage I am sure. However with the standing, swift, propulsion type of start which we have at present, we have taken movies and the kinetic force which is extended at that particular time seems to be greater than at any time during the race. This may not be the entire answer to the problem but it would seem to me that we would have a distinct advantage from that standpoint.

MR. ELLSWORTH: Well, it has a big advantage in the fact that the horses get off smooth. When a horse jumps in the air he lights on the ground in an awkward position and then has to take off. This puts a terrific strain on his legs. It is only natural that they are going to have more strain on their legs than if they come out smooth. So I think that this is 100 percent better in keeping your horses sound and getting them all out away from there in an even break.

MR. PERLMAN: This gate has not been tried as yet at a race track?

MR. ELLSWORTH: No, this gate has never been moved off the farm where it was made and you have seen every start that was made in the gate right here with the saddle horses and with some thoroughbreds that we are going to show next.

MR. MEHRTENS: Do you think it would be dangerous if a horse started to rear up just as you put the gate in motion?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Well now, you see what happens here on one occasion if you will watch very close. A horse rears in the gate and you see what happens. He comes out of the gate even and with the others. When the gate touches him from behind all he does is go down with his front feet and get on the ground and he's gone with the others.

MR. BLIND: So far you have painted a very gruesome picture of starting and I would like to hear some of the good points of starting.

MR. PERLMAN: I think we ought to get the thoroughbred started and then we can discuss this more intelligently.

MR. ELLSWORTH: This is a little 8 mm. film taken by amateurs.

MR. VANDERBILT: Do the doors open automatically when they get to the front?

MR. ELLSWORTH: No, they are controlled by the starter. You can do it any way you want to.

MR. PERLMAN: The starter presses the button and opens the doors?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Right. After you start a horse a few times, they have a tendency to push on the front of the gate. They will put their nose right up in that "V" and stay right there.

MR. STEEN: Is the speed of the carriage moving forward controlled by the starter?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Right.

MR. STEEN: Is it controlled by that lever or is it mechanical?

MR. ELLSWORTH: It's controlled by the lever.

MR. STEEN: Then the speed isn't constant?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Well, the starter can make it whatever he wants to, he can make it go a little faster or a little slower.

MR. BLIND: You said a few minutes ago that in the type of gate we are using now a horse swells up. In other words in this gate he doesn't swell up?

MR. ELLSWORTH: He might swell up while the gate is standing still. Have you ever seen a trainer saddle a horse, how the horse swells up from cinching him, and the first thing he does is start him moving and when this horse starts to walk that pressure leaves him. Anytime you saddle a horse you should get rid of that pressure that he builds up. That's why you start him walking and then he's relieved.

MR. BLIND: We know Mr. Ellsworth that your horses eat in the dining room but how about some of these other trainers?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Well, we think this will help them. By the way, this isn't going to eliminate the starters.

(Laughter)

I don't think anyone knows enough about starting the horses to start one by himself so we have to have the starters to help us train these horses and then we must have starters that will put them in the gate. And I am sure you are going to have occasionally a man up in the gate with your horse in the moving gate.

MR. BLIND: I saw where you had one in the gate with your horses.

MR. ELLSWORTH: That's right. We had some men up in the gate. And by the way, they weren't trained starters either, they were just boys that were standing there that I told them to get up in the gate with the horses.

MR. JOHN MOONEY: Do you use conventional locks on that gate—is that the Puett type of backs and locks?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Now that's a mechanical deal. I don't know what kind of locks are used. It's a little different lock but I think serves the same purpose.

MR. JOHN MOONEY: I was wondering if there was more pressure to keep the gates closed?

MR. ELLSWORTH: You can put any kind of pressure to keep the gate closed that you want: 20, 30, 40, 50, 60 pound pressure. It's set at any pressure you want it to go open. If you want it to open hard you can put it at that pressure.

MR. PERLMAN: Don't you believe that before we are really sure that this will operate properly it will need to be tried at a race track with large fields and under racing conditions?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Well, this is very possible. We've tried it under every condition that we can think of. Now, if there is any other way, why, I don't know. We've had no trouble in converting horses that were used to the other starting gate. We didn't get one bad start and we had no problem in teaching younger horses that had never seen a gate. I wouldn't be afraid to start a horse in this gate twice and go over and start him in a race. I wouldn't be afraid to break a horse out of this gate the first time in a race. I'd rather have him come out of the gate once before, but I wouldn't be afraid to. We were the ones that started horses the first time with the walk-up gate they had here years ago before it left California and went out to Lou Smith's track. We started two horses in it before it left California and got an idea of what it did. But we never had any trouble with it whatever in starting the horses. You've seen all the starts we've made in this gate.

MR. PHIPPS: I think it is extraordinarily good but what can we do to help this along, especially its promotion?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Well, I'll tell you what I told these boys that came to me with this idea. I told them I was not in the starting gate business. I didn't want anything to do with the gates. I asked one to make the gates so we could start our horses but the thing didn't progress very well. So, a little while later, two or three months later they came back, went away again and then came back four or five months later. The only way I could see to do it was to build it right there on my place under their supervision. I had my men, welders and so on, work on it under their supervision and their help on week-ends. We got the gate built as cheaply as possible. Now this gate isn't exactly what it will be in a 14 stall gate. The larger gate will be made completely from aluminum. It will be light and have large wide tires so it won't make a dent in the race track. It will be a very good-looking, pretty gate that you could be proud to have on the race track. We made this one from steel—the frame structure from steel and the stalls were made from aluminum. So you are seeing it very, very rough. They can make a much, much better looking gate than this.

MR. BLIND: This gate was tried a few years ago by two very fine starters at Rockingham Park. I saw pictures of it although I didn't actually see it in use. Bill Mills from Santa Anita and Bob Friend, two very fine men gave it a very good try. I want to know what happened and why it wasn't a success then? They both cooperated.

MR. ELLSWORTH: Well, Bill Mills cooperated with us in making this gate and he gave us a lot of pointers. He brought people out every week or so and he'd come out to see how the gate was coming along. He told me the reason the other gate wasn't successful was because it was hooked to this tractor and the whole thing moved forward. It was jumping up and down and it wasn't smooth. The wheels going over the track, were jolting up and down, the gate was flopping up and down and then in wet weather, you couldn't make the thing go. It would pull the tractor sideways. They couldn't get it around.

MR. BLIND: It also ruined a horse of O. L. Foster. A very nice 3 year old and I wonder why the horse was ruined.

MR. ELLSWORTH: Now, I couldn't tell you about that because I don't know, I wasn't there and I haven't heard the circumstances. But you're going to hurt some horses no matter how you handle them. You're not going to eliminate everything 100 percent. In fooling with horses under any circumstances you're going to hurt some. You can lead a horse right out of the stall and you're liable to hurt him. Or he gets hurt in the stall, so, we're not stopping horses from getting hurt.

MR. BLIND: Don't you think there is a very small percentage of horses which get hurt in the starting gate as compared to the number of horses which start in a year?

