

NJ  
10  
R311  
1986  
U.3

PUBLIC MEETING

before

ASSEMBLY INDEPENDENT AND REGIONAL AUTHORITIES COMMITTEE

on

Testimony on Status of and Possible Reforms  
to Boxing in the State of New Jersey

June 16, 1986  
Room 403  
State House Annex  
Trenton, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Assemblyman William "Pat" Schuber, Chairman  
Assemblyman Guy F. Muziani, Vice Chairman  
Assemblyman Paul DiGaetano  
Assemblyman Dennis L. Riley  
Assemblyman Jimmy Zangari

ALSO PRESENT:

Edward Westreich  
Office of Legislative Services  
Aide, Assembly Independent and  
Regional Authorities Committee

\* \* \* \* \*

New Jersey State Library

Hearing Recorded and Transcribed by  
Office of Legislative Services  
Public Information Office  
Hearing Unit  
State House Annex  
CN 068  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

P U B L I C   M E E T I N G

before

ASSEMBLY INDEPENDENT AND REGIONAL AUTHORITIES COMMITTEE

on

Testimony on Status of and Possible Reforms  
to Boxing in the State of New Jersey

June 16, 1986  
Room 403  
State House Annex  
Trenton, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Assemblyman William "Pat" Schuber, Chairman  
Assemblyman Guy F. Muziani, Vice Chairman  
Assemblyman Paul DiGaetano  
Assemblyman Dennis L. Riley  
Assemblyman Jimmy Zangari

ALSO PRESENT:

Edward Westreich  
Office of Legislative Services  
Aide, Assembly Independent and  
Regional Authorities Committee

\* \* \* \* \*

New Jersey State Library

Hearing Recorded and Transcribed by  
Office of Legislative Services  
Public Information Office  
Hearing Unit  
State House Annex  
CN 068  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625





WILLIAM P. SCHUBER  
Chairman  
LUY F. MUZIANI  
Vice-Chairman  
JOSE O. ARANGO  
MARION CRECCO  
PAUL DIGAETANO  
DENNIS L. RILEY  
IMMY ZANGARI

New Jersey State Legislature  
ASSEMBLY INDEPENDENT AND REGIONAL  
AUTHORITIES COMMITTEE  
STATE HOUSE ANNEX, CN-068  
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625  
TELEPHONE: (609) 984-7381

M E M O R A N D U M

June 10, 1986

TO: MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE  
FROM: WILLIAM P. SCHUBER  
SUBJECT: COMMITTEE MEETING - JUNE 16, 1986

(Address comments and questions to Edward Westreich,  
Committee Aide)

The Assembly Committee on Independent and Regional Authorities will meet on Monday, June 16, 1986, at 9:30 A.M. in Room 403 of the State House Annex, Trenton to hear additional testimony concerning the status of boxing in the State and the licensing of promoters.

Beginning promptly at 9:30 A.M., the Committee will take testimony from the following persons:

1. Joe Frazier, Former World Heavyweight Champion
2. Lou Duva, Trainer, Lou Duva Management, Inc.
3. Dan Duva, Promoter, Main Event Productions, Inc.
4. Randy Neumann, Registered Investment Advisor, CFP and Associates, Saddlebrook, N.J.

Anyone wishing to testify at a subsequent hearing on boxing is requested to contact Edward Westreich, Committee Aide.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Lou Duva, Trainer Lou Duva Management, Inc.	2
Joe Frazier Former World Heavyweight Champion	27
Randy Neumann Registered Investment Advisor CFP and Associates Saddlebrook, New Jersey	41
APPENDIX	
Copies of newspaper clippings submitted by Randy Neumann	1x

\* \* \* \* \*

mjz: 1-53



**ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAM "PAT" SCHUBER (Chairman):** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call this meeting of the Assembly Independent and Regional Authorities Committee to order. I have Committee members Assemblyman Zangari, Assemblyman Riley, and Assemblyman DiGaetano with me today, and we expect some of our other Committee members as we proceed.

This is the third hearing on the status of the boxing industry in New Jersey, and today we're going to be hearing testimony from people directly involved in three critical phases of the fight game: the promoter, the referee, and the boxer.

We are going to welcome today Lou Duva, of Lou Duva Management; Randy Neumann, former boxer and boxing referee; and, former World Heavyweight Champion, Joe Frazier. Each of these gentlemen will bring a unique perspective of the boxing industry with him to the Committee, and it is our hope that through their testimony the Committee will gain further insight into the current status of the sport here in the State of New Jersey.

I would like to advise everyone here that the testimony already heard by this Committee has been invaluable in helping us to evaluate the need for further legislative reform of the State's boxing statute.

Between hearings, staff has been working on a series of amendments to the legislation which has been proposed, amending the boxing reform bill adopted last year. These amendments are a direct result of the information that has been gathered through the testimony given at our two previous hearings, as well as through the recommendations from the State Commission of Investigation, the Attorney General's office, and, most importantly, from the office of the State Athletic Commissioner, Mr. Larry Hazzard, who is with us again today. He has worked tirelessly with us to address the important issues surrounding additional reform.



The Committee will be addressing that legislation, with the amendments, in meetings to be held after this meeting is completed. Without further delay, therefore, since we are working under some constraint this morning as it is a legislative session day, we would present our first witness, Mr. Lou Duva. Mr. Duva, would you join us up here at the table, please?

L O U D U V A: Here?

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Yeah, there you go Mr. Duva, welcome. We appreciate your being with us today. I know you have a number of interesting things you would like to tell the Committee, so why don't you proceed?

MR. DUVA: Thank you for giving me the time. First of all, I would like to make an opening statement. I'm here in hopes of looking for improvement in areas that I think need improvement in boxing in the State of New Jersey. There are areas we can talk about that we have been talking about for quite a long time, but, really, nothing has ever been done about them until recently, when some things started to gel.

When I came here I could see that we were in a friendly atmosphere, rather than at a witch hunt like the last committee I appeared before, where they were -- in my opinion, and my opinion only -- an embarrassment to boxing in the State of New Jersey. I travel all over the world, and people have talked about how ineffective they are as far as boxing is concerned.

I would like to address some areas, and I would like, also to have input from you people, and questions as to concerns you are looking into in boxing. I can talk from the perspective of what I feel about the boxers.

Number one, let me say this: We have a Commissioner at the present time, Larry Hazzard, who I feel is doing a fantastic job as far as boxing is concerned. I would think that he needs your help. He needs the State's help in order to

implement some of his thoughts on boxing, and I would hope that he gets that help from you people.

I will address myself to the first item that I feel needs a little help, and that is the physicals of the boxers. You've got to take into consideration that when a fellow comes into Jersey to box, or he's a Jersey fighter on the lower level, on the entrance level, his purse might run from \$200 to \$300 for him to box in Jersey. When he is hit with a fee of anywhere between \$50 and \$200 in order to get the complete examination, that is, the EEG, the EKG, the physical, the ophthalmologist, it really looks like it's not worth it. There has been a little reluctance from many fighters who come into Jersey as a result of that. Also, I think the fighters on the entrance level are being overtaxed as far as the price is concerned.

I would like to see some sort of investigation into the possibility of maybe getting the State hospitals throughout the State of Jersey, such as maybe the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry, which has central locations of their hospital setups, to maybe administer these tests at a real nominal fee for the fighters.

I am also concerned about the insurance plan we have in effect right now. If I'm not mistaken, I think it's a \$1,000 deductible for the fighters. Hey, thank God we've got at least some insurance in the State of Jersey. I just returned two weeks ago from Houston, Texas. One of my fighters, James Pipp, fought down there, and even the great State of Texas, and they have many a fight down there, doesn't have any insurance at all for the fighters. It just happened that James Pipp got an accidental butt. He got 34 stitches. It cost him \$900 to get repaired, and he had to pay that out of his purse. He fought the main event; he got \$2,000. To take \$900 off a fighter for an injury when he should be covered, I think, is ludicrous. I mean, for a fighter to go into a state and not be covered for insurance--

I would like to see the deductible brought down if at all possible. I just relate to you what happened to me in Texas. I would also like to see the medical examinations-- I am just going to jump around on some of this stuff. Regarding medical examinations, I think there is a ruling of 10 days prior to coming in. I think the tests should be more or less closer to the fight, rather than 10 days before. I mean, 10 days before, a fellow having his license, that gives him the possibility of fighting in another fight prior to that. There is a possibility of him getting injured and not disclosing the injury, or of having a virus and maybe not being in the best of shape or at the right strength a couple of days before the fight when he is examined. I would rather see the examination closer to the fight, rather than away from the fight -- that length of time, for 10 days.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Mr. Duva, how long do you think would be appropriate, through you, Mr. Chairman? None of us would know, how long do you think would be appropriate?

MR. DUVA: I would think, if a fellow has-- Let's say a fellow from Ohio is coming in here, and he can certify, and he brings in his reports that he had an examination done two days before, or three days before. I think that should be sufficient, rather than 10 days before, because if you take a State like Ohio, or if you go to Indiana or any of those states out there, they can take a test 10 days before, or even have a license before then, and still fight in the interim period. I would rather see it closer to the fight than further away from the fight.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Well, would you suggest two days?

MR. DUVA: I would think two days before, and I will tell you why: Usually, if you are going to come into Jersey, if you are a preliminary fighter, you are required to come in at least a day or two before the fight. If you are a main event fighter, they will tell you to come in maybe three or

four days before a fight. So, I think they should have those tests when they get here. If they have to take a test-- There is nothing wrong with taking the test. In other words, let me use Joe Smith, who comes in from Ohio, who has had no test at all. If he goes and gets examined two days before in Atlantic City, if he goes to an Atlantic City physician, and he gets his EKG, and he gets his EEG, and he goes to an ophthalmologist, if he goes in there two days before, you know that he has to be in shape, rather than 10 days before.

