minor evils. There was, we feel, some lack of frankness in respect of such causes of complaint. A similar lack does not seem to have obtained in the proceedings before the Transvaal Commission which was sitting whilst we were. However that may be, we were invited to believe that all was well with racing in New Zealand. On the other hand, it was alleged by the Dominion Sportsmen's Association, and the allegation was supported by a number of their witnesses, that a large number of owners, trainers, and racing officials habitually bet with bookmakers. No names were mentioned, nor could we in fairness ask for them. In general, the answer of the racing authorities was that it was their practice to carefully investigate all cases brought to their notice, but that the difficulty of securing sufficient evidence to justify the initiation of proceedings, much less to conflict offenders, was almost insuperable.

169. We are inclined to the view that an appreciable number of people bound by the rules of racing do habitually bet with bookmakers—both at totalizator odds and by way of doubles—and that a continuance of this state of affairs is far from conductive to the welfare of the sport. The incentive to bet with bookmakers arises from the desire, in the case of heavy bettors, to keep from the public (in a way that would not be possible if the money were invested on the totalizator) the knowledge that a horse is being heavily backed, and also to prevent the dividend being lowered by the weight of totalizator investments on the horse. If the betting is sufficiently heavy the object is to some extent defeated, we think, by bookmakers, through channels that are available to them, succeeding in investing at least a proportion of the money bet with them on the totalizator. A twofold purpose is thus achieved—the bookmakers' money lowers the dividend (to that extent defeating the objective of the bettor), whilst, if the horse wins, the bookmaker reduces his loss.

170. It is questionable whether, apart altogether from the ethical aspects of such cases, connections of horses really achieve as much as they think in betting with bookmakers. As a body they certainly lose in the long run, because if they put on the totalizator what in the aggregate over a year's racing must amount to a very substantial sum, larger stakes would be available for distribution amongst them in the next year; then the dividends from heavy plunges with bookmakers are rarely big. The news that a horse is being heavily backed seems to gain circulation, with obvious results, on the racecourse. There is much to be said for the generalization that if every owner would do all his betting on the totalizator he could well leave the odds to take care of themselves.

171. The owner, trainer, or other person subject to the rules of racing or trotting who bets with bookmakers commits a double offence—against the statute law of the country and against the rules of the two sports. It cannot be said in condonation of his action what is inaccur-