## COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1 JUDICIARY COMMITTEE 2 3 In re: House Bill 826 4 5 Transcription of recorded hearing held on May 7, 1993, at the University of 6 Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 7 8 Friday, May 7, 1993 9 10:00 a.m. 10 HON. THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, CHAIRMAN 11 MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY 12 Hon. Tim Hennessey Hon. Harold James 13 14 15 16 17 Also Present: 18 David Krantz, Executive Director 19 William Andring, Chief Counsel 20 21

22

23

24

25

## INDEX

<del></del>	
Witness:	Page
Shelly Yanoff, Executive Director, Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth	9
Frank Cervone, Executive Director, Support Center for Child Advocates	13
Rama Kaira	39
Sol Tarud	121
John Pulcinella, President, Fathers and Children Equality	139
George McCook	156
Joseph Lamonaca	169
Sheila Behr	181
Elaine Collado	187
Dr. RIchard Dunsmore	203
Edward Onichimowski	206
Ronald Williams	210
H	

want that so reported.

Representative Tom Caltagirone, Chairman, House
Judiciary Committee. A little bit of an overview and
history about this particular piece of legislation
which I find kind of interesting, being that Ivan Itkin
claims that he's a civil libertarian, the Majority
Leader of the House takes great pride in that fact, but
yet would not allow these hearings to be held. We're
holding them anyway at my expense, no thanks to Ivan
and at no cost to the taxpayers. And those of you in
the media that are here, and we'll get some later, I

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I'm State

with Republican Representative—and I happen to be a Democrat—Jerry Birmelin. It is his bill. It was voted out of the committee in the last session for action. In this session the bill was going to be reported out and because there's so many new members on this committee, some of them asked some questions and felt that it would be appropriate maybe to hold some hearings. We had a vote in the committee, 20 to 0, to hold public hearings on this particular issue, which certainly falls under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. All sorts of attempts were then made to stifle and halt public hearings on this very issue.

Contrary to the policy of the House, under rules that we just recently developed—and this is still America, I think, where free speech is protected, supposedly—the Majority Leader refused to approve these hearings. And in the House rules, the only reason that a hearing cannot be held is because of budgetary reasons. That would apply to all 21 standing committees. And I say to you that all the other committees are continuing to hold hearings.

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

So there are some people in this State that are extremely nervous about this particular issue. Extremely nervous. Which makes me ponder the question, why? What do they have to hide? We should let the truth out. I don't think that hurts anybody at any of these areas, and I've always been a strong advocate, whether I've been for or against an issue, to let people speak. Then they accused me of having personal interests, then they accused me of trying to stack these meetings, and anybody that knows anything at all about me in the 17 years that I've been in Harrisburg knows that I will let anybody speak on any topic at any time at any of the hearings that we've ever held. have never, ever stifled anybody, ever. Whether I agree with them or not, they have a right to speak and be heard.

With that as an overview, and the committee meeting that we did hold in Harrisburg was approved only because I agreed to have a joint hearing with the Youth and Aging Committee Chairman Kevin Blaum from Wilkes-Barre, and I think he's going to have to do some answering to his people up in Wilkes-Barre about his involvement in promoting a piece of legislation called 1001, which would greatly expand the powers of Children and Youth Services, greatly expand their powers and intrusion in the family lives and the reporting that goes on, which I think personally, my own opinion, editorial comment, is a travesty of justice. An absolute travesty of justice.

We have only touched the tip of the iceberg with this issue. We have finally gotten enough media people to take an interest. There was something on CNN on Tuesday of this week which highlighted these very issues that we're dealing with. I think it was totally devastating because the Speaker of the House called me to the podium and said, Tom, you're absolutely right with what you're doing. There was something on 40 Minutes or something on CBS just two nights ago dealing with this issue. There was a documentary on channel 12, the public television network, about two months ago.

So what are we talking about here? An issue that doesn't exist? I don't think so. For your information, by the way, House Bill 1001, prime sponsored by Kevin Blaum, did not have the benefit of

None.

any public hearings. None.

I am very, very disturbed at what's going on with this issue and the people that are advocating fair play and checks and balances within the system. I am beginning to look at them as very suspect with their motivation. And I say that because I served on the House Appropriations Committee for a number of years, and in this particular area they are asking for an increase of \$67 million, the second largest increase in the State budget. And everybody clse is scrambling for money to exist. And I've seen the phenomenal growth in these agencies from one end of the State to the other. No standards, no qualifications. None. And they answer to whom? And what accountability is there? I think this is what this issue is all about.

Anyways, good morning. Child abuse is a very serious crime. The State must do everything in its power to protect children. The State also must do everything it can to guarantee that those who harm or threaten children face stiff penalties such as imprisonment. We must ensure the safety of our

children, who make up our future. However, our country is founded on individual rights and liberties. Due process of law stands as one of our most important rights. Our laws must protect those who cannot protect themselves, like children. We also must insure that our laws are not abused, that they are not used for the revenge or to do harm against the innocent.

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

We hold these hearings today on House Bill 826 and the legislation that would amend the Domestic Relations Code to add the offenses of unlawful persuasion and false reporting in relation to someone intentionally using a child to make a false report of child abuse. There are questions on whether such legislation is necessary. Last year the Judiciary Committee held hearings that closely examined the State's domestic relations laws and the problems affecting our Commonwealth's family court system, a problem that continues to go on, I might add. One topic that arose was the problem involved with our State's divorce and custody laws. Some testimony focussed on how parents fought over the custody of the children without thinking what was truly the best interest of their child.

We heard several cases in which one parent wanting to be vindictive and hurt the other by

falsely reporting child abuse, such a report would ensure that the other parent lost custody and all contact with his or her children. The State has no, no power to stop such false reporting. People falsely accused of child abuse face immediately losing their children and their lives without true due process of law. They face the financial and other burdens of having to defend themselves against charges without merit. They often are tagged as guilty as soon as such charges are launched. They can lose their jobs, their reputations, and their lives because someone decides to ruin them by falsely reporting them.

б

Children are also hurt and abused in such cases. They become pawns in a struggle and their feelings of love and devotion is often torn apart. Children and Youth Services in each county receive and investigate thousands of reports of child abuse yearly. Every report must be considered seriously and thoroughly examined. However, State child abuse investigators risk being overburdened with cases of false reporting. Many cases that investigators look into are found to be without merit or are obviously falsely made. Many children could be hurt if investigators must focus their time on cases that are false or without merit instead of the cases in which

child abuse is truly happening.

б

The State has laws and penaltics against those who falsely report crimes such as rape, has laws against those who falsely report fire because such reports can put people at risk. Falsely reporting child abuse also can put our children at risk, can also tear apart relationships between parent and child. Again, we must insure that our children are protected. We also must insure that our laws and our children protective system is not abused. These hearings will hopefully show a true solution.

And with that, we'll start with the testifants. I know the Daley family is not here at the present time. And we'd like to hear from I guess it's Frank and Shelly. If you would please come forward, state your name, who you represent, and you can begin your testimony.

MR. KRANTZ: And may I interrupt? If anyone's here to testify, if you could let me know and I could take you off the list.

MS. YANOFF: Thank you, and good morning.

My name is Shelly Yanoff, and I'm Executive Director of

Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth, an

advocacy organization for children of the city and

hopefully the region and the State. I want to thank

you for coming to Philadelphia. Many times we go to Harrisburg a lot and we're always pleased to have the opportunity to present testimony here.

I'd just like to say a word about PCCY. We receive no governmental support. We are a private nonprofit, not one like those that were recently illustrated in the Philadelphia Inquirer but rather a small, understaffed one that tries hard to improve the quality of life for children. In the city there are about 35,000 children, 1 out of 11, who have had founded reports of abuse and neglect, who over the course of a year who are under the Children and Youth Agency.

We deplore, as do the sponsors and supporters of this bill, those instances in which allegations of child abuse are misused. When one party, particularly in a legal controversy a legal or personal controversy, is so determined to prevail or gain revenge by whatever tactic and that person raises fraudulent child abuse charges, it's an unspeakable travesty and a controversy already out of control. A tactic that is destructive to the parties but one that also deeply harms the child. There are, however, penalties in current law for such actions for perjury, for giving false unsworn testimony, for intimidation

and for slander.

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

From the point of view of Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth, one of the major problems in the area of child abuse and neglect is underreporting. Last year several children died in Philadelphia and neighbors were interviewed afterwards and said that they had seen it, they worried, but they were afraid to report. We have very serious concerns about the fall-out not at all meant in this bill, but the fall-out of another chilling effect on reporting. We are concerned that we believe in the great majority of cases it's difficult for a person to call and report child abuse, and that is what our experience tells us. All of us have received calls which begin very hesitantly, "I don't know if this is abuse or not, but..., and then the facts in many cases turn out to be child abuse.

Our concern here is not about those parties that because they want to prevail in custody or gain revenge, our concern is not about them at all. It is for those good faith people who need to be able to look out for their children and for the children of their community. Too much, it seems to us, has gone on in the last several decades that encourages people to only look out for themselves and not look out for the

well-being of others, particularly children. The protection of the rights of individuals cited in reports rests on the adequacy of how we investigate and follow up on those reports, rather than punishing the reporters. We insist that fairness and due process considerations guide the treatment of the person named in the report and that the investigations of such reports meet the highest standards.

. 9

Safeguards and procedures of the investigation process are necessary and are a legitimate area for attention. Proper and thorough procedures must be in place and they must be improved. The rights of the accused of course must be protected. But the rights of the children must also be protected. We are concerned about measures which may inhibit the reporting of child abuse or may lead to situations in which a victim or an observer of child abuse is discouraged from going forward. We have legions of reports of that in our office. Again, we don't report. People call us and we're not an investing agency, people call us and talk to us about this. We believe that this is an area in which there is adequate law already.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

I know it's very controversial, but we believe that

children will be harmed if there's a chilling effect on abuse and neglect reporting. Thank you.

MR. CERVONE: Good morning. My name is Frank Cervone. I'm the Executive Director of the Support Center for Child Advocates. The Support Center provides legal and social services to victims, child victims of abuse and neglect. We represent kids in two types of proceedings in Philadelphia County. First, in dependency court cases, child welfare cases. A civil proceeding where we serve as counsel and guardian ad litem. And secondly, in criminal cases, where that child is a victim and witness to a crime of child abuse as alleged and tried before a Court of Common Pleas.

We have been in the business of child advocacy formally for 17 years. We've served countless thousands of children. Typically, we serve about 500 children a year, as well as I have personally representing victims of abuse in whose cases reports have been made in which those reports have been charged to be false and malicious. And so I've had much, unfortunately, personal experience with precisely the situation which your bill addresses.

It is my very strong opinion that the bill is inappropriately focused on a closing of the reporting opportunities for witnesses and potential

witnesses to crimes or allegations of abuse. I certainly recognize and have seen instances in which the system has been misused. I have seen far, far more cases in which the system of anonymity and the system of encouragement of reports of suspected abuse has worked to the advantage of children. Ours is a system which comes in a context of a world in which child abuse was not known. We often speak of the syndrome of abuse as being in the closet until 1964 or 65. The syndrome of intrafamilial abuse, particularly in certain ethnic groups, remains in the closet. Unfortunately, all too often.

set up by the Pennsylvania legislature we think has its problems in terms of service delivery but is effective in terms of the encouragement of reporting of abuse with its appropriate—we think necessary—protections against malicious reporting. There are, as the Chair is well aware, there is law for the malicious use of process. There is tort law for defamation and otherwise for the unlawful use of process. There is a vehicle in most of these cases which lie in the domestic relations courts, namely that that evidence comes forward to the judge who make's decisions in the best interests of the child.