So, I would rather see him get examined as close to the fight as possible. There should be no prohibition against that.

One thing I really would like to see -- and I liken it to the Motor Vehicle Act, getting a license -- I would like to see a boxer, again on the entrance level-- I'm talking about the four- and six-round kid who comes in here, or the kid turning pro. I would like to see him get a permit, rather than a license. My reasoning on that is, if you designate one of the referees -- and we do have capable referees in the State of New Jersey who can detect whether a fighter is going to make it, or what his future is all about -- to give a report on that fighter, that specific fighter, if he feels, in his opinion, that the fellow needs more experience, you could prolong his license to maybe two fights, three fights, so you could take a look at him, a good look at him, to find out whether he should be a fighter, whether he should be in this fight or not, before you give him a license.

What you are going to do there is, you are going to stop fellows who have no talent at all, fellows who are out of condition, fellows who shouldn't be fighting -- you would stop them from getting a license. I would rather see them get a permit. Look, when you go for a motor vehicle license, you must take out a permit first, and 14 days later you can apply for a license and take a test. I think we should look into

that kind of an area and come up with some sort of a procedure where our capable referees and capable Commission people can take a look at them and find out whether they should even be in the sport of boxing. Maybe somewhere along the line we can stop one or two kids from becoming fighters once we have taken a look at them. Let them try. We shouldn't deprive them of the chance of trying, but once they take that test in front of capable people, such as we have in the State of New Jersey, then we will know whether they should be fighters or shouldn't be fighters. That is my thinking on the licensing of fighters.

I would also like to see something done in the area of trainers. Again, I would like to see areas of trainers-- When I say trainers, I'm talking about trainers who are a combination of trainer and cut man. Regarding cut men, I think that is an area-- We designate them as cut men, but they are not only cut men. They are fellows who can anticipate whether a fighter is dehydrated, whether he should be fighting, whether he has run out of gas, whether he is in shape or not, whether his eye is going to close up in a round or two. At all the weigh ins, the Commissioner reads off the coagulants, the substances you can use to stop a cut eye, but there is really no policing of the fellow who is designated as a cut man about whether he has the ability to apply the coagulants to a cut eye, or if he has any ability at all to detect an injury to a fighter. There is no policing of that.

I think some inspector, some Commission designee, should go in a back room, or should talk to them in the dressing room, should talk to these fellows, or they should talk to them at the weigh in, to find out whether they are capable of making the application, whether they are capable of taking care of a fighter in the corner.

The doctors at ringside will always watch the fighter, but I don't know whether they really take a hard look at the fellows in the corners and what they're doing. They probably

do -- knowing Dr. Doggett, he does a thorough job out there and he would do it -- but I would like to see it done more thoroughly. I would like to see it done in their regular procedure.

Again, these are all safety features I am talking about at this point.

When a fighter comes from another state -- I talked before about the licensing procedure -- I would think that he should be known to the Commission in some way or form, whether he fought on television, whether he has an amateur background, or whatever. I think there should be new forms made up. I think when a fellow gives his amateur background -- and I don't know, in fact, whether there is any place there for amateur background information -- I think it can be looked into thoroughly with your local ABF, the Boxing Commission in the State of New Jersey, or any state that he might come from.

I would set down penalties for any false information. And, while we are talking about penalties, I would like to see the Commission definitely come up with a procedure, not only to hold fighters responsible for their inability to fight, but I would like to see the manager held responsible, the trainer held responsible, for the actions of a fighter. I would like to see forms made up and have them certified by a manager or a trainer as to the fighter's condition, whether he has been training, whether he has been boxing, whether he has any injuries at all, again with the threat of a penalty of revocation of his license if there is any false information. Make the managers -- make the managers -- part of the fighter and the actions of the Commission. Make them responsible for the actions of their fighters. It has to be worked part and parcel with the Commission, and it's got to be part and parcel with the fighter. They must be part of it. Don't let them out of it.

There are fighters suspended because they have lost five or six fights. I daresay I don't know when was the last time we had a manager suspended. If a manger loses a fighter, he picks up another fighter. He may have four or five fighters in his stable. But, if he kowns he is forced to give the right information, if he knows he is threatened with revocation of his license, and he may have another good prospect, or he may have another fihter who is of some substance, he will not put that other fig. er in to get him in over his head. That is what I would like to see as far as managers are concerned.

You know, they talk about background checks. I am always looking for background checks on the ability of a manager. You know, it is pretty tough when you get used car dealers, insurance guys, and restaurant owners coming into the sport of boxing. They pick up some strong kid and, all of a sudden, they are managers. For \$10 or \$15, whatever the cost is, they can become a manager. You can also become a trainer with no prior experience.

It's wrong; it's wrong. I think if anybody is going to be in boxing, if anybody is going to manage a boxer, he must have some experience. If he hasn't got that experience, I don't see anything wrong with the Commission recommending to him that he get hooked up with a reliable manager, or an agent who can represent him, to make sure that the fighter is not overmatched and that the fights he is getting are the right fights, comparable fights, with someone who has the same talent that his fighter has, rather than just throwing him in.

Again, penalties must be set down. The enforcement of penalties is another subject I think you ought to address yourself to. I would think that some of the rules and regulations that the Commissioner is working under -- Commissioner Hazzard, and prior to him, Commissioner Lee-- You know, I just don't know how long it has been since they have really been upgraded. It's been a long time, as far as I



know. I think that the managers, anybody in boxing, anybody coming into boxing in the State of New Jersey, should be made aware of the rules and regulations. Maybe we should send them some changes in the rules. Maybe we should notify them. Their addresses are on file at all times. Let them be made aware of what is going on in the State of New Jersey.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: I know that as a result of last year's legislation there has been a very stringent upgrading of the rules and regulations by the Boxing Commissioners. I know we have spoken to Commissioner Hazzard about that. There has been a great upgrading. I guess the question comes down to -- from a public information point of view -- have they all been collated and disseminated to the individual promoters as a result of that? That may be something we have to look at. But I know that the rules and regulations have been upgraded very stringently in the last year or two. I know, from Commissioner Hazzard's testimony to us several weeks ago, that there is an ongoing upgrading being conducted. I think that at the end of that period there is going to have to be a republication of all the rules and regulations for everybody.

MR. DUVA: Well, Pat, you know, even when you go for a Motor Vehicle test, you get yourself a book. You get yourself a set of rules and regulations that you are guided by. I would think that probably one of the big problems is that the Commission is understaffed. I think they are under-budgeted. I think there should be more money put into the Commission. I think they should have more personnel over there. I think they need people to police the rules and regulations they have right now. I mean, you know, they just can't be in a corner there where they want to do it, but they can't do it because they haven't got the budget.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Well, I would agree with you on that. In fact, that is a good plug for the resolution I am sponsoring to finance the Athletic Commission to \$250,000 more,

with regard to funding they need for personnel and things they wish to do with regard to some of the new rules implementation they have undertaken. We appreciate that. I agree with you, they need it.

MR. DUVA: You know, I have been squawking about this as far back as the other Attorney General, the same thing, that the fellows-- You would be surprised -- if I can just give you something on the side here-- I go all over the world in boxing, and they used to ask me, "Who the hell are those guys standing with the corner people over there?" They didn't know that they were inspectors. You know, I had to ask Attorney General Kimmelman, at that time, I said, "Hey, listen, why don't you give them some kind of designation? Get them jackets; get them something that will identify that they are part of New Jersey, that they are inspectors, so that the people in Italy" -- because that is where our tapes go-- The people in Texas who see the fights, the people in California, know that these fellows are inspectors out there.

Again, you know, they say, "It's the budget; it's the budget." That is why I'm saying-- I know right now I think we are all heading in the right direction, but I think they are going to need a budget out there.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: I agree with you.

ASSEMBLYMAN ZANGARI: Mr. Chairman?

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Yes, Mr. Zangari.

ASSEMBLYMAN ZANGARI: Regretfully, I have to go to another meeting. I just want to express my heartfelt thanks to Lou Duva for the job he does for the sport of boxing as an ambassador for the State of New Jersey. Regarding the testimony you bring here today, even though I am not going to be here for the rest of it, I am sure it is going to be very, very informative. If anyone can bring us some expertise on the sport of boxing, you can, because you have exercised your prerogative to make sure that the fighters you handle, from

what I have seen on television, and from knowing you personally, have been fighters that we can all be very, very proud of.

MR. DUVA: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN ZANGARI: I am sorry that I have to leave, but I have another meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Thank you, Mr. Zangari. I appreciate it.

MR. DUVA: Talking about these fighters, I hope the Committee understands one thing. I mean, the investment in time and the investment in boxing, economically, that I have in a fighter, and I'm talking as a manager now-- It costs us quite a bit of time and quite a bit of money. The last thing in the world we want to do is waste our time. You know, I can shoot crap and recover money, but I can't recover time. So, when you've got a fighter, either he has to be a good fighter and you have to take care of him, or you just don't mess with him, unless you are a bad manager.

If I may talk about my fighters, and I'll limit it to maybe my gold medal winners, if you take a group such as my five Olympic kids, I had over \$300,000 invested in those fighters prior to them turning professional, stange as it may seem, because it costs you more money to subsidize them as amateurs than it does as professionals. With an amateur you don't have any money coming in. You're shooting crap. Again, as a professional, at least you have money coming in as the manager's share. But, I made sure that those Olympic kids were good fighters, good citizens, and that they wanted to be fighters. I surrounded them with the best talent, the best trainers, the best sports medicine doctors, the best medical doctors. I surrounded them with pension plans, annuities. I surrounded them with hospitalization. They are all covered with full hospitalization. Also, we have our own press relations department.