MR. ELLSWORTH: Yes, but you don't know about their legs. That's one thing in the point I brought out, the boys being jerked over their heads, the horses stumbling at the gate and all of those things, they start leaning on the gate, they start rearing in the gate, they start in every which direction you can think of and we think we've got it all stopped with this walk-up starting gate.

MR. JACOBSON: From the little I have seen of this gate in the movies that you've shown it is my personal opinion it is excellent. It is quite an improvement on what we have here now and also alleviates some of the horses that refuse to start. Most of those horses refuse because they seem to freeze and stand motionless. Sometimes you have to lead them out of the gate. I think it is an excellent improvement. I bet you could take a horse and school him just one time and run him.

MR. ELLSWORTH: Right. In my opinion you are very correct.

MR. JACOBSON: This is the first time I have seen the film. I think it will cut our schooling time in half.

MR. PERLMAN: Hasn't the greatest objection been, particularly overseas, that when horses start from a standing freeze it jars them and is very hard on their legs? This way they would be in motion.

MR. ELLSWORTH: That is correct. These are all sound principles and I don't know how on earth you could defy them.

MR. JOHN MOONEY: When you used this gate did you have to use assistant starters with any of the horses or did you start them all without starters?

MR. ELLSWORTH: No, we used them both ways. We put the horses in with starters. We had to have some little help to put some of them in, and when we first started, we put men up there with them. We didn't know what we would run into. This was all new to us. But it is all an open book and you can see what happens. We had newsmen there at all times so nothing was covered up. We didn't do anything that didn't come right out in the open because we knew when we got all through everything would have to be exposed. It isn't something that we tried to fool ourselves on. All I want is my horses starting out of the gate like this. I don't care who puts it out or what happens, I'd like to have my horses started out of this gate. I've tested it enough to know that it's going to cut all of your hazards down 95 percent and it's going to cut, like you said, schooling time down half. It will be a terrific improvement I think. I think it will be as much an improvement for thoroughbreds as it was for trotting horses. Maybe more.

MR. PHIPPS: We are terribly grateful for your talk and your movies and I certainly am very much in favor of going on and encouraging the development of this starting gate. I want to thank you, Mr. Ellsworth, for showing this to us, and I also want to thank Mr. Jacobson and the others for their comments.

(Applause)

MR. MARSHALL CASSIDY: The next speaker will be Mr. William S. Miller who is, as everybody knows, the President of the National Association of State Racing Commissioners and the Chairman of the Illinois Commission.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Widener, Mr. Phipps, Mr. Haggin, Mr. Cassidy, gentlemen: The title of the subject assigned me, I wish to remind you, contains the positive, the compassionate and the very gracious implication that Racing Commissions **do** make contributions toward the betterment of Racing. I sincerely thank the sagacious and the kind author of that title, particularly because, on occasion, Racing Commissioners have been described as political hacks with complete ignorance of the problems and business of Racing.

I also thank The Jockey Club for this good chance to talk a little about the unselfish and devoted service most Commissions and most Commissioners have rendered to Racing.

I should pause for a moment to say—and I hope with pardonable pride—that, on the whole, Racing Commissioners are men of acknowledged integrity and achievement in their respective States. Nearly 75% of our present Commissioners have had college training. 8 are bankers, 19 are lawyers, 2 are newspaper publishers, 27 are corporation executives, 2 are medical doctors, 2 are dentists, 2 are architects, 7 are merchants, 4 are manufacturers; and others include a university professor, a hotel operator, a civil engineer, several farmers and automobile dealers, oil operators, real estate dealers, a labor union executive, a lumber dealer, a public relations executive and a mortician.

In general, Racing Commissions, working in concert through the instrument of The National Association of State Racing Commissioners, have been a godsend to Racing. No sport in this country or in this world has had an association comparable to NASRC in its wide and complex operational scope and in its unrelenting effort to protect the integrity of the sport it was dedicated to serve.

With respect to specifics in the form of contributions by Commissions toward the betterment of Racing, I prefer, even at the risk of seeming immodest, to confine my comments to the Commission of which I have the honor to be Chairman.

Some of our Race Tracks in Illinois are eye-catching and eye-pleasing in their obvious beauty and luxurious spaciousness. But one day, our Racing Commission became more interested "in the social scene than in the scenery." In one part of the racing plant, we found gaiety, laughter, affluence, luxury and power; and in another part, we found squalor, depression and frustration. We found the front side of the Race Track with modern air conditioning and air purifiers, modern and spacious and numerous toilets, gourmet food and the best alcoholic drinks the distillers of the world could produce. We found the back side with smells of sweat and waste, community toilets and baths, vermin and open drainage gutters. On the front side, we found people with secure jobs and the chance to live a normal family life, the chance for education and the chance for decent recreation. On the back side, we found chronic turnover, chronic shifting from one job to another, much illiteracy, hundreds of empty beer cans, rats and flies. We found people without names except "Joe" or "Abe" or "Turk" or "Fatso"; people whom no one wants, people who are afraid to complain, people who must every day contend with the most primitive concerns of human existence—food and cleanliness and clothes and rest and work; people with enormous burden of waiting—waiting for comfort when they are sick, waiting in line for usually miserable food, waiting for the toilet, waiting for the bath; people whose only compensation for the absence of creature comforts you and I take for granted is the opportunity to get "drunk" or "hot" on Saturday night.

We didn't change all of this, but we made substantial headway. We have a trailer park with individual sewage disposal attachments, with electrical and water connections. We have modern laundry facilities, recreation centers with planned programs, community buildings for religious and social activities, hot and cold water at each barn, heat when needed for the tack rooms, expanded toilet and bath facilities, furnished lodging facilities. We still have a long ways to go. Some day, however, among other things, we will provide housing for those "forgotten workers" of the back side; and with that will come family life and dreams and hope and ambition and stature for these "Joes" and "Abes" and "Turks" and "Fatsos" who groom and walk and feed your horses and mine.

Last August 24, agents of the United States Treasury Department arrested 15 men for bookmaking at a Harness Meeting in the Chicago area. The Illinois Racing Board does not have jurisdiction over Harness Racing. Yet, on August 26, two days following the arrests, Governor Kerner directed my colleagues and me to establish a Bureau of Race Track Police to assume the responsibility of supervising Security at all race meetings in Illinois, both Thoroughbred and Harness. The Bureau was created. The Director and his three assistants are employed on a year around basis. They, not track management and not political patronage dispensers, select the Security staff at each track. The Bureau is free to investigate and take action against anyone whose conduct or reputation can be adjudged detrimental to Racing; and this includes officials, track owners, bookmakers, horsemen, jockeys, jockey agents, veterinarians, clockers, stable personnel or any other type individual or group. The entire cost is assumed by the 13 racing associations. Here are some of the results: As of July 27, 1964, the mutuel handle increased nearly 33 millions of dollars over the same period last year, and the revenue to the State increased \$1,777,000. The revenue to the track operators obviously increased as did the purses to horsemen. 520 investigated matters were handled by the Bureau in this period, and there were 50% more ejections from the tracks than in the comparable period last year. We had two stimulation cases in 1964—both were solved by the Bureau—and conviction in Cook County Criminal Court was obtained. The Bureau

also caused Frank "Buster" Wortman, a notorious hoodlum, to be indicted by the Cook County Grand Jury for intimidation, arising out of the ejection policy at the tracks.