1

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

occasion, the court makes note of what it finds to be the false or otherwise inappropriate reporting of an event. And that event and that reporting becomes part of the court's calculus in defining the best interests of the child. That's the way this information should be brought forward. What we would look to instead of the criminalization of false reporting is a commitment of services to children and families where a report is In a family in which a report has been made, that family is almost, by definition, in need of some form of treatment and intervention. There's attention going on in that family which caused that report to I asked from the child's perspective, what's happen. going on in that household that someone had to call in a case? That someone felt some need to call in a case? What's going on there? And the experience of that child and the experience of those adults.

And so as I've seen personally on

Another way that the Chair might ask the question, what do these parents want to happen to this child? The law as it's proposed, 826, would add to the numerous investigations events of testimony and intrusion in the life and experience of this child another round of investigation and examination and cross-examination in the presumed prosecution of the

false report. That extra hearing for the child will almost without doubt be traumatic and invasive. What we know is every event in a courtroom is unfortunate and potentially traumatic for the child. That the law gets at or attempts to get at persuasion is, for me, upsetting. There is no way to effectively get at that child's experience. It's hard enough getting at the event of abuse when it occurs.

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

What this law looks to do is to get inside that child's mind in perhaps every case. In a sense adds to the protocol of abuse investigation action protocol that asks, is this a malicious report? The protocol as it now stands looks to the child's experience. Is there evidence of abuse? Does the person making the report have reason to believe in their professional opinion that abuse has occurred? That's the appropriate scope and focus of the question. What did this child experience, and you heard over and over again, I'm told, in yesterday's hearings, certainly this morning you will continue to hear that law suits and prosecutions such as are envisioned by House Bill 826 will chill reports and will be vexatious. They are not going to limit the number of experience of children in the system, they're going to increase the number of intrusions in the life of this

child and family.

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

I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that reporters, required reporters, nonrequired reporters who have questions call us every week. I talk to them constantly. One of the functions, the informal functions of our agency, is to provide a community service resource to folks who are sorting through the experience which they've had. They see a set of events, they talk to a child, they want to know, is this something I should report? They are hesitant even in the clear cases. They're confused about whether to intrude in the life of this child. They struggle. They struggle at every call. And I'm not talking about what I think is the rare spouse or partner in a domestic situation who is trying to add to his or her case in the custody proceeding or is trying to do damage to their partner or ex-partner. Those will always be a part of the domestic relations context in a world in which there is divorce and child abuse and emotional decay. I'm talking about the vast majority of reports which are made by professionals. And it is that system which needs the protection of good faith reporting and of a free and open, in a sense, economy for the reporting of cases.

I suggest to you lastly that you

be heard. It is our experience that the truth lies in the reality, the unfortunate reality of child abuse in our community and in our culture. We have to have a way to get at that truth. We've spent the last 30 years prying open the closed doors which have kept child abuse a secret. I have heard countless children recount in court and in personal interviews horrible scenes with the persons who they thought loved them. We need a way to get at those truths. And that is, in fact, the truth of the experience of a child. That their trust was violated. It's that trust that this law will invade once again in I think a most troubling way.

б

we would urge you to withdraw your support for this bill, to turn what is undoubtedly your good faith commitment to the needs of children and families to the venue of service deliveries, to the venue of appropriate vehicles for reporting, to the venue of staffing so that abuse investigators are not overwhelmed, that they do not get shortshrift, so they do not take days or weeks to call people back. We ask you to turn your attention and your emotion and your legislative authority to that experience.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. And since this is the city of freedom and liberty, let me ask you some questions now.

MR. CERVONE: Please.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Because I would like to share with you, contrary to your emotion and sensitivity, and only because you're working in an area where you're paid to do what you're doing and this is your advocacy, I understand that, I appreciate that. But I 100 percent, and I get very close to issues. I'm handling or will be handling a potential impeachment of a Supreme Court Justice, possibly the Attorney General. I get very close to those issues too. I'm very sensitive. Believe me, anything that I get close to I guess maybe I get too close to it, I get a little sensitive about issues, but when I see people's rights trampled upon, I get very emotional about that because that's not what we are all about as a people.

MR. CERVONE: As do I.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay, now let me share with you, I have literally been flooded with calls, letters. I'd like for you to come to my office in Harrisburg and I'll share with you just some of the stuff that we've gotten in. People are afraid to come forward. I've heard from attorneys, judges—privately,

not publicly, privately—about these issues of false reporting. The buzzword, and you used it here, as they used it in Pittsburgh, as they used it in Harrisburg, "chilling effect." Good buzzword. "Chilling effect."

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know what we also heard though, too. even from some of the agency people, and they absolutely agreed, what standards are there for these employees of Children and Youth Services around the State? There are no standards. There are no basic qualifications. They vary from county to county. There is absolutely no State standard. No licensing. No continuing education. I understand this costs money to do these things. What I would suggest, in my humble opinion, is cut their staffs in half and double their salaries of those that remain so they can do an effective job and really do what they're being paid to do, not double, triple, and quadruple the staffs, as they have been doing in the last several years in several of the counties around our State. I've been looking at those figures and I think to myself, this is strange, this phenomena. What's going on here?

I agree with you, where there is abuse, it has to be addressed. But I also am very troubled by the fact, and this comes from the agency people, and this was testified to in Harrisburg, which we're having

1 the transcript transcribed by our stenographer, 60, 70, 2 even 80 percent in counties unfounded. That's . 3 troubling, because what that begins to show is a 4 pattern of people calling in reports. And you're 5 saying, well, we want more reports. We want more 6 people calling in and reporting as much as they can. One of the people from the Department of Welfare 7 testified about his life experiences as a father, as a 8 9 divorced husband. His involvement in various areas of 10 life, which is interesting, but in many cases the transitional workload of people in Children and Youth 11 12 Scrvices, it's like a turnstile. They don't stay, in 13 most cases. They come, they go, they come. probably some of the lowest paid staffs in county 14 15 government across the State. They don't have anything 16 holding them to make a career out of that. And there's 17 burn-out, as there is in many jobs.

We heard cases yesterday, and we'll hear some today I'm sure, you won't be able to stay I know, but there are people here that I'm sure are going to be testifying not only in divorce and custody cases. See, this is where it's troubling, because we had people testify that were falsely accused in Harrisburg yesterday and in Pittsburgh and we could have swamped any one of these hearings with a thousand people,

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

believe me, with a thousand different cases, at any one of these hearings. We're just on the tip of the iceberg. I know that it's difficult for people within the business to appreciate what we've been hearing.

Neighbors—

MR. CERVONE: If I may.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: --neighbors falsely calling in reports.

MR. CERVONE: You've raised a number of points. We would be glad to address some.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay. I just want you to think about these issues, because it's very, very troubling that people say there is absolutely no need for this legislation, we need to broaden the legislation like 1001 to give more reporters and more fodder and give us more money and more people, and I'm thinking to myself, wait a minute here, what about the rights of those that have been accused? We've had teachers, yet yesterday it was testified under oath and it had to go through the entire court process, and you're saying, well, when somebody comes into the system, you have an ad litem attorney appointed, you have counseling services, you have all these reams of people that are provided by the agency. The person that is being accused, though, has to spend his or her

own money defending themselves. They have to retain an attorney, in most cases, retain an attorney and go through the process of fighting the system. Everything that they do it costs them money. And in addition to that, they are billed by the agency for many things that are incurred not of their making but of the agency's making if they're forced to go to family guidance counseling, treatment, whatever. That family then incurs those additional expenses.

Now, how do you make somebody whole that has been falsely accused or falsely charged? And if it is true that there are so many unfounded, you know, then does that mean that there's evidence of a lot of malicious reporting or just, you know, how does that translate into what we're talking about here today? I'm interested in the safeguards. You're saying, well, this bill is not needed. It's not my bill, it's Representative Jerry Birmelin's bill from Wayne County. It's his bill. I don't even believe I'm a cosponsor on the bill, as I recall.

MR. KRANTZ: No.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I don't think I am. But I'm for justice. I'm for justice. And I don't think people should be a doormat for any agency, for any area of government. I personally think that

government sticks its nose in too many areas where it doesn't belong now and what they're wrestling with in Washington and what we'll be wrestling with in Harrisburg, which will impact on this issue, do we increase taxes and where do those taxes go then to fund agencies like this to get more power to do more of what they're doing? And if we're serious about shrinking government and shrinking our costs to the taxpayers, then we've got to cut taxes, we've got to cut spending.

And I'd like to start in this particular area. Be my guest.

MS. YANOFF: Representative, if we could possibly share this, you've said many things. The first is that if I were a legislator and I saw a county was running 80 percent unfounded, I would hold a hearing on that county right away. I don't think that either of us would support that. Nationally, reports come in generally they range around 40 percent, between 40 and 50 percent founded. That has been the experience in Philadelphia, which is currently approximately 46 percent.

We would support, I believe I will speak for my colleague, we would certainly support more training and certification. Absolutely that is something that we have argued for, more training and

more certification of workers. We don't see how we can double the salaries and cut the workers if we still are supposed to have a decent workload so that in fact those kids can get some care. Those kids that are legitimately in the system. So in terms of that, we're not sure how you can do that unless you're really willing to both double the salaries and in fact keep the staff, and I don't think that that's where you're coming from, right?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Oh, no. Cut the staffs in half.

MS. YANOFF: Well, I don't think you can do that and do I to 20 or 1 to 25 or 1 to 30, whichever the standard says is too high, but, I mean, the reality is that we can't see how you can do that. I think that this is a very painful issue and there are many — there's much suffering about it. In this city the school district does not report cases to DHS generally, because they feel they're too swamped. The child has to be so desperate. We think that that's so bad for the child, that if you see a child coming to school every day that it looks — that is hungry and ill-clothed, that that doesn't get reported here.

So I'm saying to you that what we don't see is a problem of overreporting here. Where there is

1 that 80 percent. I think those hearings need to go on. Absolutely. I think where you've got social workers 2 3 who are not trained. I think that has to be a public policy change. 4 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, I'm 5 6 suggesting--7 MS. YANOFF: And I want to say that I'm 8 not part of the system. We are an advocacy 9 organization. 10 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: No. no. I 11 understand that. 12 MS. YANOFF: Much like Children's Defense 13 Fund. 14 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: But who advocates 15 for the parents and those who have been abused by the 16 system? You know, this was pointed out in Harrisburg. 17 You have the victims' rights groups, the crime victims groups, the rape victims groups. You have all of these 18 different advocates, okay? And you do. And all the 19 20 different children groups or the Children and Youth. I 21 mean, they've got full-time lobbyists in Harrisburg and 22 Washington advocating for more money for these 23 agencies. 24. MS. YANOFF: But you're saying--

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And these are

25

people that have attacked and besmirched, and the people that have gone through it that have been testifying before us are saying there's something wrong. And I'm saying, wait a minute, who is advocating for them? They don't have paid, full-time lobbyists like the counties send up to Harrisburg asking for more and more money and they get legislation put in then so that we would qualify for these changes so that they would qualify for these changes that they're talking about in 1001 to give them more authority, more money.