So, when we are talking about taking care of fighters, I think we do the right thing with our fighters. I think it is the intention of probably every manager to do the right thing; again, the good managers. It is not something that only I do. Probably other managers do the same thing. I just want the Committee to know it is not just a case of getting a kid off the street, turning him into a fighter, and just collecting from him, collecting your manager's end. It's a business that you must know.

I've done everything in boxing as far as-- You talk about amateur fighting, professional fighting, whether I was a cut man, whether I was a trainer, whether I was a promoter, whether I was a manager -- I go all the way back. So, I know what it is all about. In any phase of boxing, I know what it is all about. I know the concerns of the fighter. I know, I've been a fighter. I know that as a fighter I knew the shortcuts, but I know the shortcuts don't always work out. I know what it is all about as far as a training schedule is concerned. I know what it is all about as far as the managing end is concerned, and the promoting end is concerned.

Now, talking about the managing end, and being concerned about the fighter, I think there is a new day coming as far as the managing and training of fighters. There is much new modern technology right now, strange as it may seem, and I've got a pilot plan going. After a couple of years, I finally got my pilot plan going with Evander Holyfield, who is fighting for the world title on July 12 in Atlanta, Georgia. He is fighting Dwight Muhammad Qawi down there. I finally came up with a plan that you must physically get him in shape in order for him to be a fighter.

So, what I have done is, I have gotten together with sports medicine doctors and we have devised a training program that takes two hours in the morning. I made sure to have Evander checked out with the top medical and sports medicine

doctors down in Houston. We've got him on a program now, again, on machines down there, with a hydration program to keep fluids in his body. We have a nutritionist working with him down there to make sure he gets the right food. When he goes into that ring, he will be ready.

As far as the boxing is concerned, I have my trainer, George Benton, down there. In the afternoon, rather than come in and skip rope, rather than come in and hit the light bag or the heavy bag, he'll be in there teaching him how to box. We've got television cameras set up down there. We go over tapes of his opponent. We go over tapes of what he did in his last workout. We go over tapes of his fighting. This is the approach we are taking right now in boxing.

What I am leading up to is, I think, also, that the day is going to come where the medical staff of the New Jersey Commission is going to have to take a hard look at the corner and at what makes a fighter tick. In other words, does he just have to drink water? Is there a possibility of him dehydrating? Has he maybe dried out? By that I mean, maybe he hasn't taken any fluids for three or four days before the fight in order to make weight, which becomes a hindrance in the fight. Should some other fluid be used instead of water in the corner?

These are all the concerns I think are going to be the new thing on the horizon right now. I mean, I am not talking about Gaterade either. I'm talking about different fluids out there that are being processed right now which we are using down in Houston. I know they are becoming renown in the sports of football, tennis, and such right now, rather than commercial drinks. I think we must look into those areas also with our medical people in Jersey.

Again, I can't emphasize enough the corners of the fighters. The corners must be thoroughly checked to make sure that there are people in the corners who know how to handle the

fighters. The worst thing in the world is when you're watching a fight, and you're a fight guy, and you see one or two fellows up there who have every right to be up there -- they have a license and they have a right to be up there -- but the only problem is, they are incapable of handling, really, the needs of the fighter.

I would like to see more pressure, a better procedure, put on the corner that there are capable people in the corner. If a fellow wants to walk around and throw out his shoulders because he has an investment in a fighter and he wants to be a manager, fine, but don't let him work in a corner if he is incapable of handling that fighter.

The same thing with a cut man. I would like to see more pressure put on the cut man, a background check on him by the Commission staff, to make sure that he knows what it is all about. When I say "Designate a cut man," I'm talking about someone who participates in injuries, and such. We have good medical people on the staff, like Dr. Doggett and Dr. Williams, so I'm sure that if they can get that procedure going, it will be a help.

Fellows, you know, I just rambled over here, but what I would like to do is-- We are all concerned about the improvement of boxing in Jersey. I think we have a good Commissioner in Commissioner Hazzard. I know his heart is in boxing. He is a boxing man. I use the term, "a boxing guy," and that is what he is. We all are. I think if we can get some of our recommendations across to you, and you feel they are right, I know, I would be sure, that the improvement of boxing would come about.

I think the world of boxing looks upon Jersey as a leader. There are only two states right now going, which are really doing something about boxing. They are New York and New Jersey, not Las Vegas, not California, not Texas. It's New York and New Jersey, and New Jersey is the forerunner right now.

I would also like to see you look into the question of drugs. That is a big problem. There has to be some procedure; there has to be something done about drugs. I know you are investigating that. I have been reading the papers about you investigating that. I would like to see something done about it. I have my own thoughts about it, and maybe at a later date I would like to relate them to you.

Right now, are there any questions I can answer?

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Mr. Duva, thank you very much. We appreciate your being here to share your expertise with the Committee. I know that Mr. Riley and Mr. DiGaetano have some questions. Paul, why don't you ask one here?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: Mr. Duva, of course, you are speaking from a managerial point of view, but there has been some talk, and I have heard of problems with promoters, not necessarily in New Jersey, but problems with promoters who put fights on and make certain promises to the participants in the way of monetary returns, and then, because of lack of turnout, or whatever the case may be, there is no guarantee of those funds. I don't know that that has happened in New Jersey, but, from a managerial point of view, do you feel that that can or should be addressed in some way to ensure that the funds that are promised to a participant are there?

MR. DUVA: Well, as a manager, when I deal with a promoter I want to know who I am dealing with, number one. If I feel he is a reliable promoter, you know, I don't need any other guarantee. But I think from the standpoint of guaranteeing-- I think there are only two areas that you really have to be concerned about: Number one is what the total amount of purses are for the card, and number two is the State taxes. I think that if you-- I don't think it is too tough a recommendation to get him to put up a bond for that, as long as the insurance company knows, or will issue it; either that, or a certified check, or a letter of credit, something to



guarantee the purses and guarantee the State taxes. I think those are about the only areas that you should be concerned about.

I don't think there is anything wrong with going into the area of getting him to put up a bond or a letter of credit or a certified check.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Dennis?

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Thank you. You talked about some of the guys getting \$200 and \$300 purses. You've got to be kidding me. They have mandated costs for EKGs, etc., and they are only making \$200 and \$300?

MR. DUVA: That's right. That is what a four-rounder gets, anywhere between--

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: What are the mandated costs, an EKG, and what else?

MR. DUVA: I would think, just in round figures, I've had them where they run from maybe -- with the EKG, the EEG, and the ophthalmologist -- \$125 to maybe \$250. It is all according to what hospital you hit or what doctor you hit.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Are you telling me that some guys could actually be losing money?

MR. DUVA: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: That's amazing.

MR. DUVA: Absolutely. That is why I said there has been a little reluctance on the part of some of these fighters who come in from out of town, or anybody to turn pro, for that matter.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Now, I watch the fights on television, and I go down to Atlantic City and watch some of these guys getting their proverbial heads beaten in. When you said something about people do not belong in the ring-- Maybe I am naive, but I always presumed that every boxer and manager was licensed.

MR. DUVA: Well, you're right; you're right, except for one thing. You know, take John Smith. He can almost walk into a weigh in with a fighter and fill out an application and get himself a license. I think, rather than a license -- that's why I said this before -- rather than a license, I would rather see somebody get a permit, so at least the Commission could do a background check on him as to his ability to manage, his ability to train, his ability to be a cut man, or his ability to be a fighter.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Do you know of any states that have established such criteria? Obviously, it is an admirable idea, but I cannot believe--

MR. DUVA: I am not worried about any other state; I'm worried about Jersey. That is what I am worried about.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: He wants to know for model purposes.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Yes, for model purposes. Does anybody have any of these criteria? We don't want to allow people, quite frankly, to get in there and get themselves killed.

MR. DUVA: No, I really don't think there is any state that does it, but I think Jersey can be a leader in this if we give permits, rather than licenses. That is what I am saying.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: With background checks to make sure they are capable of entering the ring and/or managing.

MR. DUVA: Absolutely; absolutely. I also think there should be a designation -- I think New York has it -- as to a cut man versus a trainer working in a corner, or a second working in a corner. I think what they do in New York is, they give an A license to an established cut man or an experienced trainer or second.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: You're talking about something similar to casino licenses where they have different levels of licenses.

MR. DUVA: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: I always thought a cut man was someone who was trained very much like -- someone who had medical training. You're telling us that those guys in the corner, who we always thought were trained somehow, can be untrained people?

MR. DUVA: That is absolutely right; absolutely right.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Oh, gee.

MR. DUVA: Look, the Commission will police it but if you bring in someone from out of town-- Look, any manager or anyone who gets into the corner without a cut man-- You know, when you put two or three guys in a corner, anyone who doesn't put a cut man in the corner shouldn't be in boxing, number one. And number two is, how do you know whether he is capable? All the Commission does at the weigh ins is read off what you can use and what you cannot use, but they don't look at the talent of the fellow who has to make that application.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Mr. Duva, I've seen -- and you've obviously seen a lot more than I have -- where they look at the eyes of a fighter. I always thought, because obviously a traumatic cataract is, I imagine, almost a part of your business-- I always thought they were looking for signs of traumatic cataract. You mean that fellow is not trained for that at all?

MR. DUVA: No, absolutely not.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: What is he looking for then?

MR. DUVA: A good cut man -- I'll say a good corner man, rather than use the term "cut man" -- a good corner man will anticipate an injury. By anticipating an injury-- In other words, with my experience, and with Ace Morroda's (phonetic spelling) experience, we can almost look at an eye, we can look at his cheeks, and we almost anticipate whether that eye is going to swell up, whether that eye is going to close up. We can notice whether the skin is going to break

into a cut. We can almost anticipate that. We can almost anticipate in the corner if the fellow is getting dehydrated, whether he is out of shape, whether he is in shape. We can almost detect whether he has a broken nose. You have to anticipate these things, and that only comes from experience.

