

## APPENDIX No. 6

be advised to put a bet on a certain horse with an unknown return. The inducement is naturally not so great, as to be advised to bet on a certain horse from which the return promised is 10 to 1.

Q. And another reason not to bet, Mr. Nelson, is that if a man advises you to bet on a certain horse and he would bet on the same there would be less to divide—A. The greater number of tickets sold on one choice naturally reduces the proportion, there is a greater number of people to divide it amongst.

*By Mr. Blain:*

Q. What was the system of betting, for example in Kentucky, prior to the introduction of the Pari-mutuel?—A. Bookmaking, sir.

Q. Do you know the reasons given for the change?—A. Well, the change was the result of representation made by Judge Price and myself to the president of the Louisville Jockey Club, Mayor Grainger, and our urging him to give it a trial. We agreed that the mechanical clearinghouse was preferable to the human.

Q. Why did you condemn the bookmaking?—A. I think the other system is more economical, is cheaper, and the percentage is a fixed amount. It is five per cent in Kentucky, eight per cent in France, and fifteen per cent in South Australia.

Q. Is there any difference from a moral standpoint?—A. Not in the least, sir. It is more of an economical method in a way and one which eliminates the human element. There is no person interested in the result. There is no interested party attacking the public purse. The man who conducts the machine gets his five per cent from the amount of money that is invested regardless of who is the winner and the public know exactly what proportion of the money is to be returned and divided amongst them, and all the money itself less the cost of operation is returned to the investors.

Q. Could an association do its own bookmaking, take the Toronto Woodbine for instance?—A. I am afraid, Mr. Blain, if I gave an opinion on that I may be told, as I have been told before, that my opinion was prejudiced.

Q. That would be all right?—A. Do you mean would it be practicable.

Q. Yes?—A. That would be practically conducting the bookmaking or the betting under the Mutuel system.

Q. Oh, no, I mean not to adopt the Pari-mutuel machine, but simply to eliminate the bookmaker, the twelve or fifteen as the case may be that are now present at the racing meet and allow the association to be the bookmaker?—A. I am afraid not sir, because you would eliminate one of the advantages of bookmaking to the customer, that is the competition.

*By Mr. McCarthy:*

Q. It would be absolutely necessary in that case for the Jockey club, of course, to employ agents who would stand in the same position as the bookmakers do to-day?—A. Sure.

Q. Making the books?—A. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN.—Why Mr. McCarthy?

Mr. MCCARTHY.—Because there must be men unless you have a machine to do the clerical work and the mental work; the association would have to appoint so many men for that purpose.

*By Mr. Blain:*

Q. Supposing they appointed responsible men instead of United States bookmakers, the association would then be responsible to the public for these men.

Mr. MCCARTHY.—At the present time they are responsible for these men.

Mr. BLAIN.—The difference in my opinion is this, that the men that are now making the books are men who follow the races, and in the other case the Woodbine Association would appoint their own men.