And we keep saying, you know, when is it going to stop? I mean, the intrusion into the family's lives, and this is a family issue, are we all about as a country and a people for allowing government to continue to intervene in the family and do we want more of it or do we want less of it? And these are policy decisions that at some point are going to have to be made, and who is going to be held accountable? Because we are all taxpayers, we are all citizens. Not only of this Commonwealth but of the country. And is it right for government to be getting into all these different areas?

Now you're saying from your point of view and your perspective, yes, we need to do more of it.

there's a lot of abuse out there, there's a there's a lot of abuse out there, we've got to help more of these children, there's a lot of horrendous things. are public policy issues that have to be debated fully and aired publicly, but you have to show both sides of the issue. You know, with everything that we do, it costs us in our freedoms and in our taxes. And this is what the raging debate is going to continue to be about both in Washington and in Harrisburg with these budgets that we're going to be dealing with, because it costs us money, in addition to rights. Now, how do you balance these things? And please, I say this in all honesty, these are difficult, difficult issues. I know there are no casy solutions to them. But you've got to understand where these other people are coming from. And, you know, I know they are chomping the bit to testify here today.

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

And I'm going to tell you the other part of this too that's really scary, and I think as a counselor you can appreciate this, how many people were intimidated about not showing up that we lost yesterday? I mean intimidated.

MR. KRANTZ: We had a total of 13 percent that canceled out due to the fact of I call it intimidation either from courts. Someone today

canceled out due to the fact that their district attorney advised them not to testify as it would affect their case. This I find horrendous. The Attorney General's Office wrote to the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia and the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh to go against the bill. Why? Why is the Attorney General fighting the legislature? Who knows.

5.

MR. CERVONE: Wc11, we know. We know. I can tell you, we know.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: People are afraid to come here today. We had some that canceled out because of retaliation from the agency people that they're dealing with. Now, don't you think that that's horrendous?

MR. CERVONE: What I think is horrendous, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, what I think is horrendous is the child who tells me a story at age 5, describing an incident with her father where the details of that story could not possibly have been known to that child but for having lived it. What I think is horrendous are my three clients who all were tested positive to venereal disease of the throat. Their father was the alleged perpetrator.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: They should be prosecuted. I have no problem with that.

MR. CERVONE: What I find horrendous is a system that would suggest, and those three children, those three children have never been able to tell. Were we not to have, and that is not a case in which reporting per se a malicious reporting was ever an issue, but were we to have a system in which we could not find out about those cases, we would be terribly unbalanced, terribly unbalanced against the needs of children, fathers, and mothers. The

Attorney General, from what I can imagine is their position, Children's Hospital, from what I know to be their position, the other witnesses who have come forward in opposition to this bill speak against this bill, as do we, because it's the wrong response to what may be a problem.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: You know it's a problem and I know it's a problem.

MR. CERVONE: I have met alleged child abusers who I have come away from the conversation saying they probably didn't do it. I have met alleged child abusers who have told me clearly, vehemently, with all the emotion that a witness could ever muster, that they didn't do it, that they were falsely accused. And I know otherwise, because I heard the other witnesses. In these cases, in all of these cases, we

can't go back. Either the very rare prosecutorial case in which we have a videotape, as is the case in a recent Philadelphia case—

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: That was one of

the points. The videotaping, this was pointed out by-MR. CERVONE: I don't mean a videotape
testimony, I mean a videotape of the events.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: All right.

MR. CERVONE: Because what we're really talking about, it's most important to understand that what we're talking about when we get at "the truth" is what happened between that, if anything, between that child and the alleged perpetrator, and what we can't get at we can't get back in time. So we're left to our other devices.

this: You know as well as I do that in a court of law you have the right to face your accuser. It is not true in this instance. You know there's different standards, different formats for the protection of the child, supposedly.

MR. CERVONE: The Child Protective
Service Law sets up a different mechanism. And you
really need to address the CPSL in the context of the
overall scheme of investigation of reports,

investigation, inquiry, and prosecution or discharge. 1 2 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Why don't they do 3 a videotaping at the time that the caseworker is doing 4 the interview with the child, and this was mentioned by 5 several attorneys yesterday, so that that can be 6 referred back to and you would have some evidence, 7 because you had no real evidence. MR. CERVONE: I would suggest to you that 8 that's a topic that one should study very carefully 9 10 with research, examination of the jurisdiction which 11 has been used in a very, in a fair forum that is really 12 an informed forum. That is like so many other of the 13 of the issues that I know you have in mind that you've 14 voiced. These are issues that are certainly beyond 15 826. 16 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: But we could amend 17 826 to do anything and everything we want it to do. 18 MR. CERVONE: I don't think it's a good 19 bill, I don't think it's a good vehicle for that. 20 not sure it's--21 MS. YANOFF: Actually, we have not taken 22 a position reporting 1001. 23 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Wc11, the State

MS. YANOFF: But we're not -- we actually

24

25

organization has.

are not and we don't rubber stamp.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, then why don't they hold public hearings? I would suggest that you take this back to your group and groups statewide and ask them to do what I'm doing and hold some public hearings on that bill that the chairman refused to do. I don't understand what's wrong with holding public hearings like I'm doing. I've been slated by people in Harrisburg in Children and Youth Services because I wanted to oblige my committee. I just wanted to vote the bill out, debate it on the floor of the House like we did in the last session, you know. Some of the members wanted to have public hearings. Okay. We voted. So I—

MR. CERVONE: I would suggest to you the folks that are afraid to come forward on 826 are as many of those who fear reprisal from reporting as they might be as you and your staff suggest the fear of reprisal for the disclosure of the problems with the system.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Absolutely.

MS. YANOFF: I just want to say just that neither of us are associated with or are a part of a larger State association. We both are independent, representing independent nonprofits. We -- I wanted to

just urge that the State continue to err on the side of protecting the child, that in the parens patriae historic responsibility, we have to provide more protection for those who are not adults than it has and for those who are weaker than for those who are stronger and adults. And the analogy to rape victims is not appropriate. I'm sorry, the analogy is to accused rapists, not — the child is the victim in abuse.

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

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I never said anything different from my opening remarks that we have got to do everything humanly possible and those who have committed those violent type crimes against children should be thoroughly prosecuted. I have never deviated from that. What I am saying to you is that when it's being used as a weapon in an arsenal with attorneys in divorce and custody, and Counselor, you know it as well as I that they do in fact advise clients to use these weapons as tools of destruction in contested divorce and custody cases. Wrong as it may be, it is a weapon to be used in the arsenal and it is It is not right. It's not right, but certainly used. it's done. Now, that's wrong and I think we all would agree that that's wrong.

How do we make someone whole? In cases

that we've already heard in Pittsburgh and Harrisburg,	
cases that we're going to hear today of people that	
were falsely accused, and we're so concerned about the	
rights of children. What about the rights of the	
people that have been falsely accused? How do you make	
them whole? How does society deal with that? How do	
you put together a family that has been destroyed? How	
do you give them the financial well-being that	
somebody's lost their job, their reputation? Their	
lives have been physically, emotionally, mentally	
forever torn apart because somebody somewhere wanted to	
do them harm. We heard this over and over again, and	
I'm thinking to myself, it's wrong. And I know what	
you're saying, we've got to protect the children, we've	
got to protect the children. What about the people	
that are being falsely accused? How do we protect	
them?	

- 22

MR. CERVONE: I'm a parent, Shelly's a parent. I don't know if you are.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes. I am a parent.

MR. CERVONE: I prefer a system, I prefer a system in which my child has the protection which the current system affords. If there were an opportunity somehow for a person who's been wrongly accused to step

back from that accusation and say how can we do this, how can we allow these reports to come forward because I need my child protected. We consider it a kind of necessary fault of the system to the extent that you would find it that we promote reporting. And that we sort them out judiciously, cautiously, professionally, and thoroughly. That's the investigative scheme of the CPSL. That's the mind of the law. And it seems to me that's the mind of the parent who has ultimately the child's interests. The parent who says, I don't care what it takes, even if I'm going to be jailed, I don't care what it takes for my child to be cared for. Now, I know that's difficult for somebody to—

I think I've said enough.

AUDIENCE: Too much.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Please, please.

MR. CERVONE: We appreciate the opportunity to testify and to answer your questions.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I appreciate your testimony. I really do. I think one of the things that we can all agree upon, whether you're in favor or opposed to any legislation, and I've dealt with more volatile issues than this over the prochoice, prolife issues, product liability, just to name a few, tort reform, court reform, impeachments that will end up

with my committee, I get the whole gamut and it's not easy. And none of these jobs are easy or these decisions. I do appreciate your testimony and if you do have any suggestions or there are some things that I think we do have questions on and it's developing standards, qualifications, ongoing education. I think that is at the very least I think should be an area that we can work with.

MS. YANOFF: Absolutely.

MR. CERVONE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you very much for testifying.

Rama Kaira.

AUDIENCE: I would encourage you to stay.

This is your work. If you're truly concerned about children, get a broader perspective.

MR. CERVONE: I assure you, I've heard it.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Rama. We'll continue with the hearing, and if you have written statements that you'd like to share with us, I assure you we will make duplicate copies of everything that we have and when this is transcribed we'll make sure that members of the committee have it for their own edification.

while Rama is getting his material set and getting set up, let me just say to those of us that are here today, and I don't know, I guess it's the first time I'm meeting almost all of you except for the one I personal I met yesterday in Harrisburg, I have no particular axe to grind with this legislation, but it bothers me that people can so glibly talk about our rights and take them so glibly. I don't hold it that way. I'm not a civil libertarian. I have my own agenda about various issues, but it sure as hell reminds me of Nazi Germany with Hitler and imposing his will on the people. And if anybody can't see that from the testimony that we're getting and what we're hearing from one end of the State to the other, then they're blind, deaf and dumb.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I mean, I am sick and tired of hearing the nonsense that there's no problems, there's no problems, there's no problems. I clearly told them that in Harrisburg and Pittsburgh that if they would like to see a demonstration of the numbers of people that have been abused, maybe that's what it's going to take to open people's eyes as to how much false reporting is really going on and how the system is really being abused. And we need to educate

those people in Harrisburg, different legislators, that have the mind that it is not going on and everything is fine and we need to give them more authority and more money.

But Rama, go ahcad.

MR. KAIRA: My name is Rama Kaira. I'm a first generation immigrant and by profession I'm an engineer. I work for a large corporation in this area.

I am an excellent example of an American dream realized and lost to an American tragedy in my short time that I've been in this country. I have been falsely accused of sexual abuse of my daughters, and that was in the context of a custody hearing. And I was expecting that because I was recommended for custody of my daughters. I have been taking care of my daughters for about a year until that time. Also, my ex's attorney had given a real threat to my attorney citing this kind of technique in a previous case that he had used to send kids to a mental hospital for the weekend and prepare them for a rehearsed testimony, and that's how he had won the custody of those kids.

Even though I was expecting that, my custody hearing was set for December 14, and that was Monday. On December 11, I get this call from Children and Youth Services, and that was Friday, about 3:00

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's when I got the chilling effect. the chilling effect. Look how I'm recommended for custody of my two daughters and look at the timing of this situation. On Friday afternoon, when I won't be able to do anything over the weekend. I get this call. I demanded the caller that I be given a lie detector test so we get to the matter of truth in this case. She finally talked to her supervisor and she got her supervisor to agree to see us the same evening. after all those people, I used to have a very bad impression of Children and Youth Services. There are some good people in Children and Youth Services. lady went out of her way to see us that same evening. And we went there, we talked to her, we explained how the situation. I had transcripts from an earlier hearing in which the custody evaluator had testified that my ex had abused the kids. So that was a documented proof that she was the one who was a child abuser and not me. I was only being framed in this case.