If you have an incapable or inexperienced fellow working in a corner, he can't do it, so he becomes a detriment to the boxer.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: The third thing that I think was brought up, again through you, Mr. Chairman, was the most disturbing. You sort of glanced off at the end about this thing of drug testing. I presume you were, by insinuation if not by direct testimony, indicating that there is a possibility that there is drug use involved in boxing. Is that correct?

MR. DUVA: Well, gee, I don't think anybody should be surprised at that. I don't think it is only in boxing; I think it is in every walk of life.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Of course it is. What I was really saying was, are you telling us that somebody could go into a ring and there is no test at all to see if he-- Like horses, they test to see if they are on drugs. There is no test--

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: I think what Mr. Duva was saying was that there is testing, but I think his format, if I remember what he mentioned to me in the hallway, is that he is advocating more stringent penalties with regard to the use of drugs.

MR. DUVA: That's right. That is what I am saying. In other words, the procedure for drugs I am sure we will arrive at, one way or another, today or tomorrow, but we are going to arrive at it in Jersey in boxing. But what I would like to see is more stringent penalties. What I would like to see is the revocation of licenses. You know, don't piddy-pat these guys. I mean, you know, if they are coming into this

State, and they are coming in as drug users, and they're failing tests, hold them up for ridicule. Just don't say, "Okay, you have a 30-day revocation," or "You have a 20-day revocation," or "You've got six months." Get them out of here. Get them out of here. Get them out of the sport.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: I agree. When is the drug test given before a fight? How long before a fight?

MR. DUVA: They don't give them before a fight. They give them after the fight.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: How long after the fight?

MR. DUVA: Usually immediately after the fight they'll take a urine test. I don't know right now what the procedure is for getting a report on the urine test. I think it is probably a couple of days, or something like that. I really don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Mr. Muziani?

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: Mr. Duva, if a fighter is a four-rounder, or an eight-rounder, or a 10 or a 12 or a 15, whatever, somewhere along the line he might meet an opponent who really gives him a whipping, and he could become disabled because of that. When you have a disabled fighter, what is available to him? When he is not able to fight any longer, and he is disabled because of a fight, where the manager saw fit to put him in that ring, he thought he had it and he didn't, and he ended up a loser, so to speak, and now he is disabled, where does he go for help?

MR. DUVA: No place; no place. This is what is wrong. Baseball has medical programs for the players. Baseball has a pension fund; football has it; basketball has it; hockey has it; but, boxing doesn't have anything.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: Okay. You said--

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: If that's true, the question then is, Lou, how do we fund a system like that for boxers?

MR. DUVA: Pardon?

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: How would we fund a pension system for fighters?

MR. DUVA: I think -- at the threat of having a rough and tumble battle with my son -- the promoters, the television people should be responsible for this. I think with television contracts, televised fights, the contracts are usually attested to by the promoter, and they are put on file with the Commission.

I think if we can come up with some sort of a procedure -- some sort of a plan -- whereby they would contribute something out of that TV contract, together with the TV people-- They have it in baseball; they have it in football. The television contract in football, baseball, and basketball is made accountable for the negotiations of the league with the club owners. I think that if we can look in that direction, where the TV contracts become part of the promoter, and also become part of the Commission, I think that they are the ones, together, who should be taxed with this. There should be some input from them because they do it in basketball, they do it in football, they do it in baseball. You will notice in negotiations at all times with the owners of these respective franchises, it always comes out that they are waiting to see what the package is from television.

Well, it shouldn't be any different in boxing. The television contract, the closed circuit rights, the paid TV, the commercial television, should all be part of-- They should be taxed, and that money should go into a fund for the boxers. That is my feeling. What the procedure should be, who gets what, what the payments should be -- the payout should be -- that is another question. I think, if I am not mistaken, they have some sort of a plan out in California like that, but I don't think they fully tax the promoter or fully tax the television people.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Thank you, Mr. Duva. I'm sorry, Mr. Muziani. While we were on the subject, I just wanted to follow it up.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: I probably misunderstood you because I thought you implied, earlier in your testimony, that you do have a pension plan for your people.

MR. DUVA: Oh, we have our own pension plan. Oh yeah, we have our own pension plan for our fighters. Again, I address it to the five Olympic fighters I have. Everyone has his own pension plan; everyone has his own lawyer; everyone has his own accountant to look his accounts over, in conjunction with our office.

Let me give you the bottom line on that. There is nobody that is going to have to throw a benefit for my Olympic kids. My Olympic kids are all well-protected.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: So, the Olympic kids are protected, but not the professionals.

MR. DUVA: No, I'm talking about professional fighters. When I talk about it, I'm talking about Mark Breeland, I'm talking about Evander Holyfield, I'm talking about Pernell Whitaker, Melrick Taylor, and Tyrone Biggs (names spelled phonetically). They are all protected. Everyone is protected; everyone is certified; their accounts are served; they get monthly statements. They're in good shape.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: What about the youngster who goes into that four-rounder who doesn't have any Olympic background? What's he got?

MR. DUVA: That's the trouble. That is the problem you have. That is why I say-- You asked the question, "Where do they go if they get injured?" I don't know; I really don't know. There is no place for that kid to go. There is no place to go for the fellow who has maybe been in boxing for two or three years, who hasn't made it, and who should have some income coming in. Maybe he hit the top; maybe he hit some good



main events; maybe he has had some thrilling fights out there; maybe he has really done a job as far as the boxing public is concerned. Then he has to turn around and maybe drive a truck or something like that, with no additional income for the years he put in in boxing. I think, positively, something should be done about that fighter, and I think the ones who should be taxed are the promoters and the television contractors. They are who should be taxed on this.

Hey, a lot of the boxing is emanating out of the hotels here at the casinos. I think maybe you can include them in this, too, and come up with some sort of a program for the fighters. Every other sport has it. We don't have it in boxing. It's really ludicrous that we don't have anything like this in boxing. That kid out there is giving his all, and I think he should be taken care of in some way or form.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Mr. DiGaetano?

ASSEMBLYMAN DIGAETANO: Just keeping along the same line, Mr. Duva, do you know of other managers who provide pensions for their fighters, as you have just talked about with your Olympic medal winners? I mean, is this a standard practice, or would you say this is something that is done sporadically, or intermittently?

MR. DUVA: No, it's not a practice. It's not a practice. If you are a good manager, I think you should have some concern about your fighters. Today it is a whole different ball game. In years gone by, if a manager had a bunch of fighters, he would put them in, he would negotiate for them, he would get paid off by the promoter, he would give the fighters their end, and that would be it. Then he wouldn't see them again until he had another fight.

Things are different today. In order to manage a fighter correctly, it almost has to be a reversal. Rather than you owning the fighter -- and some people say, "I own him, I

own him, I own him"-- Those days are gone. What you do today as a manager is work for the fighter. The reason you work for a fighter is because you have to get the best for him. You have to get the best trainer for him; you have to get the best economics for him; you have to get the best physicals for him; you have to get the best medical attention for him; you have to get the best matches for him. So, in essence, you are really an employee of the fighter.

I think the day is going to come -- I really feel the day is going to come -- when the so-called manager is going to be knocked out of the box. That is my opinion. The manager is going to be knocked out of the box because for the same manager that a fighter would hire, he can go out and hire himself a manager with a different title as an agent. He can get himself a good trainer, get himself a good medical man, get himself a good accountant or lawyer. For the same gross payout that he is going to give a manager, he will have all of these people at his disposal.

The trick is getting the right people to work for you. Eventually that is what is going to happen. I mean, I am not naive enough not to know that fighters, athletes are getting smarter. Everybody is getting smarter out there. The fighters are getting smarter; the managers are getting smarter; everybody is getting smarter out there, and it's got to come. If you want to do the right thing for the fighter who becomes your commodity, you must do the right thing, you must manage him right. Managing isn't just booking a fight. Managing is knowing your fighter, taking care of his personal needs, taking care of his medical needs, taking care of his economic needs, and taking care of his physical needs. These are all put into one ball, and when you put it out, then you know whether you have a fighter or not.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: With respect to the pension plans and the particular benefits that you have set up for your

Olympic medal winners, I think you mentioned -- earlier you mentioned that they have their own attorney and their own accountant. Is that something you provide for them, or do they get that on their own so as to ensure they are getting the proper money, so to speak? How does that happen?

MR. DUVA: No. What we do-- We have a unique situation. My son is a promoter. He owns main events. I am a manager. I have been in the business for 50 years. Like I said, I have been in every phase of the business. Danny is a lawyer. Even though he is grown up, he has grown up in the boxing business. My son has done everything also. I mean, when he was a kid he worked in the dressing rooms, he set up chairs, he put up posters, so he knows the boxing business as well as I do, I guess, at this point.

You ask, "Do other people do it?" Other people don't do it, but what we insist on-- To clear the air, we insist that the fighter gets his own accountant. We have our own accountant right now, but we insist that he gets his accountant to work along with our accountant as far as the money is concerned, to make sure the money is right. There is a statement given out after every fight. As far as the legality of contracting is concerned, there are attorneys. We insist that their attorneys sit in on negotiations. We insist that their accountants know what is going on. The reason for that is to clear the air, to make sure that there is no collusion there.

We insist that they get their own accountants and their own attorneys. If they have any problems reaching that point -- understand? -- we will suggest to them, "Look, there is a good lawyer in that town. Here is another one who represents football players and fighters. Get together with him." We insist on that, Paul, and I'll tell you why: If my son were to represent a fighter, then it would be collusion. But as long as my son says, "Look, get your own accountant, get

your own attorney to negotiate the contract, to make sure" -- as far as the lawyer is concerned, as far as the accountant is concerned -- "that your statements are true, that your expenditures are true, that your purses are true." As long as we've got that, we've got no problem.

