	11	ı		
1 2	IN RE: House Judiciary Committee House Bill 219, Assau	ttee, Public Hearing, lt on Sports Officials		
3				
4				
5				
6	Verbatim record of the	e Public Hearing		
	held at One Oxford Centre, Fourth Floor			
7	Auditorium, 301 Grant Street, Pittsburgh,			
	Pennsylvania, on Thursday,			
8				
	October 1, 1	987		
9	2:00 p.m.			
10				
11	Honorable H. William DeWeese, Ch.	airman		
12				
13	MEMBERS OF THE CO	MMITTEE		
14	Hon. William E. Baldwin	Hon. Gerard A. Kosinski		
15	Hon. Jerry Birmelin	Hon. Allen Kukovich		
ו פו	Hon. Kevin Blaum	Hon. Joseph A. Lashinger, Jr.		
16	Hon. Michael E. Bortner	Hon. Nicholas Maiale		
.	Hon. Thomas R. Caltagirone	Hon. David J. Mayernik		
17	Hon. Michael Dawida	Hon. Paul McHale		
	Hon. H. William DeWeese	Hon. Terrence McVerry		
18	Hon. Chaka Fattah	Hon. Nicholas B. Moehlmann		
ĺ	Hon. Michael C. Gruitza	Hon. Jeffrey E. Piccola		
19	Hon. Lois Sherman Hagarty	Hon. Robert D. Reber, Jr.		
	Hon. David Heckler	Hon. Christopher R. Wogan		
20	Hon. Babette Josephs	Hon. Robert C. Wright		
21				
22				
23	ADELMAN REPORTERS			
	231 Timothy	1		
24	Gibsonia, Pennsylvania 15044 412/625-9101 or 1263			
25				

1987-099

11		
1	ALSO PRESENT:	
2	Michael P. Edmiston, Esquire Chief Counsel of Judiciary Committee	
3		
4	John Connelly, Esquire Special Counsel of Judiciary Committee	
5		
6	Amy Nelson Research Analyst of Judiciary Committee	
7		
8	Mary Beth Marschik Staff of Representative Moehlmann	
9		
10	Honorable Joseph Markosek	
11	Honorable Richard Olasz	
12		
13	Honorable Joseph Preston	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## INDEX TO SPEAKERS

2		
3	SPEAKER:	PAGE
4	Charles Heberling Executive Secretary	
5	Western Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic	
6	Association	4
7	Dwayne Norton	
8	Official of District 7 Pennsylvania Interscholastic	
9	Athletic League	9
10	Honorable Emil Narick	
11	Judge, Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas	18
12		
13	Thomas Thamert Governmental Affairs	
14	Representative, Equitable Gas Company	32
15		
16	Leonard Czarnecki District Official	
17	Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic Association	45
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

(Whereupon, the hearing commenced at 2:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: The meeting will come to order.

Welcome to our October 1 public hearing, phase two, discussing

Dick Olasz's legislation, House Bill 219.

I profusely apologize for this late commencement.

We were late getting out of here from the morning's endeavor.

I profusely apologize for this late commencement. We were late getting out of here from the morning's endeavor. We discussed open-ended mortgages. That might give you some idea of the scope of involvement in this Committee. It was very, very complex. We weren't able to finish until about a half hour past schedule.

On our unfortunate schedule, we're almost on schedule. I apologize for being late. Representative Joe Preston from Allegheny County is joining us just walking in. Welcome, Joe.

To my left, Joe Markosek of Allegheny County, out around Monroeville. To my immediate left, Dick Olasz. The staff and I welcome you, as I said, and I would like to make an additional invitation to Dick Olasz to share just a couple minutes about his Bill, and then we'll call the first witness.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Thank you, Bill. Because of the time restrictions placed on some of our witnesses, I will hold my testimony until the end. Briefly, what House Bill 219 would do, it amends Title 18 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes and what we would be doing is adding

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a new section, 2712, which would make a maximum fine of \$10,000 and a term in jail not to exceed five years. So, I will get on with other documentation that I have in support of this Bill so that Ace Heberling and some of our gentlemen that agreed to testify today can get on with their other duties. CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Thank you, Dick. The first witness is Charles Heberling, Executive Secretary, Western Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic League. Welcome, and again, I apologize for starting late. MR. HEBERLING: I just got here myself.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: I don't know whether you are for or against. I am anxious to learn about this Bill. We invite your comments.

MR. HEBERLING: Chances are this is long past due. You know, athletic competition has become so competitive by not only players, but coaches and fans. Today's society, the idea that we all have to win, has been carried over to an extreme by many people.

I represent the W.P.I.A.L. in an official capacity here. We are a league of 145 high schools. We participate in an interscholastic athletic program of 21 activities.

We hire officials, the schools hire officials, to officiate their games. My job is post-season play. I hire officials to handle all our post-season play.

We have been blessed so far at least in the high school end of it that the incidences of violent behavior by coaches or players or fans has been rather limited. However, we have had occasions. A few years back, our Board had to suspend two kids. One kid for the rest of his high school career, and the other one for the rest of that season.

Suspend from athletics?

MR. HEBERLING: That's the only thing we have jurisdiction over. For jumping a fence and attacking four football officials at the end of a game. We handled that. We handle any problems like that that arise during high school activities.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE:

However, I would assume that your Bill would not be limited to such a small scope because I think where you run into most of the problems here is with the sandlot or outside of the organized school activity, but even in-school activity. I subscribe to a magazine called, Referee, and over the past two or three years, there have been incidences in soccer especially in California. I remember a very bad one. In baseball, we had an occasion where an umpire had been clubbed with a bat. We had an occasion where an official lost work because of the injuries that they have received while they were officiating a game.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Outside the line of duty?

MR. HEBERLING: Yes, this is all voluntary. These

24

25

officiating assignments are all extracurricular. CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Rather than getting tripped 2 in a football play, they were assaulted? 3 MR. HEBERLING: After the game. The baseball 4 incident erupted in the middle of a game, and one of the 5 guys came out of the sidelines with a bat and clubbed the 6 guy over the head with it. When you talk about that kind 7 of behavior, then there ought to be some redress for people 8 who are victimized by that. At the present time, I think 9 the penalties probably do not allow the person that was 10 injured to regain hardly anything. 11 Therefore, I thought it was a pretty good idea 12 that Representative Olasz came up with. 13 CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Okay, sir. I think in the 14 interest of time, we're going to ask each person to share 15 his or her views on the matter and then we're going to ask 16 you to linger for questions. 17 MR. HEBERLING: I know he has a question for me. 18 CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: If you have a scheduling 19 problem, go ahead. 20 REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Mr. Chairman, one of the 21 questions I had because I know he does I think handle some 22

MR. HEBERLING: I have been in the National Football League for 22 years.

professional sporting activities --

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: This is the point. We read about the threats, heard them on the news media about people crossing the picket lines. The game is going to be played this Sunday. That means an official is going to have to cross the picket line.

MR. HEBERLING: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Right off the bat, what about the officials being confronted by the football players now? Are there special safety precautions being put forth to safeguard?