She determined the charges were unfounded and she promised me to give me an unfounded letter for Monday morning's court hearing. And then also she suggested as a cautionary measure that I take these girls to some doctor and have them examined, even

though she was very much satisfied but for my protection she had suggested that.

1.3

From that point on my nightmare began, sir. Right from that office I went to a Montgomery Memorial Hospital in Norristown to have these children examined. Nobody wanted to touch them. All of that weekend I took these girls from doctor to doctor, and I didn't want these girls to be examined by a male doctor, I wanted these girls to be examined by a female doctor so the trauma is minimized. As it is they were going through a trauma and then I didn't want them to be examined by a male doctor. I called all the hospitals in this area, all the doctors, nobody wanted to touch those girls. Maybe it was for better in their prospect that they were spared of even that trauma.

Monday morning I went to CYS office to get that letter. Even though she had assured me that, I had this lingering doubt in my mind that there may be a problem, there may be a problem, and until I had that letter in my hand I was praying and praying for my daughters. That's all I did. Finally, and fortunately, I had a letter before the custody hearing.

I reached the custody hearing Monday morning, I gave the letter to my attorney, and at that time my attorney took the letter to the judge's office.

To cut this story short, sir, in this case I was given the custody of my daughters, I still have custody of my daughters. But if I had not met with this lady who was so genuine and so right in CYS, it was a matter of luck, that's all there was to it, I could not have the custody of those daughters. And I didn't want to let custody of my daughters to court. I was asking the court to give those children to more responsible person who can take better care of those kids. I didn't win anything by getting custody. It's more responsibility for me. I am to work harder for that. But I was found to be more responsible parent. In fact, the judge had written in his opinion that Mr. Kaira has effective parenting skills and the children have thrived and prospered under the present arrangement. The decision came in the middle of January 1993, because at the hearing we did not get the decision. We got the decision afterwards, and the saga continues.

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

Since that time, during this year, I've been accused of abuse because the calls have either been made to police or to CYS about five or six times in four months. She does not want to quit because the system helps her. The system plays into her hands.

And it plays into some men's hands, too. It's not that I'm here putting my ex-wife down or putting ladies down

or putting families down. I'm here for the children, not for fathers or not for males or against females. I'm here for the children. My children have gotten hurt. Many other children have gotten hurt by this system. And I'll show how the system is flawed. My data, is only gotten from the 1992 child abuse report and I can show the system is seriously flawed.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now comes the part of the malicious reporting, sir. My ex had gotten in touch with one of the neighbors with whom I have little disagreement over certain issues but I can't pick a fight with her or anything. We just disagreed on certain things. So my ex sensed that and she befriended one of my neighbors. Now she wants to come pick up the girls and drop them back. She has no business befriending my neighbors other than to try to defame me, and that's exactly what she has done. So she got this lady from my neighborhood to call the police and again making accusations of abuse. And this lady wrote me a letter after I found out about it and I didn't want to challenge her or anything, she still wrote me a letter, sir, and I have all this material with me and I would like to give you copies of all that, sir. Part of this letter says, and it's really malicious: "I have watched so many nationalities such as yours come to this

country and immigrating as you, you are of white race and become instantly racist against blacks. You are no better than I am.

These statements clearly show that this person is malicious. She has some sort of inferiority complex from me or from somebody. This person has problems, and in order to get back at me, she made these accusations. There are a lot of malicious accusations and I have proof of that.

Now, the subsequent conference with CYS are not pleasant, not like the first one. In fact, I talked to one lady at CYS and immediately she asked me, how could you have custody of your children? Who gave you custody of your children? I want to talk to your attorney. I was terrified by this, saying, wait a minute, some of these people have hidden agendas about fathers having custody of their children. What is going on? This place is infiltrated by feminists who have hidden agendas. Instead of these people being only concerned about the welfare of the child, they are concerned about how come fathers have custody of their children?

Now, this whole thing has devastated my life. I used to think I have nerves of steel until I got this atom bomb. That's how it is known in the

circles by attorneys and social workers. Now, we all know atom bombs can evaporate steel, and that's exactly what happened to me.

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

While some of the police reports that I got from the police department, after -- they would not give me police reports. If I'm accused of something, I should be entitled to those police reports. wouldn't give them to me. Even now there are some police reports, they wouldn't give them to me. They said that you have to go get subpoenas. I took subpoenas there and they still won't give me all the reports. I don't have the right to find out what I'm accused of. That's a shame. That's an absolute shame. But I got one of the reports, which was written as a result of this accusation, and this report sets, and this is written by a detective, Angie, my older daughter's name, she's 11, and the report says, 'Angie appears to be brainwashed, almost to the point of being programmed to hate her father." Ever since the final decision came, sir, my ex has started working upon those girls, absolutely. Horribly, If I continue the report, sir, again. "At one point Angle stated that no one should have a dad, and that when she gets married she is not inviting her dad to the wedding. After she gets married she's getting a divorce, " unquote. That's what the detective's report says. I have a copy of that. I'll give you that too, sir.

Now, I have some material here, sir, some papers that let me get these papers here because I'll be reading from some of these papers, the very last one. It turns out that the agencies that are chartered to take care of children, they are destroying the children. Let me quote something from one of those reports. "A court appointed panel of 13 experts reviewed the entire Illinois child welfare system." I don't — there was no study made like that for Pennsylvania are, sir.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I've asked for one. Yesterday.

MR. KAIRA: It's number one, sir, on the page. A court appointed panel of 13 experts reviewed the entire Illinois child welfare system and their handling of the 23,000 children in custody. The report establishes that the agency charged with preventing child abuse and neglect is itself abusing and neglecting thousands of children. Are we that far from Illinois? Just because we have this agency in Pennsylvania it would be perfect and it's not nothing to do? It may not be like the agency in Illinois? I don't think so. We've got some of the same

shortcomings right here. And if you read some of the other things from the paper that is there, the alleged child victims and real victims of sexual misuse. I'm going to quote, "If adults make a mistake and treat nonabused children as if they had been abused, it is not benign. \* Smith 1992, and their references are at the back. A psychotherapist describes a letter brought to him on the fourth visit by Stephanie, a 17-year1d psychotherapy client. And here the letter goes: "I am so miscrable, Dr. Smith, I need your help now. As you know. I have told you how my mother and I just don't like each other. We fight and argue all the time, but I have never told you why. When I was little, 6 I think, I dearly loved my dad. I think he and I were very close and did many things together. I know my mom and dad didn't get along but somehow things were all right between me and my parents. Then one day my mother told me my father was very sick and needed to go to a doctor to get well. She told me I would have to say that my dad had hurt me by touching me in places that were nasty. She said if I would say this, dad would have treatment and gct better and be a nicer dad to me and bring me more presents. My mother rehearsed me that that was what I was to say and then took me to a doctor in another city and practiced with me again

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

what I was to say and I said what she told me to say. Later my mom said that dad had to go to hospital to get the help he needed, but when I was 12 I found out he was in prison because he had molested me. Once I got to see dad in prison he told me he had written me many times, but Dr. Smith, I never received any of those letters. I think mom burned them. Later mom told me that dad was living in another State. Just last night my mom and I got in a big fight and she told me dad had committed suicide. I feel so bad I am to blame because I lied for my mom. I hate her, I hate myself, I can't stand myself, I can't wait to leave home when I get older. Please help me. Dr. Smith. And there is a comment by the author of that letter, author of that paper, it says the next night Stephanie died from an overdose of her mother's sleeping medication.

Let me read a few more things from the same document, sir. I think they're really relevant here. 'Much has been made to the harm of children if there is a false negative decision. That is failing to identify a child as abused when it is true. This conclusion ignores the damage done to innocent people who represent the false positive generated by the system. Also the severity of damage may be greater when a nonabused child is treated as if abused than

when an abused child is not correctly identified. The justice system must begin to consider this possible reality and to ask how accuracy of decisionmaking may be improved.

England here as to how false accusations of child abuse affect people who have been accused. A study of 13 families that who were erroneously charged of sexual abuse was recently carried out in England by Westminster College, Oxford. The study examined the process of investigation, outcomes, and the effects on children, parents, and extended families, all suffering post-traumatic shock. The report also suggests that the type of counseling required by these families is unique and the closest model is that of victims of violence. They are disabled because an external force has assaulted them and turned their lives apart.

document. "Even if allegations are eventually judged to be false, the family, including the alleged child victim, will have been severely traumatized by the allegation. Schultz surveyed 100 families falsely charged with sexual abuse and almost all reported major disruption and trauma. Davis and Rapucci surveyed 85 men who had claimed to have been falsely charged with

abusing their children or stepchildren. Almost all, regardless of whether they had been found guilty of abuse or not, reported a variety of negative effects in diverse areas of their lives."

Robinson, 1991 reported on the Minnesota families in which 25 adults were accused on the aftermath for the Scott County, Minnesota, families in which 25 adults were accused of abusing their own and other children. The charges were dropped after only one did go to trial and ended in an acquittal and the children eventually were returned home. However, the families all experienced severe dysfunction and distrust, and perhaps emotional damage to the accused and the accuser alike. Whiteback remarks, "Acquittal of charges cannot undo the damage. Even unsupported charges tend to leave lingering doubt among friends, family and associates."

whole situation. I don't know how I'm able to manage to take care of my children and take care of my job for the sake of my children and be able to function. I think it's basically because of my prayers. In this whole situation only God has been with me and no one else. Your friends fall apart, your friendship circle, your society falls apart. Everybody turns away from

you when you're in this situation. You're all by yourself fighting an anonymous system which says, no, you can't do that. It just destroys us completely.

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

real perpetrators, in my opinion, are worse criminals acting true on positive cases of child abuse perpetrators should be hanged. They've got no right to mess with the children who can't take care of themselves. God has given those children to take care of them because they can't take care of themselves. And real child abusers should be punished tremendously. They should be hanged. But then at the same time, the people who are abusing children indirectly should be punished, too. False accusation of child abuse is indirect abuse of children. It should be treated the same way. It should not be treated differently. All fathers -- most of the accusations are made against fathers. All fathers are not bad. All fathers are not dead beat dads. Some of us put our lives and our livelihoods on the line for our children but we do not get any help or encouragement from any of the agencies, any of the groups. There are no groups to help fathers in this whole situation. It is only in America where gays get more attention than fathers, who want to take care of their children. Some of them who are forced to give up are labeled irresponsible.

1 It is really very hard for fathers who 2 genuinely care for their children to be able to take 3 care of them under the conditions of divorce. They 4 have to deal with enormous divorce industry. That's what it is. It is an industry which consists of 5 6 attorneys, child welfare workers, social workers, 7 Children and Youth Services. It's an industry. These 8 children advocacy groups are not advocating for 9 children. They're advocating for their own pockets. If they were advocating for children, they would be 10 11 looking at this whole situation from children's 12 standpoint and not from agency standpoint. People who 13 come here to testify that they get paid while there is a conflict of interest right there, we have taken time 14 15 off from work to be here and to make our voices heard, 16 and it's not just in some of these cases, as you said 17 sir, this is just a tip of the iceberg.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: That's where I would hope and pray that the media would start asking some of the probing questions as we tried to yesterday in Harrisburg.

MR. KAIRA: Yes, sir.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: About getting some actual facts and statistics.