The only time you run into a problem is when you get a manager who pays the fighter off. He doesn't know what he is getting, he doesn't know what the write-offs are; he doesn't know, really, how much he got for the fight; or if what he got for the fight was true. They signed a contract. But, if you are going to negotiate and you have fighters of any substance at all -- and I am not talking about the ordinary preliminary fighter who is not going to go anywhere-- Again, I will address it to the Olympic fighters. The best move I ever made as a manager was to make sure that each one had his own attorney, had his own accountant, because in that way when we negotiated the contracts, they represented the fighters in negotiations. They weren't one-sided deals. We didn't say, "Here is the contract, sign it. I'm your manager."

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: Are there any further questions? (negative response)

MR. DUVA: Thank you for your help. I would hope that this Committee would work closely with the Commission -- with Commissioner Hazzard -- because I think, after listening to some of the questions, which I didn't get at the last conference before another committee, that you are really concerned about boxing. I think you are going to improve things. I think you are going to be a great help to boxing in New Jersey, and I want to thank you for your help.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: Well, we thank you, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: You can be absolutely assured that this group is not on any witch hunt.

MR. DUVA: All right, thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: We are going to have a five-minute recess here while we wait for, I think, Joe Frazier.

(RECESS)

AFTER RECESS:

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: I would like to bring the meeting back to order, please. I remind the members that we have two further witnesses, former World Heavyweight Champion, Joe Frazier, who is now at the witness table, and Randy Neumann, former boxer and boxing referee, who is going to testify, also, today.

At this time, let me welcome Joe Frazier to our Committee meeting. He has just arrived from, I think, Philly. We appreciate him being here. To his left is our Commissioner, Larry Hazzard. So, without any further ado--

Mr. Frazier, as I indicated to you earlier when we were talking outside, you know, the purpose of this meeting is to review the situation of the regulation of boxing here in the State, and how we can make it safer. We are trying to get the input of all the individuals who participate in one way or another in the activity, to help us in our deliberations, and they have been very enlightening so far.

So, with that in mind, we welcome you here to New Jersey. We appreciate your coming before our Committee today. If you have an opening statement you would like to make with regard to this subject, please feel free to do so. Then, I know the Committee members will have some questions for you.

JOE FRAZIER: Good morning, and I'm scared to death.  
(laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: For the first time in your life.

MR. FRAZIER: I would like to say I know all the boxers in the United States and around the whole entire world appreciate all the things that New Jersey is doing for boxing to make sure that it is safe. I have nothing but good to say about boxing. Being the Champion -- I once was the Champion -- there has been a lot of excitement in my life. It made me more understanding. It made me, let's say, become a partially wealthy man, a comfortable man. I've been all over the world and have met some fine people and have done some fine things. I met kings and queens, governors and presidents, and whatever.

I can say nothing bad about boxing. I've seen the State of New Jersey improve a lot of good safety things for boxing. I know that all the young boxers, and the older guys around the entire world, appreciate what the State of New Jersey is doing for boxing.

I have been communicating down in Atlantic City with Commissioner Hazzard. All the fine people I've seen in boxing have grown and things have become safer. As of now, they are trying to get a pension for fighters. I really don't see anything wrong with that because if you look down the line, baseball players, basketball players, and all the other sports have a pension plan. I don't think the point is that you have to be, let's say, beat up or hit on the side of the head to have a pension plan. Let's say handicaps come with age. We know that when we get a certain age we have to take a 2/3 -- that means a rest -- and depend on our pension.

I really can't say anything bad about boxing because it has brought me a long way. It has provided a good living for my friends, the people who work with me, my family, and has made them understanding. So, that's it.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Mr. Frazier, I appreciate your being here. Let me follow up with a question with regard to the pension system, which is something we have been looking into as we have gone on here. We had some testimony from Lou Duva earlier on it.

Obviously, you have done very well with boxing, but there are others who have not. They haven't had their shot, they may never have made it, but have gone on and are having financial difficulties. A pension system, I think, would go a long way toward helping out in that particular type of situation.

The question is, how do we fund that type of a system? Do you have any recommendations on how we would fund that?

MR. FRAZIER: Well, that's probably a little above my recollection, to explain that, but I guess--

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: The recommendation has been made to us that the promoter do it. Do you have any problem with that?

MR. FRAZIER: Beg your pardon?

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: That the promoter share in the pension system, or contribute to the pension system, possibly out of his TV contracts, or whatever.

MR. FRAZIER: Well, I would say, yes, it could be that way, and, let's say, a certain amount of money could come from the athletes themselves, the fighters themselves. For the fighters who don't make it, we should all put together and make sure there is one big package, and that everybody will be taken care of like in the other sports, baseball, basketball, and football.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: We have recently received a series of reports that have been done by the State Commission of Investigation with regard to the sport of boxing. They made a number of recommendations. One of them was that the boxer-- They recommend that the boxer wear a helmet during the course of the matches. What is your thought on that?

MR. FRAZIER: Well, I really don't see that that would protect the fighter any more. We wear headgear during workouts in the gymnasium, but that doesn't really take any pressure off



the chin line. That covers the head, and you really don't go for a man's head to knock him out or, let's say, to knock him down. I would say it is the chin line. So, really, the headgear is just a weight on the head. I don't see where that would prevent anything from happening to the man's head at all, really.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: One of the other recommendations has been that blows to the head be banned also -- that the matches that would be conducted in New Jersey would ban blows to the head. It appears to be impractical, but what do you think with regard to that?

MR. FRAZIER: Well, we can go way back in time. Boxing itself was a gladiator sport. I think if you would take the punches from the head or any parts of the body any more, you wouldn't be in quite a gladiator sport. I look back on the basis that with baseball, football, basketball, when your time comes, let's say the roll call, you've got to answer, regardless of what it may be. I've been in this sport 20 years or more, and I think it is one of the greatest sports in the world.

I really don't see where headgear could prevent anything from happening.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Mr. DiGaetano?

ASSEMBLYMAN DIGAETANO: Champ, having watched you with a great deal of admiration throughout your career, there is a technical question which I would like you to address at this time with regard to the equipment. There has been a lot of testimony, and there has been a lot of talk, about a different type of glove. There has been mention of the so-called thumbless glove, and there has also been mention of a glove with the thumb tied down, but without actually a separate thumb pocket.

What is your feeling on whether or not there should be the so-called thumbless glove, or whether or not the thumb

should be tied to the glove somehow, or sewn to the glove so that you could avoid the thumbing to the eyes?

MR. FRAZIER: Well, I'm pretty sure that the Commissioner had gloves on before. If you tie a man down, let's say, so he can't be free with his hands, I think you are really going to take something away from the ability of the man. Regarding the tied down thumbs they have now, I think they would work somewhat, but I don't really see that any one particular man could throw a jab and aim directly for a man's eyes. He's not quite that fast or that good. These things happen maybe, let's say, a thumb in a guy's eyes, but they happen by accident. I really don't see how a man could be that sharp to thumb a man directly in his eyes.

Number one, if he is that good, then he can take the man out. The main thing is hitting him on the chin and getting him out of there, instead of trying to thumb him in the eye. I really don't think that is going to help. Your handicap is punching power. By having the thumb tied down to the glove, he is not really free or relaxed. But, if that is what the boxing body and others think will work, then give it a shot. But, I think you handicap a man from, let's say, doing the things within his power, when you tie down his hands.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: So you would say then-- You would not advocate the use of a thumbless glove. Correct?

MR. FRAZIER: I would say no. I would keep the thumb there because, number one, the guy can't really perform right, and by his hands not being quicker, and his hands not being free to do the things they ought to do, you can handicap him from, let's say, winning a fight because you have the thumb tucked down under.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: With regard to fighting strategy, there has been some talk that nowadays there is less emphasis put on actual defense, and less emphasis on parrying your opponent's blows. I know from watching you that you have

been a great offensive boxer and you have a tremendous punch. Do you feel that the sport is getting away from the defense?

MR. FRAZIER: Well, that's the first time I heard that. Everybody usually says that I took more blows to my head. Thanks a lot for that.

The main thing about-- I think we need more, let's say, teaching and understanding about boxing, just as in hockey, baseball, basketball, football, and, let's say, tennis. They don't take a hockey player and put him on the baseball field. They don't take a basketball player and put him on a football field. This is one of our big problems. You try to teach these guys technique and experience, how to get under shots, how to duck shots. I think that with more skill in boxing, the boxers would be more prepared, they would be more understanding and, therefore, they wouldn't get hit as much. If a fighter had that experience, how to duck, how to catch, how to slip shots, I think that would be a help.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: Champ, I recall one of your greatest fights -- one of the fights against Ali -- where there was a lot of publicity about the training you had, that you had personal training on your own with regard to your skin, your face, to prevent cuts and injuries like that, from punishing jabs like Ali's. Quite honestly, you must have had some great corner people and a competent cut man.

We just heard some testimony today that while that certainly was the case for you, and for many of the great fighters, possibly in some of the younger fighters, some of the fighters just coming in, the so-called four-rounders, there is not the ability there with the cut men, and that there should be some restrictions, some qualifications, some standards, so that your corner people are certainly competent, qualified people handling you in the way of cuts and things like that.

Do you feel that is something that needs to be addressed?

MR. FRAZIER: Well, I think, let's say, we all have a tendency to have a different kind of skin. Some guys you could hit with a sledge hammer, and you would never open up a cut. I was one of those guys who would puff before I would open up. Now, I don't know much about cutting. There could be tests run on a particular fighter. If he has bad skin, if he has tender skin, I think maybe the doctor, or, let's say, the boxing body, or Commissioner Hazzard here, could look into that to find out if his skin--

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: No, no, I'm addressing more the question of the abilities of a corner man, of a cut man, to know the fighter, and to know whether or not -- as you say -- one fighter is more prone to opening up, or whether a particular fighter will blow up or hold together, things like that. Do you feel there should be some sort of uniform licensure, or some sort of uniformity in looking into the background of a corner man, to be sure he is competent and able to handle the corner?