MR. HEBERLING: About eight or ten years ago, the National Football League recognized there was a problem at all the stadiums regarding the entrance and egress for the officials before and after the game. At the present time, there is an ex-FBI agent in each of the cities in the National Football League whose responsibility is to make sure there are local law enforcement people who are available at the site to take us into the field, meet us coming off the field at halftime, meet us at the end of the game, take us back to the dressing room, put us in our cars, and get us away from the stadium at the end of the game. That's been standard procedure for the past, I would say, eight years.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: I don't think the public has any idea about that.

MR. HEBERLING: No, they don't. We don't publicize that kind of stuff at all. It was brought about as a matter of fact by a couple of our guys getting injured. I was in a game in Minneapolis about ten years ago where a kid threw a whiskey bottle out of the stands and hit one of our officials in the head. Just about K.O.'d him. He was all bloody. We had to take him out of the game.

Another incident in San Francisco, a guy threw an empty bag of bottles out of the stands. The whole bag hit our linesman as he was leaving the field. There were other kinds of things not near as serious as that, but it occurred. The security people in the NFL office decided we ought to do something about it now.

In reference to the question raised. This particular weekend, because of the nature of the type of game that is going to played, there is special precautions being made that we will be met at the hotel by the security men, and we will go in a special gate this time. We will not attempt to go in the regular gate where the players are because they figure there is going to be pickets there. They don't want any confrontation between us and them. So, we're going to use a special entrance to get in and out of that stadium.

I am sure that there will be beefed up patrols that is included for this weekend especially. Does that

## answer that?

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: That answer's fine. Once again, Mr. Chairman, that's the idea of protecting officials, and that's the intent of this Bill. You can see that the NFL does take those precautions.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE PRESTON: No.

REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: No.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Thank you, sir.

The next individual to participate is Dwayne Norton. Dwayne is an official of District 7 of the Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic League. Welcome.

MR. NORTON: Thank you, sir.

Ladies and gentlemen, yes, I am the official representative of District 7 of the P.I.A.A. There is 12 districts in the State of Pennsylvania. We are the largest district in the State of Pennsylvania. We have over 2,000 registered officials in District 7 alone. I also sit on the W.P.I.A.L. Board of Control.

I have officiated in basketball and football well over 25 years. And, believe me, gentlemen, it has changed. I believe a lot of it is filtering down from the TV. They watch the officials getting attacked on TV which I know most of you have seen last year, coming off the football field. Twice I watched the TV and it showed

officials being attacked.

In high school, I think it's filtering down to that level. Because they see nothing being done with these fans that are attacking officials. As Mr. Heberling stated, we have had occasion in the W.P.I.A.L. District 7 where we have officials attacked. In fact, next month, we have a case coming up where an official was punched on the floor of the basketball game which will be heard at a hearing.

So I think this Bill 219 which I have discussed with Mr. Olasz and read many times, and I also brought it up at our State meeting in July in Mechanicsburg with the head of the P.I.A.A. that this Bill was forthcoming.

I believe that contacting a lot of officials in my district, the consensus of most of the officials are that this Bill is in a long time coming. We do need some teeth in a Bill like this. We need something to protect us. A lot of the schools right now have security people usher us onto the field and the basketball court and usher us off.

Now, I believe that shows you right there that there is the threat of harm coming to officials. I for one am strongly in favor of a Bill such as 219.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Okay, sir. Questions by the Committee or staff? Dick, do you have anything to ask?

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Dwayne, there were two

1 pretty severe situations in Western Pennsylvania in the last 2 couple of years, were there not, without mentioning the 3 name of the school? MR. NORTON: Yes. There has been. I would like 4 to comment. I believe a lot of times officials are attacked, 5 and it's not reported. It is not reported. 6 CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Would you elaborate without 7 giving us any specific details on the name of the schools, 8 could you elaborate on one or both of the incidents that he 9 is referring to? 10 MR. NORTON: Yes. One, Mr. Heberling related to 11 The fan jumping over the fence. I have another one 12 where a basketball official was chased by the fans into the 13 dressing room. And there was a large metal door on the 14 dressing room. As he closed the door, they slammed the 15 door and cut off two of his fingertips. 16 CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Was there a civil suit? 17 MR. NORTON: Yes, there has been, sir. 18 REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: That's all I have. 19 CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Joe Markosck? 20 REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: The question I have 21 really is a question for the staff. 22 CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Fine, go ahead. 23 REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: Looking at the Bill, 24

when we're defining sports events, obviously, we're defining

it beyond when the buzzer sounds. For example, this gentleman mentioned the incident that he just described occurred after the game was over and the official was heading to the locker room or whatever. I just notice in the Bill when we're defining sport event, that's not perhaps really defined when the sport event is over is the question I have for the staff pertaining to the Bill.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Chief Counsel?

MR. EDMISTON: It's not clear when the offense liability on the part of the defendant would terminate. I think the provision you are referring to is 2712(a) which would make it an offense for an assault during a sports event or for an assault which was as a result of the official act of an official. We don't have a statement within the Bill as to when the result -- when you would stop being able to term the assault; two weeks, a week, when you get home. That's not clear.

REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: For example, if the official stops for a beer after the game, you know, goes into a tavern and some of the fans are there, participants or whatever, a fight breaks out there pertaining to the game or let's say, carries over to there, how does that —does the Bill still apply?

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Page one was assaulted during a sport event or was assaulted as a result of his or her

official acts as a sports official. So, if the umpire shows up at Joe's Bar and Grill an hour after the game and three or four people assault him with a baseball bat because of a close call at third base, I would think that they would come under the provision of this Bill that Dick has introduced. Again, I am not the judge.

MR. NORTON: Yes, our rule book states also that we -- in fact, before the game starts, an hour prior to the game, we are there. I think our jurisdiction starts then and also --

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: We might want to think about some clarifying language in the Committee or on the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: I am not being objective.

I am in favor of the Bill, obviously. The other question I had was in regards to the penalties. If I understand it correctly, and perhaps I don't, the penalty is somewhat less than the penalty for aggravated assault; is that correct? And, my question is, why not make it the same as aggravated assaults?

MR. EDMISTON: In answer to your first question, it is a lesser penalty than aggravated assault. Aggravated assault is a felony of the first degree and the penalty involved there is a maximum fine of \$25,000 and up to ten years. This Bill would establish the offense involved as a first-degree misdemeanor and the maximum imprisonment term

would be up to five years and the fine would be up to \$10,000.

REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: My question is, why make it less if it's a serious crime which I think it is?

I am trying to put teeth into this thing. Why not make it the same as aggravated assault? What was the reasoning that went into making what it is now? Is there a good reason for it?

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Ask the prime sponsor rather than the staff.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: First of all, an official, he is in uniform as Dwayne indicated perhaps an hour before the game. He is out on the football field maybe taking warm-up along with the team. Whereas a case of first-degree, you are looking at a policeman who wears his badge, uniform, is a lot highly visible perhaps an eight-hour term. The same with a bus driver or anybody. You recognize him being that by the fact he wears the uniform in performance of his duty for eight hours or more. You know damn right well what you are getting into.