MR. KAIRA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: They throw these numbers around like there's a tremendous increase in these areas and the facts, from what we're gathering, don't substantiate the agencies with their bloated figures. Something's wrong there. We tore them apart, even the Department of Welfare, on some of the figures that they were reporting. And when you let that type of statement go unchallenged, that these tremendous increases justify their going after additional money from the State, then that of course portends to the public that there's a tremendous problem out there that needs to be addressed. And it just really isn't the truth of the matter.

But, you know, therein lies the problem. How do you get the actual statistics unless you do a complete, unbiased study to gather up the information, to review these cases that are unfounded in fact and then take that one step further statewide by interviewing those families to find out exactly what has gone on? And I'm sure there are other people that are going to testify here today that are going to tell us about, and see, this is where I think a lot of people think it only involves divorce and custody issues. We know from the testimony and the letters that we've received already that there's a lot of false

reporting going on for all kinds of reasons. it's not only neighbors fighting other neighbors, and that was testified to yesterday. We had school officials, for whatever reasons, they overhear something that's being said and they think that they have to get involved and they do something, not realizing that they didn't get the whole story. You know, it's like taking half a story and printing it and not having the whole story. I mean, that would make And, you know, I agree with you, and this is where trying to educate the public, and we're at a total disadvantage, because as you saw here today, and it's like I was saying earlier and I don't want to continue on very long with this, when you point out to people that the agency people have a vested interest. they in fact are being paid, and in many cases the top people pay paid quite well.

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. KAIRA: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: So they're advocates. They're advocating for more.

MR. KAIRA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Then you have the stream of people, and we can document this. As a matter of fact, in Berks County, since we have a reporter here, I'm going to say this for the record

because I'm going to turn it in to the State Ethics Bureau next week, a director working for Children and Youth Services and an intake caseworker that worked during the day for Children and Youth Services and in the evening worked for a psychological firm that handles the very cases that are assigned from Children and Youth Services during the day. Now, if that isn't an ethical violation of conduct, I don't know what is. And I talked with the State Ethics Commission about this and they said absolutely that's an ethical violation. Now, who's going to do something about it? I mean, here you have a conduit of people working at the agency level then working here in the evening at a psychological firm that's doing a lot of the work for the agency people. I mean, if that doesn't appear to be a conflict of interest, I don't know what does. State Ethics Commission says that this is absolutely in conflict.

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

A lot of the people in the psychological business, psychologists, psychiatrists, and what not, certain firms get an awful lot of business from these various agencies in the counties. This whole area of family law, by the way, and Dave, the executive director, said to me his opinion is it should be turned inside out, upside down, that there has to be a

reshuffling of the deck when it comes to the family law area because of the tremendous injustices that are going on. And you're alluding to them. But we had asked specifically for some type of a study with the State.

MR. KAIRA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: To gather up this information from all the 67 counties and do an in-depth review so we could put together a report like they have in some of the other States to find out what's really going on out there. Let's say of the 30,000, 40,000 cases that were reported last year to the State. I don't know what the actual number is.

MR. KRANTZ: 50,000.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 50,000 area. That 30,000, 40,000 of them of unsubstantiated, unfounded. You know, all of a sudden you begin to say, well, you had the charts. Do you want to get into that?

MR. KAIRA: I would like to get into that, if I could.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay, finish.

MR. KAIRA: Sir, you're absolutely right about statistics the way they are used in the favor of Children and Youth Services. They collect a lot of statistics, but they don't know how to use them

properly. There is not a paragraph in this report that says we collected all these statistics and this is how we're going to use them to better ourselves.

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

CHAIRMAN, CALTAGIRONE: Um-hum.

MR. KAIRA: They ask for more money.

Now, how many of us go ask for a raise from our bosses without showing work?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, you know, let me just interject one other thing here because since we're in Philadelphia and Philadelphia has a high minority population, let me say this. I've heard from my efforts not only in my own area but in Pittsburgh, and we're starting to hear from Philadelphia. you're working and you have an income, you have the wherewithal and/or the resources to try to fight back -- this applies to both men and women, by the way. We've had as many women contacting us as men about the abuses that are going on. But if you happen to be poor and even worse, if you happen to either be black or Spanish, it's total devastation. You don't have any resources to fight back. And the travesties of justice that I've been hearing about with the poor people, whether you're black, white, or Hispanic, or whatever other nationality or race you happen to be, but if you just happen to be poor, they don't have any resources,

they don't have any wherewithal to go for help or to turn to people. And, I mean, somebody's got to look at that and say, this is appalling, what's happening. And somebody's got to advocate. And I think, you know, if a call went out by the legislators themselves at their own districts to try to get some information about what's going on in their own back yards, quick enough I think they'd start to find out that there's horrendous injustices that are occurring and they are as silent as the lambs because they don't have the wherewithal to 10 fight back. It's the system.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KAIRA: Yes, sir. You're absolutely right.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Go right ahead. Ī had to say that because we're hearing more and more from poor people too that don't have the resources to fight back, and it's devastating. I mean, as devastating as it may be on you and others in this room, just imagine what it might be on a lot of the people that just don't have the resources that many of you may have to have your case fought.

(Applause.)

MR. KAIRA: I had made.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We have two new Representatives. My subcommittee chairman, Harold

James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Harold James, James, 186th District, south Philly.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: My name is Tim Hennessey. I represent the 26th House District, which is northwest Chester County.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

MR. KAIRA: Sir, I had not too long ago,
I think sometime in February, I had written a letter to
all the State Representatives and State Senators. And
I sent out a little survey and I sent out a copy of
this article from the Wall Street Journal by Richard
Gardner, which points to—

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I remember this because I remember the survey.

MR. KAIRA: —which points to the scale of this problem, sir. And then this points to the fact that some States have to do certain things the way they've been doing them because of the Mondale Act of 1974. Well, my question to that kind of argument is, but wait a minute, with respect to — there should be checks and balances between Federal government and State government. Where are those checks and balances? Why do we have to do exactly what the Federal government tells us to do? With respect to rights of

unborn children, we're ready to challenge the Federal government and the Supreme Court. What about rights of born children? We should be taking rights of born children just as seriously. When Thomas Jefferson stated in the Declaration of Independence, within five miles of where we sit today, that we hold these truth is to be self-evident that all men are created equal and they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, I'm sure Thomas Jefferson was talking of everybody, including the rights of born children.

Now, it turns out that 20 years ago we could put a man on the moon but today why do we have to settle for our children being on the streets and on drugs? Why can't we be constructive in our ways to keep our children where they belong and in protective and caring homes? That should be the first of Children and Youth Services, not to punish people, not to create a whole industry and ask for more and more funding. A large number of children have been victimized by the divorce industry. We all know that. But we're all in this together. Just because those industry people are going to benefit today, down the road we are all going to lose as a nation. We do recognize the importance of

the North America Trade Treaty. We do recognize that we have to help Mexico and we have to work with Canada. Why don't we have the same feeling with respect to families within our own nation? We should have that. We should take care of each other. As long as we believe that we can run a society through remote control and laws like this one, and we want to be politically correct and acknowledge the fact that we have to be morally correct and endure some short-term pain for the long-term gain, as we have experienced in our growth, we will continue to fail our children and hence ruin the future of our country, which is held in the hands of our children. We must have laws and associated enforcement systems in place to punish the direct and indirect abuse in this particular manner, not just our indirect abuse also.

Now I think I want to get into this. And I have some handouts. Sir, I have put together some charts and some information. All of my information is based on this report, and I have no reason to believe that this report is unbiased. Also, there is no error of any nowhere that this report has been audited for accuracy. I haven't seen it. It may or may not be.

Now, if you would look at the data here, the red balls are substantiated reports and the green ones are

unsubstantiated reports. From 1981 to 1989 — 1991, I'm sorry. Now you see that unsubstantiated ones are way up there in. It turns out that there are two-thirds of the report are unsubstantiated and one-third are substantiated. So for every child this agency pretends to help, they destroyed two other families. They turned those families into dysfunctional.

And this is how it works. If I'm telling my child to pick up her dishes from the dining table after she's done cating and the child says, wait a minute, I figure a way out to get daddy into trouble, I'm going to call 911. I'm going to call the cops and I'm going to call Child Protective Services and they'll come and talk to daddy. The family gets turned into dysfunctional. Who are we helping? Are we helping those children? We're not helping them.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We're closest with our children and our grandchildren and we're the teachers of the system. And to have them go through lecturing, and people that have children know, you have to discipline them at times. There's no getting away from that. That's part of being a parent. That's parenting.

MR. KAIRA: That's a duty. .

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: But when at the teenager years when they start to exert their own independence, and those of you that may not have gone through this yet, you will go through it, you're going to be in direct conflict with some of the things they may or may not want to do that you may think are not in their best interests and you may have to discipline them. But what you were just alluding to when I was talking yesterday in Harrisburg, and coming down here again today, it was interesting that teachers are in fact advocating for children to report parents, and that was even testified to by one of the witnesses yesterday in Harrisburg. I just want to share that with you.

MR. KAIRA: Thank you, sir.

Sir, we are failing to take care of children in this country. This is the greatest country on earth and our children are treated very badly. By making laws like this, we are not talk taking care of our children, we're destroying them, basically. I have some statistics, I don't have any copies, I have some statistics on girls getting Ph.D.s in physics. There was an article about women in physics in this country and around the world. Girls and getting bachelors in physics and Ph.D.s in physics. As you can see, we are

towards the bottom of that list, sir. We are the last country. Philippines is towards the top of that list. India is towards the middle of that list, and United States is towards the bottom of that list. Why can't we encourage our children to excel in sciences or in other disciplines where they want to be? We're not taking care of our children the way we should be and the way we you're equipped to do so.

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, if I can point your attention to this graph right here, you can see that unsubstantiated reports are increasing rather rapidly than substantiated reports. Now, what I have done basically is I have drawn a line through these. I have estimated, drawn a regression line to get a trend to these two situations, and here are the results of those trends. Now, in this thing we have substantiated cases and unsubstantiated cases. Here is the slope of the line with respect to substantiated cases. Substantiated cases went up over that period by .87, and unsubstantiated cases went up by 2.77, over 2.77 over the same period. Now, what's wrong? We're not saying that this happened because of all of false reporting. It didn't happen, all of this, because of false It happened because these agencies are not reporting. doing their work right as well.

There are different factors. And there is one factor that we can do nothing about, and there is an inherent problem in any system. We have to be up to their level, beyond which we can't go up anymore. So we can see with the unsubstantiated cases went up three times as much as substantiated cases.

Now I said, oh, wait a minute, let me look at this whole situation with respect to who is reporting what. And most, a lot of these people are mandatory reporters, they are required to report the suspected child abuse by law. Some of them are not mandatory reporters, and let me try to figure out where is the problem. Is all of it because of false reporting, is all of it because of inefficiencies in the system, or where is that demarcation anyway? What percentage is because of false reporting and what percentage is because of inefficiencies in the system?

Now, the false reporting to be coming from everyone, right in? But malicious reporting can be coming from anonymous reporters and could be coming from a friend or neighbor, could be coming from a parent. That's where malicious false reporting could be coming from, and I'll show you if that is the case. Now, let's look at the same thing in the form of graphs. Now, the first one is anonymous. Here we look

at this information in the report. It doesn't make much sense to us, it is there and they have done their duty. They have provided the data, it doesn't make much sense. It is our job to organize the data and extract the knowledge or information from it. So for that purpose, I took this data and I ordered, let's see how are the referrals being made. Who is referring who? Now as you can see, landmark cases, one dentist and clergy. And coroner is towards the lower end of this referring. We don't want dying kids and coroners saying this kid was probably abused. It should be that way. That's fine. And the school is highest in our case. There may or may not be a problem there.