In the selection and/or approval of Stewards, politics has not been a consideration. On August 8, 1964, our distinguished State Steward, Mr. Ted Atkinson, wrote to me as follows: "I can personally attest that after nearly 4 years here not a single member of the Illinois Racing Board has asked my political affiliation or if I have any." He also said: "The Illinois Racing Board has expressly and frequently indicated that the decisions of the Stewards are to be influenced only by their judgment and the dictates of their conscience."

Next Mr. Atkinson said: "The Illinois Racing Board's availability to the horsemen to discuss grievances and rule revisions on short notice has produced harmony where discord existed on many occasions."

I should like to conclude with a few comments about our veterinarians. The same state and track veterinarians are employed throughout the entire season. Now that's commonplace in New York but in our state it was never done. We have five racing meetings for thoroughbreds in the Chicago area, usually we have five different sets of veterinarians. Obviously this requires a basic continuity of records, policies and a consistent interpretation of rules. We also established a training program for undergraduate veterinary students which is paid for by the State of Illinois and is handled in collaboration with the School of Veterinary Medicine of the University of Illinois. We got terribly concerned a few years ago when we realized that a shortage of specialists in the field of veterinary medicine existed, so we did something about it. A dual program of research is also in full operation. Studies are presently confined to bone abnormalities and bleeders. The University of Illinois College of Veterinary Medicine supplies the personnel. This program was also originated by the Racing Board and is paid for by the State of Illinois.

Now gentlemen, I shall conclude my remarks by saying to you that you all have an opportunity to be helpful in this problem and in this very necessary thing of providing Racing Commissions and Racing Commissioners with sound guidance. We propose to establish a National Committee on standards. By we, I mean the National Association of State Racing Commissioners. We are doing this for this very obvious reason which perhaps some of you hadn't thought about too seriously. There will no doubt be an entire new Racing Commission in the State of Florida because there is going to be a change of the administration. There may be an entire new Racing Commission in the State of Louisiana and perhaps in other states. Now I'm not willing to concede that the men whom the Governors of those respective states may appoint will be very worthwhile men. But please understand that when they accept this job of being a Racing Commissioner they have nothing to guide them. Nothing. It takes them two or three years to get acquainted with the problems. But you all can examine your own conscience. Nothing has been done. Nothing has been done to help this situation. We propose to do something about it but we can't do it without your help, and that means the track operators, and I'm not talking about financial help. We have great mental resources in this wonderful industry and this wonderful sport but we seldom call upon them. We need the best brains of the jockeys, the chemists, the track owners, the horsemen to prepare a manual somewhat similar in its general nature to this manual that the New York Racing Association has prepared, and that too is the first time I have ever seen something of that important nature done in racing. We want that sort of thing. If you are not acquainted with it, please look at it. It's an inspiration. That's what we want to do for Racing Commissions. Gentlemen, I thank you.

(Applause)

MR. PHIPPS: We thank you, Mr. Miller. Are there any questions on this subject?

With as many important people of racing as are in this room here today this group's opinion should have influence even though we do not have the power to change. Therefore I am going to ask for a show of hands on some of the matters presented. We will circulate that opinion—whether this group is overwhelmingly in favor of a proposal or not—to racing groups who may be interested.

First I would like a show of hands on whether we should do everything we can to investigate the moving start and assist in its development. I vote "yes" on that. (Show of hands—unanimous). I thought it would be unanimous.

(Applause)

MR. CASSIDY: The next speaker is a member of one of the most famous training families of American racing history who has made a tremendous record himself while still a young man, Mr. Elliott Burch, the President of the American Trainers Association.

MR. BURCH: Mr. Widener, Mr. Phipps, Mr. Haggin and Mr. Cassidy, gentlemen. I haven't got a prepared speech. My topic today is as follows: Problems confronting Horsemen in Training and Managing Racing Stables. Well, I could keep you here all day on this subject and possibly we could go into tomorrow.

Each day brings with it new problems. Some days they are worse than others, of course. When the big horses are doing well, the problems seem minor. But certain problems continually exist. I imagine if they had had a round table back in the last century, the horsemen would be talking about the same things that we are talking about today. We have made large strides in dealing with our problems and let's hope that we continue to do so.

Actually, Mr. Miller stole my speech. I think the largest problem confronting the men on the back side, we trainers, is in our help. We don't have enough help. We don't have adequate help. The reason that they are not adequate I feel is that the job does not carry enough prestige with it. They are not recognized. Their living conditions are not satisfactory although again large strides have been made. I'm speaking largely for New York which is where I race most of the year.

One thing which was done this year in New York which I don't think most of you gentlemen are aware of, after Quadrangle won the Belmont, not only did the owner receive a trophy and the trainer and the jockey, but the groom and the exercise boy also received trophies. This to my knowledge is the first time that this has been done. I think it is a wonderful thing.

Without the men in my barn I couldn't get the horses to the race track and I certainly couldn't get them to the races. They are a large part of the whole racing picture but they are being neglected and forgotten by all of us, yet we blame them—"so-and-so didn't do such-and-such right," but how often do they ever get a pat on the back?

Another thing that has been done in New York which I think is good. They have a newspaper which is circulated around the New York stable area. It's called the Backstretch and they write up the individual grooms and exercise boys, watchmen, hot walkers, et cetera. This is a step in the right direction.

We feel that some way or other some organization whether it be The Jockey Club or the National Association of State Racing Commissioners, or the T.R.A., should start a school for apprentice horsemen, a place where they could go and learn about a horse, starting from scratch; learn the feeding habits of a horse, learn everything and then from these people we would get more help on the race track. The salaries continue to go up. Each year it seems it's higher and higher, but that hasn't encouraged young men to come on the race track. We need more young men on the race track, and decent men. That's one of our problems.

Our other largest problem, of course, is soundness, keeping horses sound. The

Jockey Club instituted the study this year of soundness. They have taken x-rays of young horses to find out why so many horses are breaking down. We feel that largely horses break down because of race tracks. We would like to see less and less track records and sounder horses.

That's about all I have to say to you gentlemen this morning.

(Applause)

MR. CASSIDY: Would anyone here like to render a comment or ask a question of Mr. Burch?

MR. JOHN FINNEY: What percentage of unsoundness, just as a casual off-hand guess, do you attribute to horses' starting?

MR. BURCH: I'm not much of a statistician so I couldn't exactly give you a percentage. Offhand I might say 10 percent, but you don't know. Possibly a horse breaks down on Saturday, it might have been from something that happened at the gate on Tuesday. I couldn't say definitely on that.

MR. JOHN FINNEY: Do you feel that the gate Mr. Ellsworth advocates is superior and improves the chances in that department?

MR. BURCH: It looks quite good to me. I'd have to see it tried out with thoroughbreds. You've seen some cold-blooded horses in the gate. Thoroughbreds, as we all know, are entirely different than cold-bloods and how they would behave—although I think we saw one shot of thoroughbreds breaking. All of us have one or two problem horses about the barrier. I'd like to see it tried anyway.