MR. FRAZIER: That would be a good idea, but once a cut occurs, and the other fighter knows that, that is the main thing he is going to work on. If you have, let's say, a great doctor who can put stiches in there that quick, believe it or not, that other fighter is going to try to open that up again. So, it's really a tough situation -- a tough question to answer -- because I really don't know if a cut is opened up right then-- The greatest doctor in the world can't stop it if you are going to go back out there and get hit in that cut again. That is a difficult question.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Champ, I would agree with you that we have to ensure that the boxer is properly trained before he gets into the ring. How do we ensure that that is the case? How can we ensure that the boxer is properly trained, in your opinion?

MR. FRAZIER: Well, I usually say, I guess, and I say it loud and clear, if you can't drive a car, then you can't show me how to drive a car. So, the main thing about it is, I think the people within boxing should be, let's say, someone who has been there, someone who has been ranked as a great fighter, close to the championship, or in the top 10 or something, and not a plumber, a truck driver, or an embalmer. I think these guys should have some kind of ability in boxing. At one time or another, let's say, they had the gloves on. Would you agree with that? (Addressed to Commissioner Hazzard, who nods agreement.) They should be someone who has had the gloves on and who knows exactly what is going on with these young men.

I feel that boxing should be more, let's say, a skill or an art. Then you would see a change in these guys. I can remember way back, a fine gentleman-- I know most of you have heard of Howard Johnson, and a guy named Doug Jones. These guys wrote the book on boxing. They were very skillful men. I think what boxing needs is a little more skill in the game. I've seen guys in my gym-- I hang around a gym and I try to, let's say, explain to the boxers that instead of hitting a guy in the head, you want to catch him on the chin line. That is where you will knock him out, not the head. Some guys, like myself, you can beat on the head all day long and nothing happens. (laughter)

So, really, I think if we can have more trainers who were in boxing and who know about boxing-- I am not saying all the trainers or all the fighters who have been there know the skill of boxing and know how to teach it. Some guys probably just don't want to be bothered once they get out of it. I was once like that myself, but when I started dipping back with my brother's son, my sister's sons, and my sons, then I decided to get back into it. I found that I know more about boxing than I thought I did.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Assemblyman Riley?

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Thank you, Pat. Champ, earlier Lou Duva recommended that we set up a situation where we recommend that people be -- as you are saying -- evaluated, more or less.

MR. FRAZIER: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: They would be getting more than a license. In other words, not just, "Here is a piece of paper," but before someone is allowed to put his life on a limb in that ring, that he be shown to have been evaluated and found capable of being in that ring. Do you think such a permit situation, or operation, would be a good thing for the State of New Jersey? Maybe we could lead the nation in that regard.

MR. FRAZIER: Well, I think, speaking about the young men who work under the sound of my voice, let's say, in Philadelphia, they have a better understanding of boxing. They are not going to listen to everything you tell them. I was there at one time, and I wanted to do it my own way, too. I think the trainers should be able to indicate how to warm up, how to use the speed bag, how to jump rope, how to exercise, and the skill of, let's say, getting under shots. I think that would be a fine suggestion.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: We have -- obviously, I think all of us agree -- a very good Commissioner in New Jersey in Commissioner Hazzard. If his staff had a situation, or personnel, who would be capable, maybe former boxers, etc., of evaluating a boxer before he is allowed in the ring in New Jersey, do you think that would be beneficial? Do you think that would be helpful?

MR. FRAZIER: That would be helpful, also, but it would be a lot of traveling. (laughter) I would say, yes, a man like that could come down to the gym and he could look the guy over to see if he is capable of going out there.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Philly is not that far from New Jersey. It's an easy trip.

New fighters: Earlier, I think they were referred to as \$200-fighters or \$400-fighters; no, four-rounders, that was the word. Presently, they are required to have an EEG, an EKG, and an ophthalmologist's exam. Do you believe that anything else should be required of a new fighter and, if so, do you think the State should pay for it, that we should have the facilities to have it done because they don't really have the money to do it?

MR. FRAZIER: You're really putting me in some trouble. Well, I would say, number one, that all the tests that are given a fighter as of now make it more than safe. Anything can happen in a young man's life, a young lady's life. A person could fall down the steps, and could have damage that you, the doctor, or nobody else knew anything about. Let's say, a fighter gets one, or two, or a lot of punches upside his head; one more punch and he falls down, and that's it. But, you don't know anything about it because these particular things could have happened in his life as he was growing up to be a man.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: One last question, not to try to get you into trouble, really, Champ. Apparently, as in all walks of life, there are drugs, whether it be politics, boxing, football, or gardening. Obviously, in your profession, it could be even more dangerous because there are situations where someone could be putting his life on a limb and not have his full faculties.

If a boxer is found to have a controlled dangerous substance, drugs, in his blood, or in his urine rather, do you believe his license should be revoked?

MR. FRAZIER: I don't know much about medical terms, but I'll take one step toward that. We have colds. Sometimes the bones or the muscles act up, just as with anyone else. When we go to these doctors, we can't tell them what to do. They tell us what to do. Therefore, we probably would take the

medication, say, to make us better. Sometimes we don't know, Commissioner, like, how bad something could be, or, let's say, what the boxing body is looking for, because the doctor gave us a prescription to be filled.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: No, I'm not talking about drugs which are injected by a physician, or prescribed by a physician. I am talking about non-prescription drugs, drugs that would not be legally acquired. If someone is found to have not legally acquired drugs in his system, do you think he should have his license revoked and, if so, for how long?

MR. FRAZIER: Well, I would say for good.

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Mr. DiGaetano?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: Champ, it was mentioned earlier by Mr. Duva that he felt the trainers and the managers should have to certify before a fighter actually fights that, in fact, he has been trained properly for a certain period of time, that he has the ability to fight, and that they believe he is well-matched against his potential opponent, so as to eliminate in the sport anyone who has had, maybe, just a couple of fights, and who, all of a sudden, is getting mismatches, or getting in the ring with someone who might seriously hurt him.

Obviously, you have come into a different phase of the sport from being the actual boxer, but do you feel that the trainer and the manager should have to sign a certification that, in fact, the boxer is physically able at that time, is in top shape, has been appropriately trained, and is appropriately matched against his opponent? Do you feel that the manager and the trainer should have to certify that the fighter is able?

MR. FRAZIER: Well, I would say, yes, but then again every trainer and every manager doesn't have a champion. You have to match these guys up really right. That is a hard question.



ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: Well, the point is, a manager can have one fighter-- As Mr. Duva says, "If a manager has a fighter who loses five fights, he picks up another fighter." The fighter goes by the wayside, and the manager has another fighter to work with. But that may have been a result of the manager and the trainer not preparing that fighter properly, or not matching him properly. So I think the idea is, if the manager and the trainer must certify that that fighter is physically able, in top shape, and well-matched against his opponent, while running the risk of their licenses being revoked, I think it might bring them a little closer. It might give them an incentive to more properly match the fighter. Do you agree with that?

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. Let's check the trainer first. Let's check the trainer's background and the manager's background. They might not be able to pass judgment on that fighter. We would have to follow up on the fights he had. I mean, is his ability strong enough to pass judgment. Let's say the Commissioner and I have a fight. Number one, these guys would have to be certified to know that he had been through the changes, he had a certain amount of fights, this guy's got ability and experience.

What I would like to say-- That is part of the answer, unfortunately.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: Yeah, that is exactly what I wanted to hear.

MR. FRAZIER: The main thing is, with these fighters today, I think we just have to check the background of the trainer. A manager really doesn't have that much to do, but just collect the money. (laughter) It is the trainer who lives with the fighter. He is just like the trainer on the football field -- would you agree with me, Commissioner? (affirmative response) -- or, let's say, the trainer on the basketball court. If we go way back, take all our great, let's

say, Senators who played basketball, or something, they took something out of the game, and then they put something back in.

In boxing, that is not the case. We can look back, probably, to two or three champions who took something out of boxing and then put something back in to make sure that these young men would be safe. Now, accidents will occur. We don't have all the answers. But, when you have a man on the gym floor with skill and ability, a man who knows what he is doing because he has been there, then I think that probably would solve all our problems in boxing.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiGAETANO: Thank you, Champ.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Mr. Muziani?

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Champ, one of the more important aspects of any fight is the judging that takes place. About two weeks ago, or three weeks ago, we had Larry Holmes here, the former champion.

MR. FRAZIER: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: He indicated that his more recent fight with Spinks wasn't judged -- at least he thought -- correctly. He thought he had won that fight. There were other people who also thought he won that fight. He implied that there were other factors in the decision other than the fight itself. Would you have any comments concerning that?

MR. FRAZIER: I would say you have the Commissioner here, Mr. Hazzard, and he was in boxing for a long time. I think before he would give any judge a job, he would know his ability and would know that he had been around for a long time and knew boxing, and he would give him a test. I really can't speak against what happened to Larry and Michael. It was a close fight, you know, as far as I am concerned. You know, Larry threw more damaging blows to Michael than Michael threw. It goes right back to the Commissioner here. He has the ability and he knows about boxing. These people that they hire to, let's say, call the shots, should know exactly what they

are doing. They should know a blow when they see one and effective punches when they land. If somebody is throwing punches all day long, and the guy is getting under them and missing them, that don't mean he is winning the fight.

I think the Commissioner has a good staff, and I think the people who judge the fights have ability, too, about boxing. They are doctors, lawyers, and whoever.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: You're saying then, that from your experience, you don't know of any fight that has been judged other than on the actual results of the fighting -- rather than other factors that might be taken into consideration.

For instance, Larry said that because he is an outspoken individual -- and he is outspoken; he has said some things which have rubbed people the wrong way -- they might have decided to take it out on him.