Now I'm concentrating on friend and neighbor and anonymous. Those two referrals are towards the high end of that scale. Let's look at their substantiated ratios. If the system was working perfectly, they would get 100 percent of substantiated ratios, assuming that all referrals were made with complete faith. There was no maliciousness in that account. The quality of information was highest. But that would not happen, I believe. We would have some problem even if there was no maliciousness, even if the system was perfect that would happen.

Now, let's look at what's happening in

terms of substantiated cases, which is sort of a measure of effectiveness of the system. Now, if you look at this, what happened to friends and neighbors and anonymous cases? They are towards the lower end of that scale. Why did we allow people to call anonymously? They are towards the high end of the scale when we talk about referrals, and when we talk about substantiation they are towards the low end of the scale. What is the problem here? Why are most of those cases false and unfounded? Because if there is a malicious person who wants to get someone into trouble, you're allowed to make a call anonymously, you're going to make a call anonymously.

Now let's look at some other disturbing statistics. And I brought this because it turns out that fathers get the blame for child abuse. These are the deaths in 1991. I don't have the report for 1992. It turns out that I basically had to pull my teeth to get that report. The report officially came out Wednesday when I was talking to someone called Mr. Woods there. I said, report is not out but could you please fax me the data so I can prepare for this hearing? They said, no, we have to wait until the report comes out. First a gentleman called me and said the report came out yesterday, and if you want some

I can't talk much because I'm busy, I got other things to do. So I couldn't get much information, other than that the 1992 deaths with respect to child abuse are basically the same.

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 here is what I was talking about. should be able to define why our system is not working. We want to prevent child abuse. So to prevent child abuse, we have this system which may be broken right now, let's try to fix it. Why is our system ineffective? We want to increase its effectiveness. So there should be a measure of effectiveness or inefficiencies of the system, and one of those measures, there could be many measures, one of those measures could be the rate of unsubstantiated reports. I believe if a call is made to ChildLine, that should be substantiated provided I know for sure the child was abused and I know this system is perfect, and if I know for sure the child was abused it is substantiated, we need to punish the guilty one. Not only are we going to punish the guilty one, we're going to show the guilty one that wait a minute, we got to show the guilty one the right way of taking care of that child. That should be part of the whole system. As is being done in a Hawaii. They have lately adopted that

approach.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, that doesn't happen. We have this problem with respect to substantiated and unsubstantiated. We have this gap. We want to close this gap in an ideal situation, but we know no system is perfect. We won't be able to close this gap completely. But we want to be able, if we want to have one family in the process, we don't want to destroy two other families. We're not helping anyone by doing If you want to help one family, maybe we should for every 10 families we want to help, maybe 1 gets. turned into dysfunctional, maybe we would say those are inherent problems in our system. We are not -- God made us and did not make us perfect, we did not make a perfect system. We're stepping into God's ways here, stepping into how the family should be handled, and that's basically where the problem is.

Now, that gap can be attributed to shortcomings of CYS. We have to address that very carefully, and, sir, you have pointed out one solution is that we should have qualified people there. There are no minimum requirements, and I called children and youth services on Monday I called them and I asked them, how many people do you have working who come in contact with

these people? What are their educational qualifications, what are minimum qualifications, what kind of salaries do they make? I practically got the runaround. I was transferred from that phone to another phone to another phone and back to the phone where I started from. And to this — as of yesterday, I did not get any of that information, sir. None. Because I wanted to talk about some of those things. I wanted to bring up some of those things.

Now, some of that gap is because of quality of information, quality of information when a person is making a referral, that information has to be of good quality for this whole thing. For us to be able to help our children. That quality of information is what is the problem. Most of the cases. And it's a serious problem in cases of custody disputes where these charges are made to gain advantage in custody situations. And as I've shown that anonymous callers as far as referrals are concerned, they are toward the high end—

(The next audio tape started at this point:)

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I think regarding the trends throughout that area is the comparison I think you were comparing to is roughly a 2

1 to 1 ratio I think you've been referring to it as a 2 2 to 1 ratio, that out of every three reports, one is substantiated. The numbers we're suggesting is about 3 one out of every four reports is substantiated. 4 MR. KAIRA: Well, no, from this I found 5 6 out that there is 30-percent substantiation ratio. 7 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: There's a difference from--8 9 MR. KAIRA: The ratio I'm showing on the second chart are increased. The unsubstantiated ones 10

are increasing three times as are substantiated ones.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: He figures it's almost 4 to 1.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Particularly the chart, if you can flip back to this for a second, maybe we can clear this up. In 1982, for example, you have 5,000 that were substantiated, and 15,000 that were unsubstantiated.

> MR. KAIRA: Yes.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: That's a total of 20,000, so it's roughly 4 to 1. And as I read the numbers, assuming the accuracy of your numbers here, that ratio seems to hold true throughout the chart. So it's really 25 percent substantiated, not a 32-percent substantiation rate.

1	MR. KATRA: So this rate is a little
2	different. This rate is talking about you heard
3	right about those numbers.
4	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Those numbers
5	are the same. What it's showing there is on the first
6	year is on the first year on the chart, the lines are
7	to the far left. You have roughly 20,000 reports of
8	which just less than 5,000 were substantiated. So
9	basically what you've done there is you've shown, the
10	way to get the total number of reports is to add those
11	numbers.
12	MR. KAIRA: Yes, sir. You're absolutely
13	right about that.
14	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: So the
15	substantiation rate shown in your reports is less than
16	you're giving yourself credit for or giving the numbers
17	credit for.
18	MR. KAIRA: Well, but this charge
19	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: N, the
20	substantiation is less.
21	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes, the
22	substantiation is much less.
23	MR. KAIRA: So this is not substantiation
24	rate here. That's not substantiation rate.
25	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I know. It's

roughly 3 to 1.

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. KAIRA: 3 to 1?

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Three unsubstantiated for every one that is substantiated.

MR. KAIRA: Yes, sir. What I was trying to do is I was trying to see this.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Which is one in for--

MR. KAIRA: I was trying to see what the rate of increase was here to the rate of increase here over this whole time period over these 11 years. Where is the trend going? Do we get more substantiation over a time period or do we get less substantiation over a time period? That's what I was trying to calculate and that's what I calculated there. See, I think this line is going up more rapidly than this one. And that's troublesome. It shouldn't be happening that way. And that shows that there are some serious problems either in the system or in the quality of information the system is getting. Now, it is the system's responsibility to make sure it gets good quality of referrals. If they want to do what they're charted to do they have to make sure the quality of incoming information is good. I can't be in business if I had a factory, I can't be in business if I didn't care about

the quality of raw material I'm getting. I would be out of business. They're not doing that.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Good point.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I have a question. You've been using, as I heard you talk you've been saying that out of every three families that are reporting, one is substantiated. I think to strengthen your argument I think the numbers that you've given us here actually show 4 to 1. Out of every four there's one that's substantiated, so that three are unsubstantiated.

MR. KAIRA: Yeah. Now, we talked about this large differences in the referrals and substantiation ratios are equal to quality of information, are attributable to quality of information. Now, we talked about these large differences in referrals that substantiation rates are attributable to quality of information and I'm being very, very — quite a bit of information we all know that a lot of that is malicious.

Now, there are some suggestions that I have put together and some of them are against the recommendations that appear in this report. This report talks about some recommendations. We'll get to that. My recommendation is that we should abolish

1 man
2 tha
3 rep
4 the
5 rep
6 abu
7 inc
8 to
9 it.
10 Als
11 hav

mandated reporting, as Dr. Gardner has recommended in that article. And this report suggests that the reporter may not have firsthand knowledge of abuse, they may not even have to see the child and they could report. They could call the ChildLine for possible abuse. That's wrong. Can't do that. You want to increase the true positive; that doesn't mean you want to increase the whole ending. That's not the way to do it. We must not have that sort of system in place. Also, this report recommends that CYS employees should have immunity from liability. Wait a minute. Who does have immunity from liability?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Judges.

MR. KAIRA: Do you have immunity? How many here are immune from liability here? If you do terrible on your job, you lose it. We all expect to lose it. We don't have immunity from liability. Why should they have immunity from liability? This bill, 826, or is 836, is meaningless. We have seen and we will see false accusations of child abuse are tripling. The crime is horrendous. And we allow the people to call anonymously. As I have shown, the quality of information from anonymous callers is very, very low. We must not have that. We should do away with anonymous. We don't get much out of it anyway, and we

1 . must increase the penalty. The penalties recommended 2 in this bill is basically a slap on the hand. penalty must fit the crime. The crime is much greater 3 than a slap on the hand, which is, what, equal to 4 probably illegal dumping or something like that. We 5 have to challenge the Mondale Act. What is stopping 6 7 the State of Pennsylvania to challenge the Mondale Act of 1974? We can't do it as individuals, the State has 8 9 to. We have to do it for the sake of our children. 10 What is wrong with that? We would be the leader in this whole nation taking care of our children. Let 11 12 others known from the State of Pennsylvania our 13 children are taken care of. This is where the 14 Declaration of Independence was signed. Why can't we 15 believe it today in all those respects when we could be 16 much more law abiding? That's all I have to say. 17 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you very

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you very much. Are there questions?

Representative James.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am really impressed with and thank you for testifying. I'm impressed with the documentation that you have outlined, though I may tend to disagree with some of the thoughts. One in terms of anonymous

reporting, and I understand your reasoning for saving that it shouldn't be, but as a retired police officer, Anonymous reporting can be good if it's used professionally and correct. And I don't think that's something that we should take away from doing that. It's just like one of the problems we had with a lot of crime in our communities is that people are afraid to report crimes because it don't affect them, it affects their neighbor, and then when it affects them they wonder why nobody didn't report it. And they're afraid because they don't want to get involved. So we need to have a mechanism that people can say things. But what we also need to have is professional agencies that do the job the way it should be. And I think maybe one of the problems may be, and you talked about the investigations. I think, and you said something about, you alluded to the fact that they maintain their job by continuing or to come up with these reports. that's bad. And we need to change that. We need to make sure that the people that do the investigations or that there are people that do the investigations and that's what we need to work on in terms of agencies. I would, do you see that like when there's an allegation made and then somebody comes to check, I don't know how that process works, but it would seem to me that that's

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

1 where one of the key areas needs to be strengthened. 2 How would you suggest that be strengthened? MR. KAIRA: I have a comment on your 3 4 anonymous reporting issue, sir, before I answer that 5 question. Why do we have anonymous reporting? Because б people are afraid to get involved, right? Why are 7 people afraid to get involved? Because the way the 8 system is, it doesn't work, right? 9 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: It doesn't work 10 properly. 11 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: It doesn't work 12 properly. 13 MR. KAIRA: It doesn't work properly. 14 Why shouldn't we try to fix that instead of creating a 15 situation in another system? One part of the system is 16 broken and in order to accommodate that we're willing 17 to make another part of the system which is going to 18 have shortcomings but because the other one is broken. 19 The rate of substantiated from anonymous calls is 20 lowest. Why is it lowest? 21 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Well, I think 22 that's why my question to you in terms of the 23 investigation is lowest is because there's no 24 factfinding. There seems to be a problem with maybe

the investigators or whoever goes out to check those in

25

terms of doing the job professionally. And it could be because they wanted to substantiate to keep the job.