MR. TED ATKINSON: I had watched the first showing I believe at Arlington Park and I was quite impressed. I think that the movable starting gate will possibly overcome a great many tendencies of horses to lean and get themselves off badly but I think the business of needing a walk-up start, from the standpoint of keeping horses sound, is vastly over-emphasized. I think that when Eohippus first came out of the woods he learned to break running. And I think it's perfectly natural to him that if a wolf comes upon a horse on the range I don't suppose that he takes off at a walk, trot, canter. I think he breaks running and I don't think there is anything to be gained in that respect from a walk-up start.

MR. BURCH: I couldn't disagree more. How many horses do you see come to the race track and go from the gap and go like this. You warm them up before you give them their exercise. Why do you think they walk, jog, gallop, breeze? This is to warm them up so it is not a shock to their system.

MR. ATKINSON: Well, it may not be a shock to their system once they are warmed up. Remember the horses going into the starting gate have had a gallop anyway. Generally speaking the unsoundness of horses is caused by competition. I don't think you would have nearly as much unsoundness if you didn't have it.

MR. CHANDLER: I went abroad with Ed Blind, and we saw a lot of starts in Europe. We went back to where the starting is done on the track over there because they were starting horses like Ed has to contend with in the International. Now in France they started two-year-olds last year and this year all horses are starting from the gate. The Englishmen are a little reluctant but they are showing interest because the English writers which went over to see the big race in France are coming back and saying the sooner we get the gate over here the better because they are getting perfect starts. Now I heard a major objection in England with respect to the gate was the standing start and the strain on the horses' legs. I would like to ask Ed if he thinks this movable start will help his chores on November 11th. We have had people ask us when all the horses in Europe use the gate, are we going to go back to the gate? I wonder if Eddie will tell us whether he thinks the walk-up starts would help.

MR. CASSIDY: Eddie, will you step out there so you can talk over the microphone?

MR. BLIND: As everybody knows in the International at Laurel we get a majority of foreign-ridden horses from different countries, horses which have been started all different ways and I know only one language. You know that is not French, German or Spanish. I have seen racing in England, Ireland and on the continent and I think 90% of the time horses over there start flat-footed anyway. I saw Terrill start in Ireland and I saw Marsh at Epsom and I saw 19 or 20 two-year-olds in a single race and 15 started flat-footed and 5 were walk-ups. Speaking of horses breaking down, I think if we had more grass racing under the conditions they have in Europe and England, our horses wouldn't break down so often. I think they put too much emphasis on the flat-footed start. I don't really think that flat-footed starts break the majority of the horses down. You were speaking of the starting gate. I surely would like to see Europeans have a starting gate as we use. I would like to have a modern starting gate for the International. It would make my chores easier. But we haven't got the time. Therefore, it wouldn't be practical. It is a lot easier for us to teach our horses to break from the European way of starting than to teach their horses our way. Horses come over here one day or two days before the race. On the other hand, I've broken horses in one day that have come from France that have never raced out of our gates and they have raced the next day. They can be taught very easily if they have a little age on them. Of course, young horses have to be taught more. I think the modern gate, as we are using it today, has come a long way and it has helped the starters a lot. Anything they can do to improve the start and keep the horses sound, and if this moving starting gate is the answer, then I am firmly behind it and I hope that Mr. Ellsworth makes a success of it. Anything I can do to help it along, just call me. Also, the starting gate has helped the horses, meaning when there is no gate used, horses are often kicked so badly that they have had to be destroyed. I've also seen them go a sixteenth of a mile or so and their leg would break off where they were kicked while at the post.

MR. ELLSWORTH: I might add here that an Englishman veterinarian came over and I showed him this gate. After he got home he contacted one of the big industrial men over there who has horses and they have written four or five letters, and they said all those countries over there were ready for a starting gate but they were holding back because of the sand. He said, "If you will let me make this gate and be your representative over here, I'll guarantee you it will go like wildfire." We haven't given him any answer yet. He'll pay all expenses and make the gates because he wants to put the gates over there.

MR. CASSIDY: If I may be excused I'd like to make a short comment. I originated the stall starting gates in the beginning and I naturally think they have been an advantage and a help to racing in America. I also tried on several different occasions to introduce a moving starting gate and the reason I wanted to introduce it is the same reason that it is being tried at this time. I'm all for it. If we could have moving starts from every start it would be wonderful.

But I would like to say this. Having watched horses breaking from the starting gates for many years I don't think that causes any great difficulty to the animal. All the strain in breaking from a standing start is in the hind legs and you don't find many horses break down in the rear.

MR. PHIPPS: Thank you very much, Elliott, for your talk. We enjoyed it.

(Applause)

MR. CASSIDY: The next and last speaker on the program for prepared topics is a man everybody knows, the editor and publisher of Triangle Publications, Mr. J. Samuel Perlman:

(Applause)

MR. PERLMAN: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. Thank you for the applause because after I get through you may not want to applaud.

My topic is Commercialism in Racing. I'd like to borrow a phrase and add to it "Myth and reality." What is commercialism in racing? Frankly I don't know. If we said "materialism" I think I would understand it, because that is one of the great problems being widely discussed politically today. There have been a number of articles in the magazines and newspapers on the subject of commercialism in racing. I think that the sportsmen who granted these interviews have made an important contribution to racing, they have a deep interest in the sport. They race stables; they have been active in track management. But I think one of the drawbacks of their criticisms and all criticisms in relation to commercialism in racing has been that not a single one of these people who have so deep an interest in changing things have offered a single solution. It is one thing to ask questions but it is another to provide the answer.

I do not know if there are any solutions but I think the whole idea about commercialism being a disease in racing is wrong. We are not separating the myth from the realities. To begin with I think it is an error to approach the problem on the basis of sportsmanship and commercialism without bringing the public into the situation at all. After all, there are only two groups of sportsmen in racing, the public and the owners of horses. The public deserves more consideration than even the owners because owners have an advantage in that losses are tax deductible. Losses on wagering at the race track are not tax deductible.

Let us first attempt to determine whether thoroughbred racing is a sport or a business. I have pondered this question for many many years—I've been in the sport for 40 years—and I think I've finally arrived at what I believe is the proper definition. Racing is a sport operated as a business. I think the same can be said of virtually every sport in America today. What is baseball? Baseball is a sport operated as a ruthless business in which the ballplayers are chattels. A man who owns a horse that has done well turns him out and gives him a happy life. A baseball club that owns a ball player who has stopped hitting turns him loose and he has nowhere to go.