Whereas the official, maybe his scope of employment is limited to three and a half, four hours. It's not on a day-to-day basis like a police officer or bus driver who spends 40 hours at least in performance of his duty. I think the thing is to let these people be alert. You're not

going to go before a District Magistrate and get a rap on the knuckles and say, don't do it again, be a good boy, discharge. Through news media, we hope to get out that, hey, you attack an official, it may not be as severe as attacking a police officer, but unfortunately, some of those today that attack policemen get off easy. To let them know, hey, this is more of a severe penalty now than you have been accustomed to in the past. That's my intent rather than to shut the door on an open scene on officials, managers coaches, et cetera.

REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: My response would be as a suggestion to consider amending this to make it aggravated assault. If you don't, with your permission, I may. I think if we're trying to put teeth into this --

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: I think you realize what is being done or not being done now. This is substantial step forward.

REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: I understand that.

thing in now. If we want to try to improve on it later, I have no objection to it. But, I think this is a lot higher than we have currently as far as the penalty. We haven't heard from all the sides yet. Some people might be opposed to this Bill in the current position as opposed to raising the penalties. It is the subject of discussion. Do you want

to put this in the same category as attacking a police officer? I really don't know until there is an opportunity to discuss it with our attorneys.

REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: I am not going to use any more time up on that issue. I would suggest to the sponsor and Committee and staff that perhaps that's an arguable point there that should be considered.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Thank you very much, Representative Markosek. Anyone else for Mr. Norton?

Chief Counsel, Mike Edmiston, has a question for Dick Olasz or Mr. Norton.

MR. EDMISTON: Mr. Norton, the incident you mentioned where the official was injured with the lost end of his fingers, was there a criminal proceeding initiated against the defendant?

MR. NORTON: I don't believe there was, sir.

MR. EDMISTON: But, you are not certain of that?

MR. NORTON: No, I am not certain of that. Most officials are reluctant to turn something like this in.

The referee -- and we love to officiate. But, in some schools, they feel that if they cause trouble, they will never go back to that school again to officiate. They don't turn a lot of these incidents in. A lot of them go by the board. Because they feel if they go to a criminal suit, they are going to go against the school district and what

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have you and not be officiating in that conference or whatever. A lot of that enters into it, sir. CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: One more question. MR. EDMISTON: Incidences where the official has contacted the law enforcement authorities and cared to press charges, are you aware of any difficulties that have been involved in the proceeding under the statute, the simple assault provisions or dependent upon the character of the action and the injuries involved and aggravated assault provisions in the Crime Code? MR. NORTON: I am not aware of that, sir, no. I know in the W.P.I.A.L., if it's reported to the Board, which Mr. Heberling was the secretary of, then we have a hearing in front of the W.P.I.A.L. Board. We try to rule on that situation. CHAIRMAN DEWLESE: Thank you very much, sir. MR. NORTON: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Judge Narick, welcome to our Judiciary Committee hearing on House Bill 219. The reason I was hesitating was I have been told the schedule is a

different way. I was momentarily --

JUDGE NARICK: I appreciate the courtesy.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: -- stammered up here. I don't want to do that without your permission.

JUDGE NARICK: No problem. He is one of my associates.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Welcome.

JUDGE NARICK: Very quickly, gentlemen, I want you to know that I don't speak for the Commonwealth Courts. I am the Senior Judge on the Commonwealth Court. I am also an associate supervisor of the Collegiate Independent Football Association of which Tom Thamert is part of our staff. I do not speak for that organization.

I give an opinion based solely on the fact I was a high school football player, student athlete at the University of Pittsburgh and a football official, high school level, major college and supervisor of officials for the past 12 years of major colleges. So, I come from that kind of reference.

But, I would quickly make note of this Bill as a lawyer or as a judge would too, that I notice that there is an existing law of simple assault which covers all of our citizens. What you have done with this, I take it, is increased the nature of the penalty from a second-degree, I take it, misdemeanor to a misdemeanor of the first degree. That's one. I see that.

So, in effect, it's somewhat redundant if you did have a problem involving assault. There is no reason why it couldn't be handled prior to any consideration of this

type of Bill.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, the other. I make that reference. I suggest to the staff and you to consider that very carefully, and I think what you did was just change the degree of penalty. The other is this. I don't think the offense defined takes care of one very important area. That is, an assault by a player to an official. For example, in my very first college football game, and I won't mention the colleges, I called a foul against a player which required he be disqualified under the rules and he was. This happened in the second quarter of the game. As the game went on in the third quarter, apparently he didn't like the call I had made. And so, as I was getting ready to place the ball for kickoff, he came from behind me and socked me in the jaw and knocked me out. I was out for about 30 seconds. My wife was there excited about my first experience and was shocked. This can't be the real world of football.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: I thought you disqualified him, Judge?

JUDGE NARICK: I did. He came on the field off the bench. I recovered being younger at that time. I continued to work the game. My wife drove us home. But, I recall that after the game was over, the coaches and athletic directors and press said, please, let's handle this within the organization. Don't publicize it and don't do anything.

We'll handle it within the organization.

The upshot was, I had my jaw x-rayed on Monday and found out nothing was broken. I was sore, hurting, but nothing broken. So, we didn't do anything in that sense.

Now, two things could have happened. One was I could have probably brought an action against this person. But, I am not so certain it would have stuck. The other was that I think they told us to handle it within the organization and group I belonged with, the College Football Officials. We presented them information to the school, and the upshot was that the school and the kid apologized and he was suspending from playing football the rest of the season.

I took no action either legally, civilly or criminally. I am curious and concerned about situations where that may happen to an official by a player, and does the Bill cover it, or does it cover the situation involving a coach who may strike a player as was done in the case I think involving a Maryland coach last year who I think struck an official.

So, I would suggest that consideration be given to that problem. Now, of course, I don't think -- I think if this does apply, for example, to a player striking an official or striking the coach or anybody associated with the sport as defined under this statute, then, of course, I

think that's getting into a dangerous territory because we do have rules and rules committees. And, every year, since I have been associated with football, every year there is new rules being promulgated with the idea towards safety.

In a lot of ways including that players can not use abusive language, can not make any threatening gestures, that's all an evolution that has been taking place, and also they can't do certain things. Of course, striking and those areas. I would suggest that you should not put yourself in a position of bringing the law into a team situation where the official who may be violating the football rules would be subject to criminal offense, misdemeanor of the first degree. If I had a situation come before me, I think I would have to say that, yes, the official would be involved. Yes, the coach may be involved if they, for some reason, struck an official. And, that's happening.

I remember Woody Hayes had a situation. The question is whether or not he could have been subject to a criminal offense. I think under this particular Bill, he may be. I don't know if you want it to be that way. If you do, I think you better be very careful because you are encroaching on an area involving the rules of the game which the rules committee and the people who are experts in the area of the game are always striving to meet the current demands or whatever they may be.