MR. FRAZIER: Well, it's--

ASSEMBLYMAN MUZIANI: And that's very possible.

MR. FRAZIER: No, I don't think so. I think probably they see what they see, but then again they don't see what they don't see. I don't really think the people would be just that downright-- I don't think they would call the shots wrong. From what we're talking about here, what they see, they don't see. Do you understand? Because they probably had three fights, and lost 10. That makes a difference, see? One guy could be throwing punches and one guy could be jumping and moving, but if he isn't landing any blows and effective shots, how can he win a fight? It's just as clear as that. Therefore, they probably didn't see what they saw.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Champ, I want to thank you very much for being with us today and helping us in our deliberations as we go along on the issue of boxing. I appreciate your taking the time to be here. I'm sure you will make yourself available to the members of the press as you exit.

I appreciate it. Thank you very, very much.

MR. FRAZIER: I hope I was able to add some help because the game has really been good to me, and I love it. I think it is a very clean sport.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Thank you very much. Thank you, Commissioner.

At this time, we are going to take testimony from Mr. Randy Neumann. I will remind the audience that this meeting will adjourn at 11:45. Randy, thank you for joining us. Mr. Neumann is a former boxer, an author, I think, and an investment counselor at the present time, who has specialized, I believe, in helping other people in the sports field. I have had an opportunity to speak to him. I find his comments very, very interesting, and I think they will be a help to the Committee in its deliberations. So, without further ado, Mr. Neumann, why don't you go ahead?

RANDY NEUMANN: I would like to thank the Committee for their invitation to be here. I hope to be a valuable resource.

To give you some background on my experience in the boxing business, this is my 20th year in it. I started in 1967 as a college freshman; I had lots of brown hair and I was a lot thinner. Since then, I have had 38 fights in five countries. I was a New Jersey champ, my home State. In 1975, when I was my own manager, I was rated among the top 10 heavyweights of the world.

Back in those days when I was an active boxer, I worked as a second for several friends in the business. I am currently a certified financial planner, which means that I have passed the designation tests. I used to represent a lot of boxers in financial planning. I did a story in Forbes Magazine back in 1981, and I will leave this for you. This is a pension, insurance, tax minimization, and investment plan for a young boxer, so I have had experience in setting these things up.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Randy, that was an article you had written for Forbes, is that correct, on the issue of the pension?

MR. NEUMANN: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: On how to set it up properly?

MR. NEUMANN: Yeah.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Could you leave us that copy, please?

MR. NEUMANN: Sure, I have a Xerox machine, and I wrote it, so I assume I still have the rights to it.

However, I had to make a decision a few years ago. I became a referee in New York in 1982, and I had been working as a financial planner with several boxers. At the time, I assumed that as a referee I could just step aside when one of my clients became involved in a fight, but I saw that that could become cumbersome, so I just made a tough decision and wrote a letter to all my boxing clients, and said, "Fellows, I can't do the job for you any more because of the potential conflict." So, I have left that area of business and I am concentrating on refereeing, which provides me with a thrill, and gives me an opportunity to do the real important stuff. There are a lot of financial counselors around who know what they are doing, but there are not too many referees in the world, first of all, and I think my services can be better contributed to boxing as a referee from being on the firing line.

I have also been writing about boxing for several years. This is the first collection of articles I have done about boxing. I believe I showed the Chairman some of them. I am a unique commodity in the writing business because not too many fighters are writers, and vice versa.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Obviously, we know you have written for Forbes. I know you also wrote for Sports Illustrated, I think.

MR. NEUMANN: Yeah, Sports Illustrated, Argosy, True, Travel and Leisure, Signature, The Daily News Sunday Magazine, and nine articles in The Times.

What I want to comment on here are some of the changes I have seen in my experience in boxing, which is 20 years. This is from a story and it kind of sets a tone. It was in The Times in March of '84 and the title is "What Makes Boxing Change Its Rules?" I wrote it. I started to quote from Washington Irving's book, "Tales of a Traveler." He said, "There is certain relief in change, even though it is from bad to worse. I found in traveling in a stagecoach that it is often a comfort to shift one's position and be bruised in a new place." Now, that says something of the tone of the article.

The first change I think was very positive. I was directly involved in it in my first professional fight in the Garden in 1969 and, by the way, in those days, the entry fighters got \$50, not \$200 or \$300. This morning's testimony touched me in several areas. In that first fight I had, I banged heads with my opponent and I found out I was a bleeder, which I had known as an amateur, but I opened a nice gash over my eyebrow. As luck would have it, I hit him with a right hand just about at the bell. That was the first time in New York history that a fighter was counted out through the bell. It used to be when the bell rang, you were "Saved by the bell." Then the corner people would come out, drag the fighter back into the corner, get him back up in 60 seconds, and let him fight again. It was perceived that that was a hazard, which it was, and that was stopped.

The other side of that round is what we call in New York the "Classen Rule." Willie Classen was in a fight with Wilfred Scypione in the early '70s. Scypione was giving Classen a good beating. Classen had been a good fighter, but he had slipped. In the seventh and eighth rounds, from looking at films at medical seminars, we saw the fight could have been

stopped, but it was not so obvious that it had to be stopped. It was a tough fight. However, in the ninth round -- in the tenth round, rather, after the ninth round -- Classen couldn't walk too well. He was helped from his corner to the middle of the ring. We now have what we call in New York the "Classen Rule," which says a fighter must come out under his own power so the referee can see how his gait and stature are. I happen to like that rule because I used to box with Classen in the gym.

We have the "tough luck" rule: I fought Chuck Wepner in 1974 in Madison Square Garden for the New Jersey Heavyweight Championship. Strange, but it occurred. After six rounds, I was ahead 4-2, 4-2, and 5-1. We banged heads at the end of the round; the seventh round opened up, and the referee stopped the fight immediately, which he had to because the bleeding was profuse. We have amended that rule today because now if the fight progresses past the number of rounds four or six and somebody is cut, from other than a punch because a punch is part of the game, but a head butt or an elbow is not, we now go to the cards, and whoever is ahead on points gets the fight. That is a lot more fair. It would have made a material difference in the movie "Rocky" because I had a fight, a contract to fight Ali after that fight with Wepner. He got the fight, I didn't. Sylvester Stallone saw the Ali-Wepner fight and got the idea for "Rocky."

Also in the article, in shortening the fights from 12 to 15 rounds -- from 15 to 12, rather -- there have been a couple of knee-jerk reactions by various rules organizations that think that should be ruled out. The WBC said, "Okay, Doo Ku Kim was killed in the 14th round of a 15-round fight. If we make all the fights 12, that won't happen." Well, that is statistically incorrect. Doo Ku Kim's brain -- and I get this medical knowledge from attending the various seminars -- was-- They kept him alive with machines so his mother could come over here from Korea to see him before he died. Because of that,

they were unable to get enough findings as to what was the exact cause of his death. But, it is the general consensus from the autopsy report that it was probably the bottom rope that broke his neck.

It wasn't that he was beaten into submission and died of subdural hematoma. It was a close fight. As he went down-- This is a hazard of the ring; it is the bottom rope you hit with the most momentum because you are on the way down, and that kind of snapped his neck. That is not that common in boxing. It is a lot more common in football. That is how football deaths usually occur, spinal breaks.

So, my point in the paper was about shortening the rounds. Based on this logic, why not make championships three rounds and they would be four times safer? Absurd, but-- And at one time the WBC wanted to strip Hagler because he was fighting 15 rounds instead of 12.

The thumbless glove: I have some data here that I picked up at a IBF convention out in Portland, Oregon last month. This was delivered by an ophthalmologist, and I'll leave this, too. This is from a clinical ophthalmology textbook: "The estimated number of sports-related eye injuries for 1982," and there are 12 sports listed. Boxing is number 12, and is only one of three in less than a thousand. The other ones have more. Then there is another chart down here, and boxing, again, is at the bottom.

The point is, the detached retina got a lot of publicity with Sugar Ray Seales because he faked the eye test, and he was legally blind in one eye and could hardly see out of the other. That was a tragedy. That couldn't happen today, by the way. However, people said, "Well, we have to do something to improve the sport," so they started with the thumbless gloves, then the attached thumb gloves, etc. But, as usually happens, no one consulted the fighters, or very few of the trainers. By taking a fighter's thumb away, there is less of



an instance of a detached retina, maybe, because we don't have enough data on that yet. Eye injuries in boxing are rather low. However, what you really do is, you take skills away from the good boxer and deliver the fight back to the slugger because in a clinch -- and I see it happening all the time, especially in New York now with the thumbless gloves -- a fighter can no longer control the other fighter with his God given ability, this appendage. Amateurs grab the head and grab the arm, and that is silly. A good professional fighter, when he is in a clinch, with minimum energy will control the other fighter merely by hooking the elbows with his hands and moving the fighter around and positioning him, taking a rest, tying him up, and when it becomes excessive, then the referee will break them. But, tying up is an approved strategy in boxing. If you do it excessively it's not good, but--

By taking that thumb away from a fighter, it is my point that you are going to contribute to more head blows, which is one of the things we are trying to eliminate, or lessen. A good boxer tries to lessen that as a daily part of his training regime. So, taking the thumbs away from fighters, I think, will do much more damage than it does good.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: What about the headgear, Randy?

MR. NEUMANN: Okay. The main piece of data on the headgear is from Wayne State University. Headgear in the boxing business came about in the late '30s or early '40s. You don't see too many fighters with cauliflower ears today, nor too many wrestlers any more. Wrestlers used to get more of them by class because of the headgear. The headgear in a gym situation does basically two things: It protects the ears and it gives you some protection against eye lacerations; not totally because I've been cut under one.

But, in a fight, I think the benefit -- and this is arguable because Wayne State's finding is that putting that cumbersome piece of equipment on the head increases-- If you

want to increase the force of a blow, you increase two things, the speed or the weight. Energy equals mass times velocity squared. So, if you put a heavier glove on and put something in here, you are going to increase the damage, not decrease it.

