

remedy in operation and sympathetically administer it. Now, in all these cases, the appeals to hazard or chance, as well as the risks taken, are laudable. It is surely not wrong to make an attempt to get on in life, to take up the cudgels on behalf of one's native land, or honestly endeavour to remedy a crying evil. If there were not always cool, calm, and intrepid spirits, prepared to take the necessary risks, there would be national, social, and individual stagnation; of real and solid progress there would be none. The taking of such risks are, therefore, not only laudable but necessary. Such risks are not gambling risks, but are part and parcel of a nation's evolution. Then, take for example, the sport of rowing. The rowing men of one College pit themselves against the rowing men of another College and essay conclusions in order to discover who has the better team. So with cricket, football, hockey, and right through the whole list of outdoor sports. A sane desire to excel and thereby develop strong, healthy bodies as a means of increasing one's usefulness, is a duty quite as binding as the cultivation of one's mental faculties. So also with indoor games viewed as a means of relaxation, affording rest to mind and body, the trying of conclusions between devotees is of the very essence of such games. In all these cases, though the dominating factors tending to success are skill, patience, and endurance, the issue is largely a matter of mere conjecture, and here too there is nothing immoral in making the appeal to hazard or chance. No one would dream of contending otherwise. Where, then, does the immoral element, if any, come in? That element, I think, comes in when either combatants or non-combatants make the passing of money or money's worth, other than as prizes, solely depend on the issue of the event. Player A pits himself against Player B for a consideration, or non-combatants X and Y bet on the respective merits of the rival players or teams. In either case the mere making of the bet is conclusive proof that the game is not sufficiently attractive to the persons betting without the additional zest of winning something foreign to the pastime. Not the victor's laurel alone, but something in the nature of pelf is required to satisfy a passion for acquiring something which would not otherwise belong to those making the bet. Now, universal experience is that wherever the passion for

gambling enters into sport, there you at once sow the seeds of possible corruption. We are told that the love of money is the root of all evil and certainly, wherever it is not a gift, or a prize, or a just reward for honest work, its tendency is first to corrupt and then to degrade; and how often have we seen even a gift or a bequest take away from the recipient all incentive to honest effort as a preliminary to working in him utter degradation and ruin. It may be said that gambling only gives an additional zest to the pastime. The point, however, on which I wish to insist is that those who will not either play, or look on without playing, unless there is an extra inducement in the shape of a bet, will, in due course, use the pastime merely as an instrument for gambling. Instead of the betting remaining a mere incident of the pastime, the tendency is for the pastime to become a mere incident of the betting. Take the sport of horse-racing, which we are constantly being told is the "Sport of Kings." Does any sane and intelligent person even pretend, at this time of day, that if all gambling on horse-racing, whether by means of the totalisator, the bookmaker, or otherwise, was made a criminal offence, that this "Sport of Kings" would survive a year if such a law were rigorously enforced? and, if this is so, does it not follow that horse-racing is not now pursued merely as a pleasure, but as an instrument of gambling? Now, it is to be noted that whilst pure sport is health-giving and, therefore, a means of creating the best asset any nation can have—strong and sane men and women—gambling adds nothing to the wealth of the community. Two persons bet, one wins, the other loses. The only result is that money or money's worth is transferred from the loser to the winner. There has been no production as a consequence of the transference. How different is a trade transaction? A orders from a mechanic some useful article. The mechanic proceeds by means of his labour to convert the raw material into the article ordered. The Dominion is the richer by the result of the artisan's labour, and, even if the person giving the order is subject to a duty to pay the artisan the price of the article, he gets something in return for his money, whilst the artisan has, at least, the opportunity of devoting the money earned to many useful purposes. Here, then, we have two economic values at the

root of the transaction: The vendor receives the price, the purchaser the article bought. In a betting transaction there is only one economic value, the money which the loser pays to the winner, for which the loser gets no adequate return. Further, in a gambling transaction, there is the admitted tendency for the winner to stake his winnings in some fresh hazard, involving the almost certain risk of loss, whilst the loser often plunges still deeper into the mire, and the end thereof is shame, disgrace, a prisoner's cell, if not a suicide's grave. It cannot be too often insisted on that the passion for gambling is apt to grow by what it feeds on, until it becomes an almost uncontrollable mania, the subject of which does not scruple to sacrifice honour, worthy ambitions, money, social status, and the love of family, on the altar of his insatiable god. As an instance of the extent to which gambling is apt to lay hold of the popular imagination, and of the extent to which men will go in order to gratify their passion for gain, one has only to remember the instance of the defaulting bookmaker on the Flemington racecourse only a few years ago. Scores of people kicked the unfortunate man to death in the presence of thousands, and to this day not one of the murderers has been brought to book. This is an extreme case, but it serves to shew how gambling helps to stir up the hellish passions of human nature. Instead of the victims of gambling becoming more fitted for their respective walks in life, as is the case with those who follow pure sport, they are apt to become the slaves of a resistless lust for gold, which even when gratified is as often as not wasted on unworthy objects. Further, does it ever occur to those putting their honest pound on the totalisator, or risking it with the bookmaker, the source whence comes the dividend in the case of a win? Doubtless, by far the greater number of those who invest can afford to lose, but what about those who risk money which should go to pay their honest debts, or who cause their dependents to suffer in order that they may gratify their passion, or those who risk money not their own? It may safely be said that not an important race meeting passes by without there being included amongst the investors at least some representing one or other of these three classes of people. It must be remembered that not every case of extravagance or