23

24

25

Those are the observations I make. I really appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee 2 for that purpose. 3 CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Judge, thank you very much. 4 Before we have questions, I would like to welcome 5 one of our senior members of the Judiciary Committee, Mike 6 Dawida. 7 Dick, do you have any questions for the Judge? 8 REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Not right now. I want to 9 kick something around. 10 CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Joe Preston? 11 REPRESENTATIVE PRESTON: Judge, in your opinion, 12 how would this happen if the person say is not an adult? 13 Who would be responsible? Would the parents be responsible 14 potentially for the fine or disciplinary action also? 15 JUDGE NARICK: The parent? 16 REPRESENTATIVE PRESTON: Yes. If, let's say, 17 the infraction was caused by a 16-year-old kid who was at 18 a game or are we saying a college student who is only 20 19 years old who is still under parental supervision as far as 20 the school is concerned, are his parents going to be poten-21 tially responsible? 22

JUDGE NARICK: I think under the law, the person whether it be a minor or adult would be subject to the provisions of law. The only question is, whether he would

be under the juvenile section of the law or our senior section of the law. But, I think insofar as the parents are concerned, I assure that they might have some responsibility, but they wouldn't be the ones subject to any responsibility. They wouldn't be liable as such for the conduct of the child.

REPRESENTATIVE PRESTON: So, in other words, if a 16-year-old young individual was fined, his parents would not hold any accountability for that at all as far as any physical damage that might happen to the individual?

JUDGE NARICK: Are you asking him or me?
REPRESENTATIVE PRESTON: Well, either way.

JUDGE NARICK: If you are asking me, my opinion would be, no, the parents wouldn't be obligated. I am sure the parents would try to help their son or child or whoever it might be.

MR. EDMISTON: While Representative DeWeese is stepping out for a moment, he asked that I chair on his behalf.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Judge, one of the major reasons I think you and I in a private discussion had previously as being the main reason why I introduced this Bill -- I want to read something to you that occurred here in Homestead approximately two weeks ago.

"A Homestead man has been charged for punching a

Steel Valley Midget League coach during a game at Campbell Field, Munhall," it gives the man's name, "was apprehended by Munhall patrolman, James Beserock and Paul Gyrina yesterday. Washington was charged with simple assault and terroristic threats. Arraigned in the night court, he is scheduled to appear before District Justice Richard Terrick on September 9 at 1:30 for a preliminary hearing."

I don't know what took place at that hearing.

"Chief James Coyne said witnesses told police
Washington ignored repeated requests to leave the game after
harassing players and arguing with the coach, a West Homestead
resident, during a Sunday game.

"Coyne said Washington reportedly ran onto the field and punched the coach in the face. When he was asked to leave again, witnesses said he threatened to return with a gun.

"Police stood by until the conclusion of the game but said Washington did not return."

These are the things --

JUDGE NARICK: I think why hadn't he been prosecuted under this simple assault statute?

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: I am going to check back because Mr. Norton and I both know the District Magistrate very well.

JUDGE NARICK: Sir, I think what you are doing by

this particular Bill, you are trying to emphasize one part of our citizens who may be subject to the assault aspect. That is, sports officials. Although the Crime Code right now covers all of us, you, me and everyone else. It is conceivable even in a situation involving an official attacking a player or attacking a coach or attacking anybody associated with the game would be subject to this.

But, I think you are just pointing out more emphatically and making it a more serious offense when you have simple assault involving and directed towards an athletic official as I see it.

REFRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Well, you know from your experience in the Court, you just see this on a day-to-day basis. You know the involvement of how emotional parents become in Little League games, baseball, football, whatever it may be. Here's a guy volunteering his time. You know you have witnesses reluctant to come forward and testify in murder cases. You can imagine this poor coach. He is scared to death. He is not getting any reimbursement other than coaching this team.

This guy knows where he lives, and I'm sure he knows him very well. I am speaking matter-of-factly as a man on the streets. He is the one that is fearful. Not the guy that did the punching. But, by word of mouth, if the word gets out, hey, you are facing a jail term and substantial

fine, that's going to spread a lot more people will sit in those seats where they belong instead of becoming more active in feeling, hey, I have a license to go out and smack anybody I want to if it is the coach, official or whatever the case may be. You know yourself. They may bet a six-pack of beer on the outcome of the game. Hey, this guy made a bum call. You are going to pay for it, pal.

The only thing I can say is, I think you are going to have the same kind of consideration. Assuming arguendo and you pass this legislation as you had under the old law, simple assault. Whether or not anybody prosecutes and will the system work. I am saying I think the law should be enforced. If they haven't been, it's the fault of the law enforcement people including under the sample case you recited. He should be prosecuted under this. You can do it right now. If he is not, obviously, it's a case where either the Courts nor prosecutors can force people to testify, and they have their own reason for it.

Whether you are doing it simple or under your particular law, as I say, I think I see in this most significantly the fact that you can publicize there is a crime now if you strike anybody associated with the game. Okay. Whether it be soccer, basketball, football.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Further questions? Mike

Edmiston.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. EDMISTON: I have a question, and then, I will seize a moment of liberty to make a comment before I ask it. I coached some of those Little League teams. thing I know enough not to do is be an official. the risk involved there are much more clear. But, I did want to ask you, Judge, Mr. Norton commented earlier that often times at the scholastic level, they will be guided to the site of the sporting event by security people who will be employed by the school district. I think ushered was the word he used. If that personnel involved in ushering an athletic official to the event were a school district employee, under our law, as to aggravated assault where an individual, for example, were to become disenchanted with the official's call and were those school employees to be ushering the official from the site after the game and were that group rushed by an individual who committed an assault, they could be prosecuted for the offense against the school district employee under the aggravated assault statute as was mentioned earlier of a felony whereas were they to be prosecuted for assaulting that official who made that call dependent upon the harm involved as far as long as it might get would be simple assault. That, in essence, we would have two different classifications of victims where the injury inflicted might well be the same. I am wondering if

you have a comment to share with us on circumstances like that?

JUDGE NARICK: I can say this from my experience as a judge. Obviously, a school district and others may be concerned because they may be charged with not taking extra care for the hazardous conditions existing. For example, being aware of the fact, you may have rowdyism at the game. You may have people intoxicated in some way and acting in a way that may be unruly. I could conceive of a situation where a school district may be involved in a civil action because they didn't exercise due care in protecting the interested people on the premises of the school district. I can see that possibility.

But, I want to say also, friends, you know, there has been an evolution taking place in the way of security. For example, when I went to the University of Pittsburgh, they had only one security person at the main entrance at the Cathedral of Learning. Now, they have a force of police that are associated with that University in excess of 300.

Also, we instruct our officials -- I am talking about college officials, you don't tarriate going off the football field after the game. You don't spread out or make yourself a target. But, rather we tell the officials to stick together and get off the field quickly and go to the

dressing room. That's one. But, also don't you remember, not many years ago, maybe you are too young to remember, some of you, but during that era where we had threats at stadiums, violence, Harvard, Yale, Wisconsin. I remember being involved in a game where we had specific instructions about how to adjust to situations that may arise at a football game.

For example, we were assigned to a game at
Wisconsin. For the first time in my experience, we had a
policeman in our dressing room with us while we dressed.