Now, just what is the status of racing? I have some statistics here that are based on a survey made by the T.R.A. several years ago and I've amended it to take into consideration its tremendous growth. There are 40,000 horses in training today. That is more than there are in the rest of the world combined. There are more horses in training, more sires, more brood mares, more of everything in racing in the United States many times over than there is in the rest of the world combined. These 40,000 horses, conservatively speaking, are worth about 200 million dollars. Believe it or not, there are 4,000 stallions in this country. There should be a lot less, but there are 4,000. They are conservatively estimated as being worth 75 million dollars. There are 20,000 brood mares worth at least 125 million; 10,000 yearlings worth about 50 million; 14,000 weanlings about 30 million; 2,000 breeding farms which, with their land and buildings are valued at about 900 million; 101 race tracks conservatively estimated as being worth a billion dollars. There are the feed suppliers, the transportation companies and the concessionaires, together estimated as having a value of at least 150 million dollars. The total is in excess of two and a half billion dollars. There are 50,000 people employed and an annual pay roll of 250 million dollars. The revenue to the states in 1963 was 316 million dollars. Of course, just as much was retained by the race tracks, which pay all the expenses. This, in addition to other contributions made by the public such as admissions, concessions, buying The Morning Telegraph and Daily Racing Form, et cetera. Actually, the public contributes one billion dollars a year toward racing and that is a conservative estimate.

In New York State alone the state got more than 100 million dollars out of racing last year. Critics have said that racing is being run by businessmen instead of sportsmen. Now when you get a business or a sport in which two and a half bil-

lion dollars is invested, when you have a race track such as Aqueduct which costs more than 200 thousand dollars a day to operate—that's far more than a million dollars a week—it seems to me that you do have to have some businessmen to watch that type of operation. I do admit that the policy of race tracks should, whenever possible, certainly be controlled by people who have the sporting instinct though, I think the two are inseparable. You can't operate racing properly as a sport and have racing of quality unless it is successful as a business. You can only have decent purses if you have decent income. You can only have decent facilities if you are making money and in business you can only produce a decent product if you are operating profitably.

Now what is racing when it has all these billions of dollars involved? Obviously it is a sport operated as a business, the same as football, baseball and everything else. The papers are full of stories about CBS buying the Yankees and whenever a baseball player gets 100 thousand dollars a year it becomes much bigger news in the papers than his accomplishments on the field.

I am not suggesting for one second that I believe this is exactly what we want. But those are the realities we must face; that is what is going on. If we are going to have good racing it has to be operated profitably or you will not get good horses.

Now what is sportsmanship and what is commercialism? Let us take Saratoga as an example. I've heard many people say how commercial Aqueduct is and how sporting it is to be at Saratoga. I bow to no one in my support of Saratoga during the 20 years that I've been the editor and publisher of *The Morning Telegraph* and *Daily Racing Form*. I do not believe newspapers have done more to publicize the charm of the sporting side of racing itself in Saratoga. I love coming here. But I am not sure that the difference is commercialism and sportsmanship. I myself termed Saratoga an island of sportsmanship in a sea of commercialism, but I am wondering if that isn't a cliché. It sounds good, but let's analyze it. Saratoga and Aqueduct have the same management. They have the same horses, the same trainers, the same jockeys. Where does the sportsmanship come in? The racing strip at Aqueduct is better built and is a better strip to race on than Saratoga. It has a mile chute that Saratoga does not possess. But to say that there is a difference between sportsmanship and commercialism is wrong unless it is sporting to lose money. The difference, I think, is that when people go to the races they don't come from their business offices. They don't have to travel a long way to come to the races. They are on a holiday. They live in a house near the race track and they can come in the morning and watch the workouts. It's wonderful and I love it. In New York, I've got a problem. I'm in the office, I have to work. Saratoga is nostalgic and it represents a way of life that has disappeared. I think that it is to the credit of the N.Y.R.A. that it is perpetuating a way of life which is so dear to all of us and which, I think, shows the world that racing is not entirely materialistic and commercial. But don't forget one thing: if you want to have a nice home in the country you had better have a good business in town to support it. If Saratoga paid purses on the basis of its handle it could not afford more than \$25,000 a day. But last year purses averaged \$65,000 a day and \$40,000 of that came from Aqueduct. All these people who love racing so much probably would not send their horses to Saratoga for purse distribution of \$25,000 a day because they have to balance their budgets like the rest of us.

Racing is a form of entertainment. Racing competes with all other sports for the public. And I think the only way in which you can compete is to put on a good show. Take Aqueduct as an example. Until the new Aqueduct was built racing in New York was deteriorating, the plants were in terrible shape because the "take" was too small and they couldn't afford to improve them. Now the crowds have increased tremendously because the facilities are good. The late Doctor Strub was the first man to have the imagination to think of the potential of racing and what

did he do? He built a beautiful race track with fine facilities. He gave the people a good show. The people came. The racing improved. California has developed one of the best breeding industries, one of the strongest in the whole country. The state has virtually its own racing. Ninety percent of the horses that race in California today, if not more, are from California. Hollywood Park's last meeting set a world record for daily average attendance. And why? Because it is a pleasure to go to the race track. It's comfortable; it caters to the public. For example, I've advocated for a long while that horses should be identified during workouts for the benefit of the public. Hollywood has done that for a number of years. On the other hand it is a great pleasure to come to Saratoga in the morning and watch the workouts but they don't tell you who the horses are. How much nicer it would be if it were announced that "Kelso is going to work five furlongs." Hollywood Park and Santa Anita frequently attract several thousands of people who come out to watch the morning workouts. Of course, they know who is working. Why don't we do it? Why don't all race tracks do it? I don't know, but they should.

You have another example in Canada. Mr. Taylor has been a dynamic force there. They have built several of the finest race tracks in America. They started about 12 years ago by acquiring all of the race tracks there in the same manner as in New York, except that it's on the basis of the free enterprise system in Canada. They have created their own breeding industry because they couldn't get any decent horses. By increasing the play, by giving the public good facilities, thus drawing larger crowds and larger handles, they were able to increase their purses. This has become a great incentive to the breeding industry. Today you see horses coming out of Canada to win the Kentucky Derby.

Frequently people say "Racing should do this." Now "who" is racing? In England The Jockey Club completely controls racing—the racing dates, everything that goes on. Racing in the United States is completely sovereign in every state. No one in this country has anything more than moral influence on what goes on in racing. We are indeed fortunate that the National Association of Racing Commissioners was created about 30 years ago. If it weren't for the influence of the National Association, which is purely moral and ethical, you wouldn't have anything like the acceptance of rulings and the uniform rules that you have today. But there is no one that has the authority over racing in any shape or form. Actually this group here can have a great moral influence on what we do to improve the sport. Many of our problems in racing are the problems that we have in our general life. We are a democracy and have the free enterprise system. Now Winston Churchill has said that this form of government is one of the worst that has ever been created but the best that has ever been conceived. So we are in the position where we may have many problems but the free enterprise system is still the best way and people who make mistakes must pay the penalties and learn from these mistakes. For instance, we have many people who are opposed to gimmicks. They are opposed to twin doubles, they are opposed to horses racing too often. If a man owns a race track and his business isn't going very well, he is obviously going to do everything he can to improve it. I'm opposed to the twin double but I don't know what I would do if I had a race track and it was in the red. Racing has one very great problem. Its income is frozen. The take is fixed by the state and as you know it is pretty difficult to increase it. In fact, you know how difficult it was in New York just to maintain it because politics are involved. If anyone has found a way to control legislatures, I would like to hear it. There also is the problem of preventing many of the things that happen at race tracks. They say horses run too often, that there are too many of certain types of races. But there is no way to control that. You cannot tell a trainer how often he should run a horse. They say there are too many two-year-old races so the horses are raced too often and they are ruined. But there is nothing to stop the owner or the breeder who thinks that this is detrimental to the horse

from racing him lightly. No one is forced to run. Just because there is a lot of whiskey around doesn't mean that everyone has to get drunk. If it is good business not to race horses too often the owner should not do so. You will find however, if you study statistics that the horses that race lightly as two-year-olds don't do very well in this country. It's the horses that have the most education and remain sound that succeed. There is no way you are going to control, nor should you attempt to, what an owner does with his horses. So far as the many two-year-old races for rich purses are concerned, these are attributable to our competitive system. New Jersey or Delaware tracks want to get the good horses and they will do everything they can in a competitive way to get them.