Secondly, you make boxing less of a defensive sport because an extra inch or two on each side of the head allows one of the key defenses in boxing, which is making a guy miss. Making somebody miss is much better than blocking and parrying because if you make them miss, you are still in position and you are totally balanced yourself. If you block or parry, you have already taken one of your weapons away as a defensive move, and it is one less you can use offensively. Of course, you can catch a punch, but that is a little more difficult.

The headgear, I think again, is an empty issue in terms of making the sport safer. The headgear and the thumbless glove, I think, are not good.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: What about the bottom line issue then, which the State Commission of Investigation reported, and which we asked Mr. Frazier about before, the banning of head blows altogether?

MR. NEUMANN: Sure. I think if you do that, you might as well ban the sport, which is a whole other issue. The AMA has come out in favor of banning the sport on a moral issue, not so much on a medical issue. We'll deal with that in two areas.

On the medical issue, Jack Battaglia was the head of their Medical Committee in 1983, when the AMA was over in Hawaai. That is when the first paper came out of the bandbox. He didn't like that finally because many of the pieces of evidence that his Committee decided not to use because they were weak, were used in that final report. It was a strange situation, where you had the larger body just sweeping away what the Committee had found. That is one issue, the medical issue.

On the moral issue, and I don't believe it is in the province of the AMA to try to dictate morality, they said, "Well, the problem with boxing is, it is the only sport where the avowed goal is to knock the other guy unconscious." I don't think that is accurate. I played football in high school, and I now do financial planning for many NFL players. The players of mine who are on the line, either offensively or defensively, I can tell you quite frankly, their goal is not to score points or to kick the ball over the uprights. Their goal is to get the guy in front of them. If they are defensive players, even better, to get the small guy behind them with the ball. If they can put them out of the game, that's even better.

Also in this area, football is less honest than boxing about its brutality. In boxing you've got a guy with just a pair of shorts on and a pair of gloves; he is very well-exposed. The only weapons the opponent has are natural weapons. By the way, if you want to get rid of head injuries more, take the tapes and the gloves off these guys. They won't knock each other out as much, but they will cut each other up the way they did in the old days. So, we don't do that. If you really want to hurt somebody, put some padding on him and let the other guy use his padding as a weapon. Then you'll get-- Unlike in boxing where you get some micro-concussions -- which is a small amount -- add some lacerations, very little soft tissue or other damage, and compare that with football, where you get mini-concussions. Then the announcer says, "Isn't it funny, he had his belt on wrong." And, you get severe joint and visceral damage in a long-term career.

So, I don't think you can compare the two and say that boxing is bad and football is good. Oh, football has a lobby, and a league, and boxing doesn't.

The last thing I would like to cover before any questions -- and there's not too much time -- is, what has really changed in boxing -- and Lou Duva touched on it today -- is the sanctity of the corner. When I was a young fighter--

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Sanctity of? I'm sorry.

MR. NEUMANN: The sanctity of the corner.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Oh, of the corner.

MR. NEUMANN: First of all, the corner men could drag the fighters off the floor back to the corner. They could do basically anything they wanted with them. They could put them on Munsel's Paste then, which was an iron-based powder. They could put it in Vaseline. It was like a superpowerful styptic pencil, and if one were to cut one's head off and put this stuff on, it wouldn't bleed. However, the two undesirable side effects were: Number one, if it went in your eye, it would blind you; it would burn it. And number two, once it was in there it created a crystal-like compound, and if the doctor didn't know it was in there and he stitched over it, you had rocks in your head.

So, they got rid of Munsel's Paste. The other thing was ammonia capsules; we used to call them "bombs." I was once at a seminar in New York run by a head of neurology, Dr. Bennett Derby. I was the only fighter there because I was a referee at the time, and the rest of the group were doctors. They all started saying, "Oh, gee, ammonia salt is terrible. I'm glad we got rid of it." I made the naive point, I said, "Why, what's wrong with it? You know, you get a little groggy, and it brings you right back." A doctor said, "How would you like it if I stuck a sharp fork up your nose?" "I don't think I would like that too much." He said, "It's a painful stimulant; it's the exact same thing. If your body is telling you you are in that state, you should be allowed in that state, and if you fall down, or do whatever you do, you shouldn't be stimulated to go out again."

So, the point of my talk is, there has been a lot of progress over the years, most of it good, some bad. I wish more of this would get out to the press, but I don't see too many here at this session. Things don't filter down too well.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: There are some back there yet.

MR. NEUMANN: There has been an evolution. The sport is safer. There have been responses to criticisms of the over-brutality of the sport.

Are there any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Randy, let me ask you a question. We talked about this before. On the pension system, which we have been focusing in on a little bit today, how would you propose that that be-- Obviously, everyone agrees that there should be one. The question comes then, how do we implement it and how do we fund it?

MR. NEUMANN: Okay. The ones I deal with -- or dealt with in this case -- were on an individual basis. Each year the IRS makes tax minimization more difficult. In those days, we could do a defined benefit plan, set up a retirement goal of \$134,600 -- this was back in '81 -- back the guy's age of expected retirement back to 33, and dump, like, \$40,000 a year into that plan for the individual. So, it's really a different issue. We can't do that anymore.

I teach a course for the certified financial planning designation and the area happens to be retirement. Also, my wife is a pension administrator, so I am familiar with the area. The problem with a pension plan in professional boxing is that the same thing will happen that happens now. One percent of the fighters will get all the money. The pension plans are based on a couple of things: length of service, amount of income, age, etc. If you get the guy who makes the most money -- the most money is going to be put in the plan for him. Guess who gets the most money?

So, unless you set some-- Unless you get it out of the ERISA law, which dictates pension plans, and get more of a social welfare plan for the fighters, there is not much you can do in the way of pension plans for fighters. That is not even discussing the problem of the entrepreneurial phase of the

business, how fighters come and go, investing schedules, and all that business. It has been tried several times.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: But, you're saying it is possible. I mean, it is not going to be able to be done on a straight--

ASSEMBLYMAN RILEY: I think he's saying it is impossible under the Federal--

MR. NEUMANN: Well, you could do it, but what would it do?

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Well, I mean, under ERISA, yeah, you could get it out of ERISA.

MR. NEUMANN: Yeah. Then it would be more of a social benefit, and is the State going to kick into that, or the fighters? I did a piece in The Times back in March of '82, "Suggestions and Search for Incredible Bouts," and the editor has asked me to do something about when Marvin Hagler fought Caveman Lee and Marcus Iraldo got knocked out in 10 seconds against -- that kind of business. Really, that points to a larger body to do this, a Federal commission or, let's say, a national commission; not so much from the Federal government, but probably from the people with the most benefit from boxing these days -- our friends at the tube. They are the ones who should be setting up something like this, but they are not going to.

So, I am not saying you shouldn't do it, but I think you are going to find more problems than solutions in a State-run pension plan.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Randy, let me ask you the \$25,000 question, which is: In its last report, the SCI indicated to us that the sport has become-- You know, we talked about the health issue and the safety issue, and you have answered questions on them. The other side of their question was that the sport has become so infiltrated, or the influence of organized crime has become so pervasive in the

activity, that they feel it should be abandoned for that reason alone.

Now, you are a former boxer and you referee now, what is your thought on that issue? Is that the case now, or what?

MR. NEUMANN: Definitely not, and I can kind of tell you historically what occurred. Back in the '50s when James Norris and the IBC -- the International Boxing Club -- ran Madison Square Garden through the Heavyweight Division, there were certain individuals -- Frankie Carbo, Blinky Palermo, etc. -- who were involved in the boxing business. They were also involved in what the government calls "organized crime." The boxing business kind of wanned in the '60s when it got kicked off TV when Benny Paret died. From a business point of view, it was no longer profitable for organizaed crime to be involved in boxing. That was the time I was involved in boxing. You talked about \$300-fights; I fought 10-round fights in opponents' back yards in other countries and was paid \$300, \$400, or \$1,000, just to get myself back into the ratings.

So, during that lull in the business, it was no longer profitable for the boys to be in the business, and they are just not in it today.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: So your opinion is that today they are not involved in this at all, to your knowledge?

MR. NEUMANN: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: And your reasoning for that would be the fact that it is not profitable for them?

MR. NEUMANN: Yes. They are businessmen. You're talking about a whole different environment. Back in those days you could get big bets down on fights with bookmakers, in New York City for one. Let's say, if you could get a \$100,000 bet -- and this is from Jake LaMotta's testimony in front of a Senate committee -- if you could get a \$100,000 bet down, and you could pay a fighter \$20,000 to lose the fight, then you made an \$80,000 profit. That was great business.

But, from what bookmakers are left, from what I understand, and from the government being in the business more, you just can't get a bet down on a big fight, even in Vegas, which runs lines on fights. They skewed the line to one side. It is no longer a betting man's business. That was the key profit motive in those days.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Randy, will you please leave your articles with us? I know from your showing them to me that they are all-encompassing of various aspects of the sport. It is rare that we are able to get someone here who is boxer, writer, and an investment counselor at the same time, who has stayed in touch with the sport and can give us a historical aspect of it, as well as what it is doing now.

Unfortunately, our time is short. I apologize for giving you a short shrift because of the time constraints we are under this morning.

What I would like to do, if I might, if you would leave us your articles-- I think the Committee has found your testimony quite interesting. We would reserve the right, taking your schedule into consideration, to invite you back before us when we have a little bit more time, because there are more things we would like to go into with you which I think would be very helpful to us.

MR. NEUMANN: Yeah, I would be glad to.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: Okay, fine; we appreciate it. Thank you very, very much for being with us today.

MR. NEUMANN: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN SCHUBER: This meeting is adjourned.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)





## **APPENDIX**