He also escorted us to the bench, and we also received
instructions that if anything takes place in the stands,
we are to leave the field, and let the University officials
and security people take care of bringing it under control.

That went on for a couple of years. That was really unnerving.

It happened, I think, at the Yale-Harvard game
where we were involved where we had the same kind of a
situation. That has changed. Now, I think from our experience
at least at colleges, I don't see that being such a situation
where we're subject to that kind of security. But, I think
there has been that evolution taking place, and I think this
maybe trying to address itself to the current problems.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Dick Olasz for a final observation.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Mr. Chairman, in all due

respect to the Judge, I have been around for a while too.

I think you will agree that there is a general breakdown of discipline and you and I both know of the late Judge Kenneth Stalandis (phonetic). I think you agree if he were the Commissioner of baseball today, the guys that have the fingernail files and the sandpaper in their glove would not have been fined. They would have been out of baseball for probably maybe the rest of their career as he ruled with an iron fist.

Eut, approximately six months after I introduced this Bill, and I don't know if you know the gentleman or not, but Barry Mano, he is the founder and president of the National Association of Sports Officials. This was in the USA Today, August 23. He says, quote, officials are being attacked, and they want help. We would like to have a statute that makes assaulting a referee tanamount to assaulting a policeman," Mano said. "Schools hire us to manage the games and make sure they're fair. In effect, aren't they making us policemen?"

"A legislated effort to protect sports officials will be an important focus on the Seventh Annual National Convention of Sports Officiating," which took place in San Francisco.

Here's a man that is head of the national officials' group asking for legislation. I am happy to say

that I introduced it six months before he made that appeal.

JUDGE NARICK: Congratulations. But, I have to bring to your attention not only as a judge, but also a long-time official, and of course, I view this as being something that if you did have the situations come up, attacking officials, you had some basis upon which you can charge them criminally. I think, as I said before, I think you are emphasizing that this be related to sports specifically and perhaps this may be a determent to those who may be getting involved.

I am not saying, sir, that you shouldn't be alert and address these very critical issues. But, I must again say speaking as a judge and also I don't speak for my Court, but only for myself and also an official involvement. Of course, the person you are referring to, I think, sometimes you may have some incident that may be really exceptional situations, and they point those up.

We had games going over the years, 38 years of my involvement, and I don't recall other than one experience where an official has been hurt. That's me.

One other suggestion I would make to the staff.

I think on your sports official definition, I think you have here a person at a sports event who enforces the rules of the event such as an umpire or referee or a person who supervises the participants such as a coach. The term you have also

includes -- I would suggest the term, also includes all.

players, substitutes, coaches, trainers, cheerleaders in

uniform, band members in uniform, mascots, if any in uniform,

game managers, athletic directors and other person affiliated

with the teams subject to the rules of the sports event.

All those people I have enumerated are subject to the rules

of the college rules and also high school rules. They should

be the ones also embraced within this.

Sir, do you have that?

MR. EDMISTON: Yes. Thank you, Judge.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Thank you, Judge.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Thank you very much, sir, for your testimony.

JUDGE NARICK: You are welcome. Good luck.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: The next gentleman to testify is Tom Thamert, an acquaintanace of all of ours in the Governmental Affairs Representative of Equitable Gas and also a long-time collegiate sports official. Welcome.

MR. THAMERT: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to go on record as saying I support Representative Olasz's piece of legislation here 100 percent. I don't necessarily agree with the Judge. If this law, this Bill, were to be enacted, can you, through your efforts, save one official the pain and sorrow that could come about being

accosted, I would say you should be commended for that.

Everybody keeps talking about today's society. I am not
saying it's today's society. I remember back when I played
football for a little school in Minnesota. We had problems.

I know that Dick goes back to the days when he was younger, and he played organized sports. Sports is a way to express emotion. I think all people associated with any sporting event, they understand that. They accept it, and I don't say the danger because there is really — it's really blown out of proportion here. I think in that there is more reward to be gained from the activity itself than the dangers involved.

But, I do have a tremendous problem when I go around the country and I talk to different officials from different parts of the country or part of my crew or whatever when I find out last year they took out \$20,000 worth of liability insurance that they may have to use to protect themselves to gain some kind of -- I don't know what the legal word is. An award through the court system.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: For the record, do you work in collegiate as well as professional?

MR. THAMERT: No. I am not allowed to work professional games. Collegiate, major Class A college games. One A, we're classified as. But to the point where last year I took out insurance because I became concerned that I

g

could become a subject of a liability suit because somebody was injured in a contest that I happen to be officiating.

It's sort of scary when you start thinking about that. Well, anyway, I do have that type of insurance. I found out that almost, I guess if you need a percentage, probably more than 50 percent of the officials and I am talking about qualified officials, that's probably the wrong word. Your certified officials. Because there is many qualified to officiate that don't officiate. But, the certified. They must take out this kind of protection. If they don't, they could end up losing everything they have because somebody believes they didn't officiate according to the rules.

In retrospect, I say, gee, that's great, fine.

That's the way the game is played. I will play it that way.

But, yet if I happen to walk out of a tunnel wherever it

might be and some irate oversealous fan punches my lights out,

now, I can't do anything or I can according to the Judge

here. I guess I could do something. He says I can. But,

I would like to see that person who not only disgraces the

university or the high school or the municipality or whatever

it may be, if you are talking Little League that's organized,

I am very sure that it's -- and I don't happen to be, but if

I was where that happened in Munhall ---

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Homestead.

MR. THAMERT: I would be embarrassed to high

heaven to walk down the street and someone say, did you see what happened up at the West Field? That would bother me as an associate. I think it bothers most of your citizens. But, the thing that I am getting to, I guess, as far as I can take it, I think you get the drift of where I am coming from.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Yes, sir.

MR. THAMERT: I know that I left the stadium last year -- Dick wanted me to relate a couple incidents. I won't mention the two schools. One of them was a great institution from this state and the other one from a southern institution. I happened to be coming out of the dressing room. By chance, I ran into the visiting team. The coach, who I know, who is very concerned with the type of game we had, and he meant the physical contact. We had like 198 yards in penalties. We thought we controlled the ballgame. We thought we did everything we could to control the ballgame which we did to the point of ejecting four players. People don't pay to come to see people thrown out of ballgames.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: College ball players?

MR. THAMERT: It could be college, pro. Right,
it happened to be college players.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: That's a lot for a college game.

MR. THAMERT: Yes, it is. It's the most ever

thrown out in one game. We're walking up the sidewalk next to the activity building where I happened to dress, and he and I are talking. All of the sudden, you hear this crash. Right above his head and my head was part of a big whiskey bottle hanging from the side of the brick there. He looked at I and I looked at him, and I said, God damn. When I said that, there was six State Police that were there like that that took him on up to the bus and left me where I was.

Prom that ---

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: You had to be down south for that to happen, those big southern troopers.

MR. THAMERT: That's exactly what they did. They escort you in and escort you out unless you are the visiting -- or a coach. It's no problem. That is why I support his legislation.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Questions from the Committee members? Mike Dawida.