Betting is seldom discussed at these Round Tables. Betting is what creates most of the revenue. I spoke before the National Press Club several years ago and a man got up and said, "Would there be any racing at all, would anyone go to the races if it weren't for betting?" Well, I said it was just like asking me whether anyone would get married if sex wasn't involved. I don't know. I think that racing is a lot more than betting and marriage is a lot more than sex but betting is part of racing. People like to bet and betting on a good horse provides the greatest excitement in the world. We can't ignore it and simply say it doesn't exist.

It has been said that the heavy emphasis on sprints and claiming races tends to over-value cheap horses and discourages the breeding and training of classic thoroughbreds. I don't believe that is true. There are more rich races, classic races at a distance in the United States than in the rest of the world combined. England only has a few classic races and a person must either run in those or nowhere else. Despite the fact that they have so few races one of their top classic races, the King George and Queen Elizabeth, drew only five horses. So I don't think that it proves that their horses are raced differently; that they necessarily developed more good horses. Our volume of racing is tremendous. There is no way to control it. In many areas racing starts too soon and continues too long. How can we control it? How do you get the state to reduce it so that you can run the number of days you prefer. Racing's greatest problems stem from the attitudes of states whose only interest is the revenue. How do you go about changing that? I don't know. New York State has the finest racing. It's non-profit, draws the biggest racing stables, the biggest breeders, men who approach racing entirely as a sport, yet it has more trouble with the legislature than any other state. Last spring, in fact, the problems were incredible. The demagoguery was nauseating, but how do you control it? I think that the New York people have been less active in politics than they should be because racing is involved in politics and the state has the power of life and death over your sport. If you are not active in politics you are going to be out of business. Maybe that is one of the problems. For many years the New York tracks paid no attention to politics at all and they were almost obliterated. How do you breed more good horses with the volume of racing increasing all the time? Last month you had racing in New York and New Jersey and Delaware, Illinois and California. Five major race tracks. These five major race tracks alone need at least 7,500 horses in order to operate properly. Now did they get the best horses in the country? I'm sure they got less than 7,500. What happens to all the rest of the race tracks? I don't know what the answer to it is because it is just as difficult to breed a great horse as it is to create a great painting and I don't know how many great paintings there are in the world. Not too many. I think the breeders are doing a good job just to provide enough horses for the volume of racing. I think there are 31 race tracks in operation right now. These 31 race tracks have got more than 30,000 horses in training. Perhaps some people here will give us some answers after I'm through with this chat.

Another problem that was discussed previously is the condition of racing strips. I've heard a lot of complaints here in Saratoga. I have had many trainers come to

me and say they are scraping the track, that the bottom is too hard, that horses have shattered their legs, et cetera. I don't know whether that is true or not. But if there is any place in the world where the owners of horses should pay attention to their trainers and the condition of the race track it certainly is right here, because the men who own the horses—the most expensive horses and the biggest stables—are also the men who run the race track. Why that problem should exist I don't know. It also exists all over the country. I think that Elliott Burch made a very profound comment when he said that too much attention is being paid to track records which are meaningless.

Officiating is another problem and that is something I think Chairman Miller's committee should take into consideration. There are numerous states—maybe 50 percent of them in this country—where the Racing Commissions name stewards representing them who have never been to a race track before, believe it or not. Fortunately New York's Racing Commissioners are appointed for six-year terms and every second year one is changed. Thus we always have at least two experienced commissioners. However, there are many states as Mr. Miller said, where every time there is a new administration four or five people are appointed who have never been to a race track. How do you control that? I don't know.

There is a great need for more distance racing. New York should set the pace. It has gotten so that trainers will not condition horses to run a distance. I don't think this is related to breeding. All sorts of horses with the finest pedigrees never run more than six furlongs. Possibly it is easier to train a horse for six furlongs but I think that distance racing is easier on them. They gallop the first part of it and don't have to race at full speed all the time. I think the only way to do it is to offer much higher purses for races at a mile or more and don't cancel events if the fields are small. If it is too expensive to do it—there is a way out. In Canada every time they have a very small field they use the Quinella and the handle doesn't suffer. If the horsemen knew that route races would go for four, five and six horses they would change their methods and the public would get a much better show.

I have spoken too long and tried to cover too many areas but I do feel keenly about all these things. In the 20 years that I have been editor and publisher of The Morning Telegraph and Daily Racing Form I tried to follow the precept that racing is a sport operated as a business. We run considerable news in The Daily Racing Form and The Morning Telegraph. None of it deals with betting. It all concerns horses and horsemen and jockeys and breeders. We do have the charts and past performances that are essential if you are going to be a successful operation and if you are going to give the public and all concerned what they require.

I do not know the answers to the problems, but I do know that racing has many virtues that seldom are mentioned. Many of the finest people in America are in racing. Finer people than any other sport. We have the best supervised sport in the country. We draw the largest crowds. So we do have virtues. But I think it is constructive to talk about our faults and I do appreciate your attention. Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

(Applause)

MR. PHIPPS: Thank you very much Mr. Perlman, you have given us food for thought. Now we will proceed to the questions that have been turned in.

MR. CASSIDY: The first topic is: SHOULD BOYS THAT HAVE BEEN SET DOWN QUITE A FEW TIMES BE GIVEN INCREASED PENALTIES FOR ADDITIONAL OFFENSES?

I think the best people to give an opinion on that would be the stewards. Mr. Dunne, would you like to say something about that?

MR. DUNNE: Mr. Widener, Mr. Phipps, Mr. Cassidy, gentlemen: I'm not prepared to discuss whatever I'm discussing, but as I gather from the question which I just heard there are people who think that a boy who has been suspended several times should be given an additional penalty. Well, I have reservations about that—the penalty in itself is pretty bad. The top rider suspended for ten days has been struck a strong blow. Just because you struck him a strong blow last spring, now you're going to strike him another and then hit him a second time. I really think it's too much. I mean, it's not fair. Ten days to a boy who is doing very well is quite a penalty. We experimented with it around here some years ago, we gave some of the longer penalties but we discontinued it. You now have the benefit of my invaluable advice.

