

*By Mr. Blain:*

Q. Are we to understand that if a jockey goes wrong in the race, the proprietor of the jockey and the horse are ruled off the track?—A. No, sir. If investigation shows that the jockey was acting at the instigation or instructions of anybody in control of that property, even though it may be the trainer and not the owner, the owner is held responsible for the acts of his trainer.

Q. And then do you say that the proprietor having been found guilty cannot sell that horse to be raced on any track?—A. The horses are included in the rules. The ordinary form for improper practices is that so and so, naming the owner, and the horse, naming the horse, are ruled off.

*By Mr. McCarthy:*

Q. Then, Mr. Nelson, have you heard in the course of this inquiry during the last few days the names of any men who have been so treated?—A. I do not recollect any.

Q. Having regard for that Central Prison list?—A. No, I do not think anybody in the Central Prison was ever of sufficient importance on the turf to be ruled off.

Q. I see.—A. One of them, the man who is known to the police, I believe, or described by Chief Constable Mains to me as "Gold Tooth" Johnson was at the Fort Erie track and was turned out, and later was arrested for something else, but he had no connection with the turf, with racing. These people do not come to the dignity of being ruled off, the police attend to them.

Q. I understand you have visited the race tracks in Great Britain and France?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. All those in Canada and a great many in the United States?—A. None farther west than Winnipeg or farther east than Quebec.

Q. Have you observed any greater amount of evil, or impropriety, existing on the race track than at any other gathering of a similar number of people?—A. The people who go to the race tracks in this country are not any particular breed that live in holes the year around and come out for the races. They are your neighbours and mine, they are the people who live with us and travel and associate with us and who go to the theatres and the churches, and I believe other forms of entertainment.

Q. Then as to comparing from your standpoint the morality of those engaged in conducting race courses with those engaged in conducting other branches of business in the community, there is nobody in Canada, probably, has as close an inside knowledge as you have?—A. I have never known and I might, if it is not to be put down as hearsay, tell the committee what the late Mr. Nathaniel Dymont told me. He was a gentleman who came into racing rather late in life, I mean actively. He had always been a breeder, but the racing had been conducted by his nephew. He told me—and he had had some of that incurable prejudice that in a great many quarters exists against horse racing—that if he had to deal in the way that he had in business with a number of his employees he would have required bonds to the extent of thousands and thousands of dollars for the faithful discharge of their duties. He entrusted them with the possession and use of extremely valuable property and interests. He said that, of course, he never bonded them—he would if they were employed in his office in the many businesses he conducted,—but he never knew, he said, and he never had a case of his own experience, nor did he ever hear of any instance, where an employer's trust was betrayed.

Q. Has your experience been that there is any more betrayal of trust in the conduct of the horse-racing business than there is in any other branch of the business life of Canada?—A. I really think that considering the opportunities the tone is very much higher.

Q. Then be kind enough to give me your opinion as to what you think would be the effect of horse racing should this Bill of my friend Mr. Miller, as it stands at present, be passed.—A. I think horse racing would disappear in this country.

Q. What do you think would be the effect supposing horse racing continued and individual betting were allowed—as to the demoralizing effect as Mr. Miller describes