REPRESENTATIVE DAWIDA: Tom, I respect you as an official and as a governmental affairs representative, and I appreciate what Dick Olass is trying to do. The audible we're trying to do is a bit more precise though. Let me first illustrate the liability insurance stuff that you talked about is not dealt with in this Bill.

MR. THAMERT: I realize that. That's my problem.

REPRESENTATIVE DAWIDA: That masquerades the

issue. The issue is not liability. If somehow or another there is a problem with officials being sued for not controlling a game properly, there may be a need for legislation, although I am not aware of any suits. That has nothing to do, and I want the Committee to understand that has nothing to do with it. I have been the author of liability legislation that might have something to do with it to help you, but this Bill doesn't.

This Bill deals with making a special classification of assaults for referees. Right now, we have a law for simple assault and aggravated assault. What Judge Narick, I believe, tried to say was that these laws may not be being used properly, but they are quite adequate to deal with the needs of officials who may be being assaulted. That was his point. I am not sure if that's accurate or not, but those laws are quite adequate, I believe, to deal with almost anybody in society.

He is saying, let's put aside. Let's make referees somehow different. He didn't talk about visiting nurses who may be going into a ghetto neighborhood who may get assaulted. He didn't talk about legislators as Bill DeWeese is coming into my territory to speak and had some abuse hurled upon him about a particular view dealing with compensation.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Pay raises.

REPRESENTATIVE DAWIDA: Didn't talk about bar tenders who deal with rowdy people all the time. There are hundreds of people. There's a man here from the Post-Gazette. A number of us legislators have no objection to him personally, but we do to his paper. All these categories are special categories we can make. We could have a law filled with 5,000 special categories.

I refereed, as you know, through college, and there is no harder game than refereeing law school people playing the med school at Pitt. I came within an inch of danger there.

My point and the point of Judge Narick is. does this Bill really do you any good, and why single you out as opposed to all these other people who are exposed to danger day-in and day-out in their lives. And, can you enumerate enough instances where you think you need that kind of special protection. That's what the issue is going to come down to there.

MR. THAMERT: I don't know if I can answer that question. I don't think I am that intelligent. I would like to lay this out for your consideration or your thought.

Sports, whether we like it or not, has, I hope in a good way, taken over society. It seems that the strike is getting more publicity right now than Bork's confirmation which should be of interest.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Good comparison.

MR. THAMERT: It doesn't say a lot about all of us in general when we do that. I think sports has got to an earie position in society. I say that if it has obtained that status, I'm not saying it has, I am saying it seems it has, maybe special laws should be written to at least make people aware of it. If this particular piece of legislation also will, only because it's being addressed towards officials of sports, if it would deter a bartender from getting shot, I would say, it's a well-worth piece of legislation. Maybe it will.

REPRESENTATIVE DAWIDA: The point is -- MR. THAMERT: I know what you are saying.

REPRESENTATIVE DAWIDA: We have to decide, is this group the one we want to protect especially and differently than the simple and aggravated assaults that already exist. I think you made a good point. Maybe it is because of the volatile nature of sports in our society. It's going to be hard to sell that argument on the complete floor of the House because there is so many other groups that will come up and say, what about us.

MR. THAMERT: I agree 100 percent. It will be difficult.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: To interject, Mr. Chairman,
I think we all agree sports today are a lot more organized

than they were when I was a kid. When we played, we picked up teams on the ball field and never had umpires. The discipline within the family, the discipline within the game, we did not have the media projecting games on a 24-hour basis into the home where now they are controlled. I say laws have been changed to adapt to the current needs of society.

Years ago, you didn't have, and I have been around for a while, they didn't tell you years ago where you had an assault on the umpires. Because the player would be booted in the can and get the hell out of the game among yourselves because you didn't want to get tagged. I can honestly tell you I don't remember ever being bounced out of a game for challenging an official. I was more concerned about the coach was going to dump me out of the game for challenging an official.

I am saying because of where we are in society today, with a weekend of football what we see on a 365-day basis, especially in hockey. Someone is always constantly challenging the guy in the striped shirt. He is not a 40-hour-a-week employee. I think that the laws have to be changed, and that's what we have done down through the course of history to adapt to a specific situation.

That's the reason why I introduced this legislation because I haven't read through -- I have things from NBC

Nightly News that focus on the number of bodily injury cases that have been brought about through a sporting event. We see on the national level — Mike, you weren't here. That I requested one of the officials what special precautionary measures are being made for you guys to cross the picket line to officiate at these games this week. I personally feel that they deserve a special section in that statute to give special protection because when they are out in the field, they are the policeman.

I don't want to see the same thing happen that we had at Belgium and South America where we lose complete control of all sporting activities. You go into some of these basketball games where you are operating in closed quarters of a gymnasium, I tell you what, I would get the hell out of there because I don't know what is going to break loose. Some of them are really hotly contested.

That's the difference in the breakdown of discipline and attitude. He is a family man. I know many that are family men. We have one other witness that is going to testify and tell you about some of the cases they have been exposed to.

That's why I feel personally that the need is there for a special section to protect an official, a coach because, brother, I have seen it happen on an increasing scale that I wouldn't believe possible 20, 30 years ago.

You have been around, Tom. Really, the frequency.

I have a friend of mine. I know how often he participated in ballgames years ago. It was unheard of for someone to come out and take a swipe at a coach or official. Not so today. I can't see penalizing the school. When I say penalizing the school, they say, well, because your team was involved in an incident, you are not going to be able to participate in W.P.I.A.L. for the next two years. What about that kid, his scholarship, his chances of a college education rests on his ability to play ball. They can't play anymore. He is going to lose the rest of his eligibility in high school. He is probably a grade-A kid, super ball player, but because someone else caused a riot, they are out. Am I right, Tom, about being dumped?

MR. THAMERT: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASS: I have documentation of schools that have been on probation. They can't participate in the sports activities. You have deprived that other kid of an opportunity to participate in sports that may open the door for him to a college education because of his athletic ability.

So back to the number one. That's the reason I introduced it.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Anything else? Amy Nelson, research analyst for the Committee.

MS. NELSON: Representative Olasz, you just brought out a question that has been crossing my mind. You said that when a team or a player on a team is involved in some type of assault, the entire team may be thrown out at the school and be banned from participation. In earlier testimony, the Judge and, I think, Mr. Norton said that it's been the practice that if an official is assaulted, the school will try and hush it up, request that they don't prosecute, ask them to try and resolve it within the school district so there isn't that embarrassment and the disbanding of the team in sports. Do you think by enacting this legislation that would change, or do you think because it carries a higher penalty, there would be even more of the covering-up, the requests not to prosecute?