MR. CASSIDY: I think we could probably have a comment from the jockey contingent. Mr. Jemas, would you like to say something?

MR. JEMAS: I think Mr. Dunne has expressed my views and the Jockeys' Guild views very thoroughly and I can't comment any better on it.

MR. CASSIDY: Would anyone else like to speak? Yes, Mr. Mehrtens.

MR. MEHRTENS: Although I agree with Mr. Dunne and Mr. Jemas, we had a case at Delaware this year where Oswald Torres was set down 3 times in a 55 day meeting. Now when you get a boy who gets set down and gets back up and in two days does the same thing over again, I think he deserves more than the normal 10 day period.

MR. CASSIDY: Thank you Mr. Mehrtens. Ted Atkinson, would you like to say something, having once been a rider?

MR. ATKINSON: I think that basically I am in agreement with Mr. Dunne. However, on the other hand, there are exceptional cases and I think that many times individuals call for individual attention.

MR. CASSIDY: Thank you. I guess I might as well ask the other steward. Mr. Rainey, will you say something about it?

MR. RAINEY: I agree whole-heartedly with Ted Atkinson and Warren Mehrtens. There are isolated cases where boys don't learn a lesson from their first suspension and soon afterwards repeat the same infraction. Therefore, I think those boys should be given more severe penalties.

MR. CASSIDY: Any other comments from anyone? The next topic is: IF A HORSE IS BARRED FROM STARTING SHOULD THIS INFORMATION BE CIRCULATED TO ALL RACING AUTHORITIES WITH INFORMATION REGARDING THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE DISABILITY?

I'd like to call on a Racing Secretary, Mr. Trotter.

MR. TROTTER: Well, I think that's a question that should be directed more to a veterinarian or a starter rather than the Racing Secretary.

MR. CASSIDY: Well, we'll turn it over to one of the veterinarians. Doctor Gilman?

DR. GILMAN: If the horse is dangerous, then he should be barred all over. If he is dangerous in New York we feel that he's dangerous also in New Jersey or Kentucky or any other place. As for eyes, if he hasn't normal vision in both eyes, we bar this horse. However, we allow a horse to run if he has normal vision in only one eye and if he runs straight in the afternoon. Horses with impaired vision in both eyes should be barred and this should be published in the paper. Most of these conditions, except for some odd case, would be permanent and would probably get worse. Another reason for barring a horse would be a horse having heart trouble. He could collapse on the race track and perhaps pile up a whole field of horses. Such a horse would certainly have to be barred if it was proven that the

heart is bad and causes this condition. There are still other conditions which we bar horses for and that is nerving. But you couldn't bar these horses throughout the country because each track has a different nerve rule. In New York, we only allow the posterior digital nerves to be removed. If we find the horse nerved higher, the horse is barred. On the other hand, in Maryland a horse is allowed to run when nerved high on both sides of a leg and in Kentucky they are allowed to run when nerved high on one side of a leg. So, every track would have different rules and you can only bar a horse according to the rules that you have in your particular state. But in general, I would say that a dangerous horse should be barred. I would imagine that no one person should have the complete say on barring a horse—there should be at least two or three veterinarians making this decision.

MR. CASSIDY: Thank you. Mr. Perlman?

MR. PERLMAN: It seems to me that the information should be published or at least sent out to every race track. Surely you wouldn't want a horse with a heart condition who can't race in New York shipped somewhere else without them knowing what his condition is.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Jacobs, would you like to say something on that? You're a trainer of note.

MR. JACOBS: I think in cases where they have trouble with the heart they are very dangerous. I know I had one back years ago that Dr. Catlett used to examine with a stethoscope and said his heart was a little bad. He won and I lost him and he went to Ohio and won and he dropped dead right at the finish line. And the eyes, I think one vet might say the eyes are bad and another might not. I know my brother Gene shipped a filly down to Garden State to run and the vet scratched her. He said her eyes were bad. Her pupils were dilated but her eyes were all right. She came back up and was running in Stakes. One vet might think eyes are bad and another might disagree.

MR. CASSIDY: I think we are going a little bit off the topic in that we are speaking of barring horses rather than circulating the information. If a horse has been nerved, whether it is a high or low nerve, it is a matter of information. I think the various states or tracks that have different rules would govern it according to their own rules but the information might be of material value because the horse could become worse and cause an accident.

MR. JACOBS: I think that each track should be notified though.

MR. CASSIDY: Anybody else? Eddie Blind.

MR. BLIND: A horse with a heart condition or an unsound horse that has been barred—I think if it is dangerous for a horse to run in this state it is dangerous for him to run in another state and therefore he should be barred all over.

MR. JEMAS: I think that information should be published. I can cite an example—I won't mention any names—there was one particular horse which had been put on the Vet's list and barred in New Jersey and he was shipped to another area of the country and he crippled a boy permanently. This boy was an apprentice rider and he hasn't ridden since. I think that information should be published as well as the information of riders who have been suspended or fined.

MR. CASSIDY: I think on this question it would be nice for us to have a showing of hands. Those who feel that this information should be circulated to all racing centers please raise your hands. (Show of hands—unanimous) That's conclusive, thank you.

The next topic here is: RECENTLY SEVERAL JOCKEYS HAVE BEEN PENALIZED FOR MAKING SO-CALLED FRIVOLOUS CLAIMS OF FOUL. IS SUCH A PENALTY JUSTIFIED?

I don't know who we'd go to to find out whether it is justified or not, unless it would be to the officials first and we'll call on one of the stewards. Will one of you stand up and speak? All right, Mr. Mehrtens.

MR. MEHRTENS: We had a case in Delaware this year which I think was justified. The boy who claimed foul at the time was in second position and the boy he claimed against was in last position.

MR. CASSIDY: I think that possibly another steward who has been a jockey should answer that too. Ted?

MR. ATKINSON: I'm afraid that if we cease the practice of fining for frivolous claims of foul it would get entirely out of hand. You'll find that very often boys are even quoted in the papers as saying "I was just taking a shot." It not only takes up time but it creates an embarrassing situation down in the winner's circle quite frequently and many times the trainers are the main culprits.

MR. PERLMAN: I believe that this question possibly should have been "How severe should the penalty be?" I think this stems from a situation that took place in New Jersey this year where a very severe penalty was given to a jockey for a frivolous claim of foul. Later the Racing Commission greatly reduced the penalty. In my opinion, the stewards were wrong because if you are going to penalize jockeys for objections they will be afraid to claim fouls. Frequently they may be justified. Then, of course, you have another problem. Jockeys frequently don't really know what happens in a race, and I think that no one knows that better than you, Mr. Cassidy. You used to bring the jockeys down every morning to show them what happened in the films. Most of them were absolutely amazed to see what did happen. In fact, I have often thought that some jockey quotes after a race are ridiculous because very often the rider is the only one who doesn't know what happened in the race. He was just on that one horse. Actually, I ask how frivolous can a foul claim be? If a foul is really frivolous the Stewards should immediately say "No we are not even going to look at the pictures." Because if they do study them they must at least have a reasonable belief that they should be looked at. If we get too severe on jockeys we are going to penalize the public. We also know and I've seen it myself—that in reviewing the pictures the following day, which I've done at Saratoga occasionally, there are races in which the jockey should have claimed foul, but did not.

