

ASSEMBLY TO LEGALIZE RACE BETS IN STATE

Pari-Mutuels for Ponies and
Possibly Whippets to
Win Favor.

(Continued From Page One)

when they were unable to agree on
amendments tacked on in the senate.

It is no secret that the amendments
were not the stumbling block to the
bill's passage. The bill was
hamstrung personally by Earl Craw-
ford, then speaker of the house, who
appointed conferees who were sure to
block passage until the session ended.

Mr. Crawford did not object so
much to the horses. The dog racing
angle was the one at which he
balked, even though the measure had
the blessing of Governor Paul V. McNutt and was being pushed by
the administration's legislation-
steering group.

However, Mr. Crawford will not be
in the house of representatives at
the coming session. Consequently,
the legislation, undoubtedly repug-
nant to the more conservative of the
citizenry, will not face so many
handicaps.

The state board of agriculture
is known to be working on a model
bill in preparation for the session.
The agriculture board needs money
badly and sees in the pari-mutuels
on horses the best method of getting
it.

The board, which directs the desti-
nies of the state fair, inherited a
bonded indebtedness of approximately
\$900,000 from previous adminis-
trations. To retire that load, it
has only a 3-mill tax and the fair
must have a good year financially
for all of the 3-mill tax to be ap-
plied to reducing the bonded in-
debt.

If it has a profitless year, main-
tenance also has to come out of
the tax.

Co-operating with the state agri-
culture board is a legislative com-
mittee from the Indiana Association
of County Fairs. The theory on
which the pari-mutuel bill now is
being drafted is that the state agri-
culture board would receive a por-
tion of the mutual proceeds and the
remainder would be divided among
county fair associations which have
been in existence for a prescribed
number of years.

However, the split of the mutual
profits may be changed, it was
learned, because one of the state's
crying needs for new funds is for
institutional building.

The pari-mutuel bill backers now
are studying the mutual systems of
a number of states, including Illi-



(Copyright, 1934, NEA Service, Inc.)

Little Annette Dionne is all exuberance, poised to go right away from there, but she won't escape from her nurse till she's been scrubbed to a rosy hue, part of the unfailing routine through which the quintuplets go every day in their hospital-home in Corbeil, Ont. Annette can be pardoned for bubbling with joy, for the other day she tipped the scales at 11 pounds 2½ ounces to pass Yvonne, long the heaviest of the babies in the quintuplets' weight race.

inois, Rhode Island, Texas, Oregon, California, Kentucky, Maryland, Ne-
vada and New Hampshire.

There has been a race among the
states in the last two years or so
to legalize wagering on the horses.
While some of the tracks, notably
in Illinois, have not had a very
profitable season this year, the re-
verse has been true among others
and the feeling is that Indiana
easily may become one of the lat-
ter.

Rhode Island, for instance, in-
novated legalized betting this spring
at a pretentious plant at Narragansett.
In the spring and fall meet-
ings, the mutual "handle" has been
approximately \$23,000,000. Texas,
in which tracks are springing up
like real estate subdivisions mush-
roomed in the Coolidge era, has seen
about \$10,000,000 pass through the
machines so far and still going.

It needs little imagination to vis-

ualize the golden stream into the
state treasuries at "takes" of 8 and
possibly at Terre Haute, Evans-
ville and Jeffersonville.

Even if the state did not wish to
share in the betting profits, it could
derive a large amount of revenue
from licensing tracks and from tak-
ing a share of the paid admissions.

The Lake county legislative dele-
gation is known to be working on a
bill to legalize the mutuels, because
Lake wants a horse track very
badly. Ft. Wayne also is reported
anxious for a track.

So far, there has not been a great
deal of agitation by the dog track
interests, but it is likely that the
whippets would run in Indianapolis,

share, the state treasury would
benefit to a much greater extent.

If the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the 6½ per cent cut were boost-
ed a trifle and the state also got a
share, the state treasury would
easily be able to meet the mutual "handle."

It is not clear what would hap-
pen if the