Like, for example, in the police department, you know, sometimes good police officers were recognized as people that made the most stops, that made the most arrests, that wrote the most tickets, but that don't necessarily mean that's a good police officer. A good police officer should be one where there's no crime around the neighborhood, around where he was patrolling, and he wouldn't have those kind of statistics. So the priorities and what they're trying to substantiate as good is wrong, and I think that's what we need to straighten out.

MR. KAIRA: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: We need so because somebody makes an allegation, we have to make sure that there's a professional that checks that allegation, that checks it in a way that it can be a factfinding. That's why I'm asking how you think we can include that aspect. Then we will make sure those anonymous calls are either substantiated or not substantiated.

MR. KAIRA: This problem is much bigger than the time we have and the one we have right now. It's a very serious problem with respect to, why do we have a drug problem right now, so much drug problem in

this country. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Because there's no 3 real war on drugs. 4 MR. KAIRA: I beg your pardon? REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: There's no real 5 6 war on drugs. 7 MR. KAIRA: Why do people go on drugs? That's the fundamental question. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Profit. MR. KAIRA: It's my job to make sure that 10 11 I provide a good, healthy environment for my child to 12 make sure that my child doesn't even think about 13 something like that. My child gets high in creativity. not from drugs. That's what my job is. Am I being 14 15 held to do my job? Definitely not. REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Well, how do you 16 17 think, based on your experience, because you seem to have done a lot of good work in this, and I just want 18 an idea from you, how do you think that we can improve 19 20 the professionalization, if that's the right word, of 21 somebody that's going to check these facts, based on 22 anonymous calls? 23 MR. KAIRA: Based on anonymous calls? 24 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Right. 25 MR. KAIRA: First the anonymous person

has to be met with.

REPRES

you an example, and
an anonymous call.

MR. KA

REPRES

that received an and
that? How would you
accuracy of it?

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay, let me give you an example, and I want you to answer me. You get an anonymous call.

MR. KAIRA: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: You are the agency that received an anonymous call. How would you check that? How would you check that so we could see the accuracy of it?

MR. KAIRA: I would call, even if I had to call that parent I would call that parent, meet with that parent away from home. I would talk to that person, not that we are calling from Children and Youth Services and we have received a report against you. I would talk to that person, maybe you're having difficulty, you received this call, not talk to the child. When you talk to children like that they are under a lot of stress. Children are not comfortable talking to strangers.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So your first action would to be talk to their parent?

MR. KAIRA: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay.

MR. KAIRA: In a nice, constructive way.

And we all know these agencies do not work in a

constructive way.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Right.

MR. KAIRA: I would talk to their parent and I would say, if there is any difficulty, how we can help, not how we want to punish you.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Good point.

MR. KAIRA: I think I could divulge a substantiation. That is the way things are dealt right Now, in terms of procedure, when a call is now, sir. made, sir, when the call was made against me for the second time, I asked the person what the procedure was. She would not tell me what the procedure is. that person, you tell me where do we go from here? What do we do? What are your responsibilities? What are my responsibilities? Explain them to me. She would not do that. She said she couldn't tell me that. Then I asked to talk to her supervisor and I asked the same question. Her supervisor said to me, how do you have custody of your children? Who gave you custody of your children? Let me talk to your attorney. You know, I think, wait a minute, this place is full of biased people. They think fathers cannot take care of their children. Wait a minute, the only way for fathers to take care of their children is to write a check for child support. You tell me a place where you can buy fathers' or even mothers' love by money? Who can sell that and who can buy it? You can't do it.

Father's as well as mother's love cannot be bought.

I feel very emotionally about this thing, but I'm looking at this whole situation from children's standpoint and we are failing our children, whether we are mothers or we are fathers, no matter where we are we are seriously failing our children.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay, let me ask you, you talked also about mandatory reporting and I think that may be a problem somewhere. If you say, and let's say if we talked about eliminating mandatory reporting are you saying then that maybe the health professionals, if they noticed something, should not say anything?

MR. KAIRA: They should.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay.

MR. KAIRA: But then it is up to them and they should have enough guidelines to insure that they are providing quality information. The idea is to provide quality information into the system so they have quality output.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay, because on the mandatory reporting, they are afraid that if they don't report them they may be sued?

1	MR. KAIRA: That's why they report
2	they don't care.
3	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So they may report
4	things that aren't accurate?
5	MR. KAIRA: Yeah. They don't care.
6	They're just trying to cover themselves.
7	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay.
8	MR. ΚΛΙRA: That's all they're doing.
9	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: That's something I
10	heard in doing some health care hearings talking about
11	defensive, some kind of defensive mechanism?
12	MR. KAIRA: yes, sir.
13	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay.
14	MR. KΛIRA: This whole process, I don't
15 .	know whether you studied physics or not.
16	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: No, no, no, no. I
17	barely
18	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: That's another
19	hearing.
20	MR. KAIRA: Well, when you try to observe
21	an event, an observer has an effect on the observed.
22	It's a fundamental thing. So when an investigation is
23	made, a damage is done. In your report, and I don't
24	know, Mr. Chairman, would we be able to get the report?
25	The '91

1	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Oh, yeah. That's
2	from the Department of Welfare.
3	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So we could get
4	that.
5	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yeah.
6	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: You could probably
7	get that for all of us on the committee.
8	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Oh, yeah.
9	MR. KAIRA: 1992 is out also, sir.
10	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay, we'11 get
11	them both. Because your chart is based on '91.
12	MR. KAIRΛ: Absolutely. Yes, sir.
13	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: The people that do
14	the investigating, are they people that usually work
15	for the DA's office or work for the child care
16	agencies, or is this a combination?
17	MR. KAIRA: They work for child care
18	agencies, sir.
19	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Okay. A11
20	right, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm just sorry that I
21	won't be able to stay for the rest of the hearing, but
22	I understand the chairman is going to provide us with
23	all the testimony because I have to go back to D.C. In
24	fact, I came in from D.C. this morning to support the

chairman and support this. I think this needs to be

and to use this information to improve, because I think 2 3 you need to hear both sides and this is the only way we 4 can improve the system. 5 MR. KAIRA: Yes, sir. 6 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So thanks, and 7 thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 MR. KAIRA: So what happens, a lot of 9 times in hearings and matters like this, we tend to be 10 politically correct. We want to find political 11 solutions. A lot of times we all know that sometimes 12 we have to take short-term pain for long-term gain. 13 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: That's true. 14 MR. KAIRA: And sometimes we ignore that 15 and sometimes there's this tenacity that we're going to 16 make certain laws, it's like remote control and society 17 is going to behave like that. That doesn't happen. 18 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Well, that's what 19 the House of Representatives did the other day in terms 20 of short-term gain for long-term pain when they talked 21 about eliminating transitionally needy people from the 22 public welfare. It's exactly what they did. But okay, 23 thanks again. 24 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative

We need to hear about this kind of information

aired.

1

25

Hennessey.

## BY REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: (Of Mr. Kaira)

- Q. Mr. Kaira, I think everybody agrees that the systems that we set up sometimes get out of control, sometimes very badly so, and what we're trying to do is find a way to put the system back into synchronization so that we have the balance that was originally intended. Let me suggest something to you. You've shown us these charts and you've shown us that there's a lot of anonymous reporting that goes on, although not so much in terms of percentage wise or actual raw numbers compared to the hospital reporting.
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And yet on the other chart you indicated that the credibility, if you will, of anonymous reporters is rather low.
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. I would suggest to you that that doesn't necessarily mean that the system is bad. As a matter of fact, I suggest maybe it tells us that the system does work and in some cases very well because what it suggests to me is that when some agencies get anonymous reports they treat them rather skeptically and don't believe them. Now, I realize that for somebody here who has been affected by an anonymous report you're not likely to line up and read the same chart that same

5

way, but what the chart shows me is that when there's an anonymous report, it's not often believed, and that may be the result of agencies actually doing their job and taking a rather suspicious approach to that kind of report.

As Representative James was saying, you know, in police work, anonymous reports are sometimes the only kind of reports you get and they can be very valuable. They could sometimes help you to crack cases that you wouldn't crack otherwise. The low substantiation rate though I think tells me that the agencies do look at these as a little more seriously and perhaps don't accept them at face value the way they might from the reports from the coroner or from law enforcement or from the school. So I guess we can look at the same charts and come up with different conclusions based on that.

- A. Sure. Sure.
- Q. Do you have, maybe the report makes it available to you, how these statistics varied about counties? I would be interested in knowing how these statistics varied by county, because the counties have their own agencies, generally. I would be interested in knowing whether or not we could find that certain counties have much higher incidents of anonymous

1 reporting and a much higher rate of believing beyond 2 this report. 3 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: That's a good 4 point. MR. KAIRA: No, they don't have that kind 5 6 of detail county by county. 7 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Perhaps we can 8 get that. 9 MR. KAIRA: Okay. REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Because that 10 11 would be interesting to find out whether we have certain counties that rely more on anonymous reporting 12 13 than others, and in others, whether or not once they 14 get that report that they tend to believe the anonymous 15 reports more frequently in one county than another. 16 MR. KAIRA: You're right. This is 17 something that we have to analyze based on the data 18 that is available and what analysis can be made based 19 on the data that is available. And I have spent just a 20 few days doing this, taking time off from my full-time 21 work and taking time off from my full-time parenting to 22 put this together. 23 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Well, I 24 appreciate the efforts you put forth and the charts.

I've made some notes on the copies of the reports that

25

you've given me, charts you've given me, because I
think it tends to help me in focusing my question when
I'm talking about or talk with or interviewing people
from the agency standpoint.

MR. KAIRA: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: To find out where they're coming from and what kind of an approach they take as far as an anonymous report as opposed to some report that comes in from an institution that they tend to be, or that these charts would indicate that are more credible in the long run.

MR. KAIRA: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. I think that perhaps one approach, you know, is as I've been trying to figure out some solution to this particular problem, to certainly find out ways when we get an anonymous report, and perhaps for that matter will all of these almost any report, to have as early and as quick a preliminary determination, if you will, as to whether there's anything substantive to it and then get it resolved as quickly as possible with as little disruption to the family. The purpose of the statutes and the purpose of the House or the government in setting up these agencies is not to be disruptive to the families, although I don't know that can sometimes

1 occur.

MR. KAIRA: I differ with that sometimes. It happens most of the time, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: What's that?

MR. KAIRA: These agencies basically disrupt your family life.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Well, you said that any kind of investigation is going to be disruptive. I would say, yes, there's going to be some disruption just in going through the process yourself. My point is that the agencies were not set up by the government to create that kind of disruption. The government generally wants to try to foster a solid family life. It's counterproductive for us not to do that. But what we have to realize is sometimes our efforts go astray and sometimes even the best of intentions can be twisted and perverted by the personalities that are hired to do the detail work that have to be done.

So I appreciate the information and as I said, I will reuse some of the statistics that you've shown us here to try to focus questioning on other people when we're hearing from the other side.

MR. KAIRA: Certainly, and if I come up with other interesting information, I'll point them out

to you.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Well, if you come up with any information, that difference by county, I would like to encourage you to give us that information.

MR. KAIRA: Sure. Sure.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I want to thank you personally.

MR. KAIRA: I have one comment.

MR. KRANTZ: Can I see the book a minute?