MR. CASSIDY: I'm going to inject my opinion in this. I don't believe that we should discourage these boys from claiming a foul. I know that in many cases the rider doesn't know specifically the source of the trouble but he knows that he was bothered and he will blame one horse or another but he should only do that if there is some indication that he has been bothered. To discourage them from making this claim is wrong, and I think you could warn them without punishing them too severely. Would anybody else like to speak on that subject? Nick Jemas.

MR. JEMAS: Mr. Cassidy, Ted Atkinson said that by claiming fouls it might embarrass the winner's circle. First, I think the integrity of the race is more important than elaborate ceremonies or any kind of ceremonies in the winner's circle. And I am sure that if the owner or the trainer (whose horse was beaten a nose) and the rider seem to think he was fouled in the race, he has every right in the world to delay the winning ceremonies so that the Stewards can review the films to ascertain whether the race was run clean or not. I think Mr. Perlman's statement brings out one of the most important points in this—the integrity to the public. If the public gradually gets the opinion that these riders are under duress if they claim foul, some-

day you are going to have some real bad riots at the race tracks, because the public is constantly learning how to view races. But I don't think that any man has the right to take somebody's rights away from him. It's in the rule book—every rule book in the country—where a rider has the right to claim foul as well as the trainer or the owner. The Stewards have a right to make an inquiry. It is in the rules for one purpose. To make sure that the race is run clean and honest. The stewards are in the stand as judges and I think it is their duty to look into a race when there is an objection lodged to see whether there has been any foul riding. I don't think any boy in the country should be punished for making a claim of foul. We had a situation in Maryland and I went down to resolve it. We found out that the trainers were responsible. We insisted that the jockey should state when he makes an objection to the clerk of scales—that he is not lodging this objection, that the trainer insists on it. There haven't been many claims of foul made down there. I had an occasion where one of the heads of the H.B.P.A. of the Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia division was complaining that the jocks weren't claiming any more fouls and they had the audacity to say in front of the stewards that when a trainer claims foul there is no chance of the number coming down. This official told me that the jock who rode his horse didn't claim foul when he should have. We went to look at the pictures of the race and found that the boy was not bothered the least bit. Sometimes these jockeys claim foul because if they don't, the trainers won't ride them back. Therefore I don't think any boy should be punished for making a claim of foul.

MR. CASSIDY: Thank you. Any other comments? Mr. Chandler.

MR. CHANDLER: I'll have to agree with Nick that the right of a jockey to claim foul should not be taken away from him. If the trainer asks if he has been fouled I believe the jockey should tell him. Of course, on the other hand Ted brought up the winner's circle—the interruption to the ceremonies. We had a case in the International last year in which a foul was claimed. It seems that everytime you had a 100 thousand dollar race last year you had a foul claimed. I believe one Saturday you had three \$100,000 races and had a claim in everyone of them. This claim made last year—the Stewards said was a frivolous claim and fined the jockey \$100. To me this is a slap on the wrist.

MR. CASSIDY: Thank you. Anyone else? The next question is: ARE LONGER SEASONS CONVERTING RACING FROM A SPORT TO A REVENUE-RAISING ENTERPRISE?

Mr. Stewart, would you have anything to say about that?

MR. STEWART: It seems that Mr. Perlman covered that subject just half an hour ago. Actually as he pointed out, the extension of the racing seasons is the result of the desire of the state to gain additional revenue.

MR. CASSIDY: Thank you. The next question is: THERE HAS BEEN A LOT OF TALK ABOUT TOO MANY SPRINT RACES. WITH THE TREMENDOUS NUMBER OF RACES RUN AT THE VARIOUS TRACKS IN THE COUNTRY IS IT NOT LOGICAL AND HUMANE TO TRY TO SPARE THE ANIMAL?

I think that's been covered by Mr. Perlman, unless someone wants to speak on it. There seems to be more long distance racing at Hialeah than in New York. You wanted to say something, Mr. Jacobson?

MR. JACOBSON: Yes, there are a few reasons for that. One reason is that you have a six week meeting in Hialeah with sort of a captive audience. The Racing Secretary can almost force you to run where he wants you. In Aqueduct the reason

they don't have the long distance races is because of that mile chute that you praised before. The mile chute has been a detriment to racing in New York. Trainers seem to like to run $\frac{7}{8}$ of a mile and they don't extend their horses to a mile and an eighth. You remember the old track that we had here—for instance Jamaica where there wasn't any mile chute. You used to run a mile and a sixteenth or a mile and an eighth. But once they run over a mile they seem to have a desire to stretch their horses out and perhaps run a mile and a half or a mile and a quarter. But when you have a one mile chute they do not enter their horses in a mile and an eighth race because they know if the races do not go they will be carded at a future date at a mile. I think Tommy Trotter will bear me out on that. This has been a thorn in his side, I believe, in trying to write races at longer distances. Also at Hialeah they do not put in their condition book many sprint races especially in the cheaper races. This goes on year in and year out. So that when you ship down to Florida you know in advance that if you bring a lot of sprinters down there you will not have the opportunity to run often. So people who ship down there naturally don't bring that type of horse. I believe if New York would do the same thing—it may take a year or so of light fields—but if those races were not carded people would sort of get the message after awhile and not have the cheap sprinters around and just look to purses for distance horses.

MR. CASSIDY: Thank you. I think you hit the nail on the head as far as I am concerned in the first part of your statement and that is the fact that Saratoga, Aqueduct and Belmont Park have no races for in-between distances from $\frac{7}{8}$ th to $1\frac{1}{8}$ th and not being able to run in-between, they choose the sprint race. Anybody else, how about Mr. Trotter, do you want to say something on it?

MR. TROTTER: Well, I think Buddy has omitted saying too that Hialeah has 3,500 horses stabled there so that's bound to make a big difference in getting your distance races together. But I think also that the mile chute will help when they go against getting a horse up to $1\frac{1}{8}$ th. I think it is pretty hard for a trainer to go from a sprint race, then go $1\frac{1}{8}$ th. So I think by your mile chute that you can gradually build up your distance. We had a lot of success this year, I think more than ever before, with our distance racing by increasing our purses. I think that has been a big help to us this year.

MR. CASSIDY: Mr. Kilroe, how do you find it in California?

MR. KILROE: Well, I'll have to agree with Buddy Jacobson. At Santa Anita, running as one of the 2 major winter tracks (if the Fair Grounds forgive us) we have very carefully screened a lot of horses that are most anxious to run. I think, Marshall, you'll agree that if the track needs the horses more than the horses need the track this automatically reduces the quality of your racing. Because they'll wait for the spot that just suits them. At winter meetings such as Buddy Jacobson has cited at Hialeah, they will run where they can.

MR. CASSIDY: Gentlemen, it's about time for us to close our meeting.

MR. PHIPPS: Again, many thanks for coming. And now the New York Racing Association invites you all to lunch in the Club House. Thank you.