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: I don't think there would be more of a covering-up. I am hoping you don't come to a point where you suspend a school from athletic participation. My hope is once the word goes out that you are going to receive more than a rap on the knuckles that from the super-intendent of the school district on down the line to the participants in the sports will say, hey, the coach may drop the guy off the ball team. They know who the actors are. The same way the manager of the Pirates, who I was very critical of two or three years ago. If he is the manager, and he doesn't know the guys are snorting coke in the dressing

room, shame on him. If you are the coach, you know your ball players. You know the guys you can count on. That's the way I see this Bill. If it becomes law and they know there is going to be a more severe penalty, they will take steps to discipline within their ranks. That's my own opinion. CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Mr. Dawida. REPRESENTATIVE DAWIDA: Have teams been called and forfeited their eligibility because of assaults of referees? REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: You will hear from Mr. Czarnecki. REPRESENTATIVE DAWIDA: We're talking about something very precise here, not all this sociological. REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: There are schools right in here where games had to end in forfeits. There is the Forbes here in Harrisonville, PA. It goes on. I will let him elaborate. He has the details on which schools were involved. CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: The package will be submitted as part of the record. Are there any other questions or comments of Mr. Thamert? Thank you, Tom. MR. THAMERT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Our final witness today, and

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I owe him a debt of gratitude for being bounced to and fro as far as the order of the testimony is concerned, is Leonard Czarnecki, District Official with the P.I.A.A., the Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic Association. Thank you very much for your flexibility as far as our testimony and the order of the testimony today. Welcome.

MR. CZARNECKI: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Leonard Czarnecki, and I am an official representative for the P.I.A.A. and we represent over 10,000 officials, men and women, who officiate various high school sports in the State of Pennsylvania. I am also the Executive Director of the Collegiate Athletic Officials' Association, whose organization trains and assigns officials to college, universities in Pennsylvania, Maryland and New Jersey.

In addition to this, I helped develop and work with thousands of young athletes who participate evenings and on weekends in novice programs such as the community and State leagues, YMCA's, CYO, and other organizations who sponsor sports programs. My personal officiating background, I have been actively officiating for the past 35 years in baseball, basketball and continue to officiate football on the high school, college, and professional level.

I would like to express my sincere thanks for the opportunity to appear before this Committee and offer our

support for House Bill 219 which would add Section 2712 to Title 18 relative to assaults on sports officials. It is also gratifying to note that this Bill is sponsored by 34 legislators who feel there is a need for this support and protection.

I have one question to ask. What took you so long? In Pennsylvania, there are over 400 high schools and again that many junior high schools participating in various sports. This represents over tens of thousands of your young boys and girls just in high school and junior high school alone, not to mention an equal number in colleges and universities and perhaps a few hundreds of thousands in novice community and city programs I mentioned previously.

Isn't it sad to think if we had no officials, these programs would find it difficult to flourish. But we do have these programs, and we must make every effort to protect them. One of the areas of protection we need and we seek today is the assault on the sports officials during or after a contest.

Assaults on officials go back in history a long way, and as our program expands, so does the likelihood of more assaults. We have no statistics to offer because, for years, these assaults were tolerated by officials for a number of reasons. Shame probably is one.

Perhaps the main reason is who wants to hire an

earn \$30 to officiate the contest and the result is a \$25 fine and a slap on the fingers. The assailant still gets a chance to go out next week and repeat the same offense at another contest at a very cheap price.

I ask why do you do it? Very simple. We love it. It's an extension of your playing days. When you can't play anymore, you want to become an official. It's an avocation, not a livelihood. If you had to depend on it for a living, you would starve. But these are dedicated men and women who want so much to be part of the athletic program. They may be assaulted and pushed around this week, but they will be back out there next week, and we sure as heck have to protect them. I don't know how much more I can add to what I said, but I do know, we're finding it very, very difficult each year to recruit officials.

In all the years of the 35 years I have been in this program, I never dreamed that we would have to resort to taking out paid ads in newspapers to recruit officials.

That never happened before. It is happening now.

I ask many young athletes whose playing days are over, why they are not interested in the avocation of officiating. The answer generally is, I could never take the abuse you guys take. As officials, abuse is tolerable if it's verbal. But, it's frightening when it's physical. It's

a long walk from the field to the dressing room, and it's even longer from the dressing room to your car.

For the record, my appearance in this hearing is a strong indication that we as officials strongly support House Bill 219 and hope that the Legislature sees fit to vote for its passage. We have now initiated a program to contact as many Representatives, Senators seeking their support to endorse this Bill for what is important to the officials in the many sports we are involved with.

Now, I would just like to comment on one or two things on some of the people who made testimony here.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Sure.

MR. CZARNECKI: The Judge made a comment, and it's true, that habitually now, we're trained to huddle up in one area of the field when you are leaving. It's kind of frightening. Why are we put in these things if we think it's so safe out there for us to officiate? Why must we resort to huddling and protecting ourselves in a bunch to get off the field? Because we have no protection from the law.

From that standpoint, the law is very, very weak.

Many times we should have pressed some of the laws we had. But, historically, we didn't do it. There were very, very many reasons for that. I think Dwayne and a few others who expanded on that that you don't want to get on the wrong side of the schools. So, a lot of it was put to

the back burner and we never pressed charges.

Some of the things you have to worry about are the schools themselves. They try to negotiate with the officials, hey, keep it low-keyed. We don't want that notoriety in the newspaper. So, we lick our wounds and go on our merry way.

The gentleman's comment over here about comparing nurses and everybody else down the line. Well, I don't think nurses participate in anything that is witnessed by 50, 60, 70,000 people. We're a focal point. People don't bet on nurses. People bet on games. The chances of that nurse being accosted coming — or assaulted coming from a football game or basketball game is very, very unlikely as is as much as it is for me to get out of that football or basketball forum.

I personally had a lot of good experiences and suffered some good experiences. Nine years ago, we had a hearing where I was officiating that ball game and there was a riot between Harrisburg Cedarcliff (phonetic) High School. That particular night, I come within that close of having a six-inch switchblade stuck in my stomach. I was assaulted by a woman that hit me with an umbrella from the field to the dressing room while her husband and her two bully brothers or sons were accompanying her, and it took everything I had to punch her in the mouth.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Not to punch her in the mouth?

MR. CZARNECKI: Not to punch her. I took that

abuse for probably 250 yards. We have a history of families,

of parents, of four very, very good wrestlers. Two hundred

fifty, 260 pounders today. Their practice is if one of

their brothers or this man's son did not win that night or

he got a reversal in a point in a wrestling match, the father

and the other three sons would meet the referee in the

parking lot. They would physically abuse the man.

Representative Olasz the cases we do have. I wouldn't want to elaborate today. These are some of the things that are happening today, and they are accelerating today. The fear we have is the recruitment of officials. Boys and girls and women's sports. Women's officials will not tolerate this abuse. They do not even want to tolerate the verbal abuse let alone physical.

We run across the whole State, one end to the other, trying to recruit women officials. We got more men officiating women's sports today than we ever had before in the history of P.I.A.A. It's obvious that women don't want to be subjected to that kind of abuse.

We have had women officials abused physically in the parking lot. That seems to be the focal point of the attack is in the parking lots. The students we're not

worried about. The students basically they care less who wins or who loses that ball game because after that ball game is over, they jump in their Camaro and do their thing.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: I am laughing because I still have a Camaro and a lot of people still think I am still in high school too.

