

So to that extent I do not agree with you at all. I do not think there is apathy on the part of State officials. I think what the problem is, as suggested by Senator Nelson, and also by you, that the incidence of crime is greater than we really know. Because of its method of operating in secret, it is very difficult to detect. That in many respects we do not really have sufficient statutes on the books to enable us to do the things that we would like to do.

For example, maybe the very fact that we cannot use electronic eavesdropping devices is a real handicap in this question of trying to control crime. As you say, we do not have sufficient laws on the books with respect to loan sharking. That is the purpose of this hearing today—to find out if we cannot get one on the books which would make it possible for us to combat more effectively what is now surfacing for the first time; that loan sharking, operated by criminal elements, is a very big business, an illegal business, and it should be stopped.

I think it would be most helpful to us if you would be willing to submit to us specific statutes that you think the Congress should adopt which would help the Congress in its efforts to eliminate these conditions which we all abhor so much. I would appreciate it if you would come in at your convenience, and submit to us some specific recommendations which you think we should adopt.

Mr. RUTH. I do have a loan sharking statute that I did submit to the House of Representatives, sir. I would be happy to share that—I am not saying these public officials are directly connected with organized crime on that mass basis, sir. What I am saying is that as a matter of practical reality, a public figure assesses what is to be gained and what is to be lost, before he injects resources in a priority program—and I say that any realist in a public official position must acknowledge that he has got more to lose from his career standpoint from beginning an organized crime program than he has to gain. That is really what I am saying.

The CHAIRMAN. I completely disagree with that conclusion, one hundred percent. I appoint myself as Exhibit A. I had much more to gain as a public official by prosecuting crime, and that is the reason I am here in the United States Senate.

Mr. RUTH. I am not referring to crime generally. I am referring to the Cosa Nostra and organized crime.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Hatfield?

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Chairman—I would like to comment on Mr. Ruth's testimony. It is very eloquent testimony.

Mr. Ruth, I have to respectfully and politely disagree with my colleagues, because I think I must identify myself with your viewpoint that you have expressed here. And I speak as a former governor, as a former legislator, as a former secretary of state of a State in which there is not a great deal of crime in comparison to States and cities to which you refer, because we are relatively a small State. We are one which is not necessarily dominated by any great metropolitan center. And yet I must tell you that I had pressures exerted upon me somewhat like those that you refer to. I must say to you that I had legislators coming to me and saying "Why, this is penny ante, that you are wanting your State police to stop at our particular fraternal club or patriotic organization, because the one-armed bandits we are operating there illegally is for a worthy cause, it is for a charitable