MR. CZARNECKI: The donkey we're worried about is the guy that has got a few beers under his belt and a 25 or 50 dollar bet on the ball game. When it doesn't come out his way, he wants a piece of the action. The first guy he is going to hit is the official.

This is basically and probably in more cases than one the reason for it. I think we need protection, and I believe we will make exerted effort to really publicize this thing and try to reach and touch every Representative in the House.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: In the game you are in now, the only way to succeed, in my opinion, is to have three, four, five, six, officials at the home office of each State

Legislator or Senator in the Commonwealth, and you do have a Statewide organization, and it is quite robust.

MR. CZARNECKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Because the protestation that was monitored from the gentleman, Mr. Dawida, will be omnipresent from the lawyers, especially on the Committee, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when it reaches the floor of the House, and that's if it reaches the floor of the House, it has to be voted out of Committee successfully. There is going to be a lot of people talking about the liability question and his example of nurses going into the ghetto will not be that extreme, relative to what you may hear in the Committee and on the floor. But, obviously, in this game, and politics is. obviously somebody said at dinner last night, the last of the great blood sports, but I don't know what they meant by that, but this is a game. If you want to win this game, it's essential, I think, that you and your organization have four, five or six referees, umpires, officials, men and women in each of the home offices between now and Christmas or between now and Thanksqiving. I am not certain when this will be brought up. It depends on my very able staff and the logistics how long it will take to put it on our calendar. I am a co-sponsor of the measure as you may have noted. Dick put me on. I am the second name on the Bill. So, I am predisposed in your direction, or else, obviously, we wouldn't be here today with the Representatives.

Dick, since our other colleagues have regressed, do you have some comments, observations and then we'll wind this up?

MR. CZARNECKI: The point is, you have a start.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Yes, we do.

MR. CZARNECKI: There is a start. I think from this point on, you may branch out. But, what I probably like and many of the officials like about this Bill right now, it is now bringing to the attention of the public and everybody else that this has been going on, has been suppressed too long. We didn't have the tool to work with. Maybe we did have the tool to work with, but maybe we didn't know how to use it. Now, maybe we have a little more emphasis with this Bill, and we certainly appreciate it.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Mr. Chairman, it is too bad some of my colleagues didn't stick around. I came from the old school where I don't even remember when we played high school ball if we were covered by an insurance policy. We played for the love of it. I think the schools did have hospitalization on us if we got busted up or not.

But, back to my statement of the changing times and changing law to adapt to the times. When I introduced this Bill, it was not worrying about liability or recovery for damages. My concern was protection for the officials, the guy that controls the ball game. And, having participated in many, many sports events in my youth and I still enjoy going to sports, I have seen this situation get out of hand where guys get a couple drinks in them and they think it's open season on officials.

I think the integrity of the games is at stake

when you start getting less than qualified people to go out and officiate ball games. I told many people, and I am a griper. I may play a pool sheet on the weekends and say, if it wasn't for that call, I would have won. That is one advantage we have with that instant reply that the pros have. How many times were those guys ever overturned in their calls? It has been proven they make inaccurate calls.

MR. CZARNECKI: The accuracy percentage of that is 98.2.

My concern was not liability insurance and whatnot. I do think in today's society that officials, coaches, deserve a special section in that law for protection because it's all around us, you know, in the organized sports that we participate in as Americans today.

MR. CZARNECKI: Dick, unfortunately, probably

TV has a very, very strong impact on that also. I find it
hard to sit and watch a college football game or pro football

game. I have always tried to be a student of the rules. I

sit and listen to a colored commentator such as Bud Wilkenson
who coached for 25 years and has absolutely no knowledge of
the college rules. They generate this thing. Boy, was the

official wrong on that one. Boy, they can't be only penalized
five yards. It's got to be ten. Bud Wilkenson doesn't know
that we must attend 13 to 15 meetings a year. We must take

in three weeks of training prior to the season starting, and we take a test on the updated rules.

Bud Wilkenson hasn't taken a test at all to start off with. I listen to Phil Rizutto saying the only thing he could say right was holy cow. He doesn't understand the baseball rules. I think these guys got to stop this on the TV and on radio from criticizing the officials unless they are a student of the rules themselves. It takes a lot of learning, a lot of attendance at clinic and stuff. It's a costly thing for officials today to attend a weekend clinic which now is anywhere from \$150 to \$250.

You are going to be working a ball game for \$35. It's not a matter of going out there to earn money. It's a matter of loving the sport. The only protection we have is really liking to go out there next week.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: You mentioned about Bud Wilkenson. Even though some writers may not have appreciated him. I like Dick Young late of the New York Daily News and the Post. But, like he said, tell it like it is, Howie Cosell, because you wear a hairpiece. But there was another guy despite the fact that he ran off at the mouth had very little knowledge of the game.

I just, for the record, whether you are aware of it or not, Mr. Chairman, we're going to introduce this into the books. But, maybe the new guys haven't seen this.

On NBC News, it talks about a Marine veteran who is now a quadriplegic as a result of the harm against him as an official. A Korean War veteran, a high-tech manager is suddenly a quadriplegic. It's like kill the umpire. It relates to what happened, how the guy ran out on the field and beat him unconscious. There is two different stories. I will give you a copy of this, Len. There is things in here about teams in Pennsylvania. You know a lot more than I have suspended from participating because of it.

Maybe I am wrong, but I don't think it's fair to have to penalize a school because of the actions of one or two bad apples. But, my intent was --

MR. CZARNECKI: We just finished a hearing of a young boy who punched an official in the mouth in a football game and the school was suspended for two years. The official gets nothing out of it. They suspended the school for two years of participation.

CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: Like Dick said earlier, some of the young athletes that might have been trying for athletic scholarships would be disallowed from advancing in that direction because of that two-year problem.

Any other observations or questions?

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: One last thing. Please,

Len, do what the Chairman suggested. You better get hot.

There are obviously differences of opinions. There will be.

Like he said, there is a lot of attorneys that sit on this Board and they may do it differently. This is the first step to give you some idea of what we're looking at just to get it out of the Committee. I am going to need all the documentation you can provide me with so that when we go on the floor, if it gets off the floor, even in the Committee meetings, I am prepared to do battle.

MR, CZARNECKI: We'll make every effort.

thank you again for participating. We had six excellent witnesses, and we had a very lively hearing this morning. Relative to Mr. Olasz's legislation that I am the co-sponsor of, I think I can sum it up from a Harrisburg perspective by saying there are Steeler fans and Browns fans and Raiders fans, but nobody roots for the zebras. And, in Harrisburg, we're going to try to do something for the athletic officials of the Commonwealth.

I think Mr. Olasz's Bill will be the first step in that direction. But, it's not going to be done unless there is an intensive lobbying effort. Because the liability question broached by Representative Dawida and the ramifications of that question will be brought up and debated ad infinitum unless there is a considered lobbying effort on your part.

This meeting of the House Judiciary Committee

is concluded. Thank you. (Whereupon, the meeting terminated at 3:25 p.m.) I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence taken by me at the Public Hearings of the House Judiciary Committee relative to House Bill 219 are fully and accurately indicated in my notes and that this is a true and correct transcript of the same.