MR. KAIRA: Yes, sir. I have one comment with the anonymous calling issue. If we don't do away with the anonymous calling issue, this bill is going to be left with a gapping hole. Another thing is, if I wanted to bring up an incidence of child abuse, I think I consider personally that could be a noble cause. If I have any integrity in my judgment, it really is a noble cause. Why would I want to hide my face? I would talk to the person directly myself. If you need some help, I'm there to help you.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: I'm sorry, I didn't understand. Who did you say you were?

MR. KAIRA: Sir, if I suspect child abuse at a neighbor's place, I would go talk to their family. This is what we have lost.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: That is what we want.

MR. KAIRA:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: It presents a danger sometimes. It depends on the area and the neighborhood. That's probably where we should be spending more of our time with money, in helping our neighborhoods and our schools and our families.

That's what I would do.

But one thing I did want to ask that while the Representatives are here, and I wanted to share with you, too, yesterday at the hearing in Harrisburg I had suggested that we ask one of the State agencies, and we could do this through a resolution, to perform just such a study, county by county, to find out exactly how these reports that they give us, I mean, these figures and information that they run by us to testify to these bloating budgets each year, little do we know at times whether or not it's really justified. What I'd like to see on the substantiated and unsubstantiated reports is a complete, thorough breakdown and an in-depth study county by county and they can do that very quickly by getting the information from the counties, and then of course going out and researching sample counties to find out, you know, what was involved, what happened to you, and

extract whatever information that they can from those
that had been unfounded, unsubstantiated, and start to
build a case. And I think a sampling of that, which is
done in many areas that we deal with in State
government, can pretty well paint the picture for what
we need to get to make at the decisions.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MAN IN AUDIENCE: May I also suggest that if you undertake that course of action, that the information that be interpreted outside the agencies.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Oh, yes. We have State governmental agencies that work specifically for the legislature, like the Crime Commission, even though people have different views on what they do and what they don't do, but they answer to us, not the Governor, not the Attorney General, not anybody else. answer specifically. The Legislative Budget and Review. Those are creatures that we created and they answer solely to us. So if we mandate that they undertake a certain study and we fund it and it's approved, let's say in the legislative body, then that is controlled completely by us and the people that work for us in that area. So I understand what you're saying, yes.

WOMAN IN AUDIENCE: Another number that doesn't seem to be offered is I don't think

substantiated and unsubstantiated alone is a good way to look at this.

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

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: You're right.
You're right.

WOMAN IN AUDIENCE: What I'd like to know is how many individuals are being harassed again and again with new allegations.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: True. And even with the substantiated/unsubstantiated, if you look at the legal follow up to this, because if you say, well, just because it's substantiated by whom, it's drawn up by the court it could be substantiated or indicated or founded by the agency, even though there may not be a court follow-up to that, because that has happened in a number of cases that we're finding out. So it doesn't always gel with what you're seeing. You may have 1,500 cases and how many are actually being pursued by the local district attorneys? As a matter of fact, and I know from in this one particular county 1,500 cases, only 78 that are being investigated by the district attorney's office. Now all of a sudden you see this number like this, and then you see it like this and you begin to wonder, well, what are they spending all their time on if they're only substantiating that one year alone 78 out of 1,500 cases? There's a lot of false

reporting going on or something.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Yeah, if we could get the-

MAN IN AUDIENCE: Yeah, if we could get the breakdown by county and start to get into that and find out where those problems are and where they have to be fixed.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Surely.

important that even as late as this week, and I called the University of Pennsylvania, I'm talking about the social workers get no training in sexual abuse or incest. Therefore, on what basis are they making any of these claims? If they're not even being trained as undergraduates, and a few phone calls to the University of Pennsylvania is not the only calls I called to verify. I called a number of—

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, it's not only that area. I know you came a little bit late, but earlier the first group of people that testified were from the Philadelphia agencies and they had, one of the things we did agree on was the setting of certain standards, qualifications, salaries, and other criteria for individuals that are working in these agencies and everybody has been in total agreement on that, that

they're paid too low, the salary is just too low compared to most other county offices, that that should be addressed that standards, qualifications, educational experience, ongoing training, that a lot of that really should be put in as a requirement. Yes, sir.

MAN IN AUDIENCE: You have a few people here yet that haven't been up there to tell their point.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We're going to get there.

MAN IN AUDIENCE: That would be nice.

(The next audio tape started at this point:)

MALE WITNESS: Are you going to permit the district attorney to have more information? Is the district attorney in these cases going to be permitted to gain information under the act which is precluded in public disclosure? Is that district attorney going to be able to get information? Now even? Going to be able to get information that even on my representation that I can't get myself in these civil cases? And to that extent, is he going to be able to share with me, because certainly my client is the one that is criminally — or excuse me, my client is the one who is

being charged with the abuse and certainly he'd be the target of this act. I have no idea who is the person? Is it the mother, the perpetrator. Is it the mother, is it the father? I can't say that for sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

<sup>-</sup> 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25`

Certainly in every case there's an indication of who or what was the authority that made the report. It's not uncommon that right after a custody action is filed the next day the children -- I mean, I can almost say that in every one of my cases. As a matter of fact, I would say most of the active cases, if not all of them, follow that path, and then quotes of what the child said is probably in every single one of them. But who is going to be the authority that's going to police this particular act? Is it going to be the courts of its own accord? going to be me as an attorney, because I believe -- I don't even know who the accuser is let alone to pass that information on to the district attorney. All I know is it just doesn't sound right. But if I can't get the information, I don't see how the district attorney should be able to get the information either and prosecute it there because the same standard holds true in the civil case. I'm trying to disprove an abuse. There's no information available to me as to who in fact made that allegation.

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

issue of due process. We never do actually face the accuser, and if the accuser gives CYS or if the accuser gives a particular authority a report, is that authority going to be held to the standard of this particular act? Is the authority itself -- I would make one suggestion. On line 1, it says, "A person," and I also believe that should include at this point in time an organization, whether it be Children and Youth or whatever, if in fact the act is going to held as it is, and I believe the wording should be, instead of a report, I believe it should be an allegation. we used it in the first side and I think the word "report" should be replaced in line 1 and 2 on page 2 with the word "allegation," for just that reasoning. I think that would at least bring into the fact that an allegation was made rather than a full-blown report, because allegation comes up in PFA, allegation comes up in testimony, in testimony before the Court of Common Pleas, before the Department of Public Welfare hearings, before Mr. Parcy has indicated appeals are taken up. It comes up all the time that that allegation, but yet the person that's on the stand and I'm questioning as a defense attorney, that person may in fact be the one that made the report. But I can't

And certainly the chairman brought up the

even prove perjury let alone prove this under a civil standard but because I don't even know, I may suspect but I don't have the right to face this person.

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

Every one of the reports that were given at those hearings has all the information blacked out, as you may or may not be aware. Every line is blacked out with who the reporter is, the address of the reporter. That creates an onerous standard under a preponderance of the evidence. I don't see how it's ever going to happen under the beyond a reasonable doubt standard because the wording is not as clear as I think it needs to be. And certainly the analogy that again the chairman made as far as due process concern. I think if you look at these sources of referrals again and you look at, okay, these are all the people that have called in these particular abuse claims. just CYS that made the analogy. Assuming we took the word out and made it "report or allegation," then you're looking at protection from abuse acts actually could come up just in the context of a custody act. Is it the intent of this chairman that within the context of a custody action if somebody that now we know that that person is on the stand, if that person makes a false allegation of abuse that could be proved or disproved in the context of this hearing or some other

hearing or a criminal hearing, I don't want to say I'm somewhat disturbed, but I've been listening now since 10 o'clock and everything's been focused towards CYS. In reading this it does not say. It happens to be placed in Title 23 under the 6300s, which would lead a person to believe it's CYS, or it's just in the abuse process, but is it the intent of this particular act to cover everything that takes place in domestic relations, or is it going to go beyond domestic relations and any of the other titles? I don't think that's clear.

the act and I can't tell you for sure. If you look at custody contempt, it's under the heading of support right after the support contempt, but it certainly has the power of being custody contempt. If it's going to be in the 6300 series, are we just limiting this to abuse actions is that come through Children and Youth, or are we going to cover the entire domestic relations spectrum as it appears? Certainly in certain cases where an allegation is made in a custody case, I can tell you who's making the allegation. It's right there and we can face them. And if I can disprove it, are they covered under this act? And then if they are, who is going to do the prosecuting? The district attorney?

... 

I'm really concerned about the fact that under the umbrella of Children and Youth, and I'm not here to say anything good or bad about Children and Youth, but under that umbrella, it's going to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, and far be it for me to even comment on anonymous calls, and I could be honest with you, anybody can go out to one of those pay phones rights now and implement anybody in this room or yourselves in it and hang up the phone. Hang up the phone. Mr. Chairman abused his son. Click. This is what took place. Click. And in that case—

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I mentioned at both the hearings both in Harrisburg and at Pittsburgh that if you wanted to show the complete idiosyncrasy of the system or the lunacy of what's going on with that hotline, anyone in this room, and there's no charges that you couldn't bring against anybody, right? They could call or report in on the Governor.

MALE WITNESS: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: The Lieutenant
Governor, the Attorney General, Kevin Blaum from
Wilkes-Barre, okay. Secretary Snider, the Secretary of
Welfare. Now, can you imagine, now just think about
it, can you imagine if several thousand phone calls
would start to go in, you know, they would be assigned

an incident number, there would be supposedly an 1 investigation of reports. Okay. You think about the 2 conclusion. The idiocy of what is going on there. And 3 they automatically say, well, you know, we fetter out 4 the nonsensical ones. Oh, do you really? What is 5 6 nonsensical? Who is making those judgments? 7 MALE WITNESS: Yeah. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: What standards, 8 9 for the people that are listening, and it's on 24 hours 10 and who is there on a Saturday night or Sunday night or Monday night at 2 o'clock in the morning? Okay? And 11 what determinations are they making? You know, if you 12 13 really wanted to saturate the system with a lot of 14 nonsense, because they can't penalize you, it's an anonymous call. It's a 1-800 call. Any of the people 15 that work in Children and Youth Services could also be 16 17 called in as perpetrators. I mean, think about that. Yes. Go ahead. I'm sorry to interrupt 18 19 you. 20 MALE WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, how serious 21 would these allegations be taken yourself and people in 22 Children and Youth being in a position of power? 23 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, supposedly 24 they would have to investigate these, you see.

MALE WITNESS: Supposedly. But because

25

you're in a position of power-

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

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, suppose there are a number of calls that are made on the same individual, would that be cause for concern for an investigation? It supposedly would.

MALE WITNESS: Let me just follow your analogy for a minute and let's take it through the test of 6321. A call was put in on, quote, unquote, to the Governor or accusing the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. And we don't know who the person is, it's anonymous. Does, and this is my point, does the personnel, now Children and Youth has that in their hands. Is Children and Youth the person now who makes the report of suspected child abuse under this act without having reasonable grounds? Is the report in and of itself the report that Children and Youth is going to write up and does Children and Youth have -- I mean, are they going to be the target now? Do they have the ball and do they become the subject of this --I don't have a problem with it if it goes -- I don't have a problem with somebody calling in anonymously, as long as Children and Youth becomes the person here who is going to make the report of suspected child abuse under this act without having reasonable grounds to believe the report to be true. If they implicate the

1 2

Governor in this particular report and I take him to a hearing and we find out before Mr. Parcy nobody did an investigation, they don't even have grounds, they don't even have procedures to do investigations, they just indicated the Governor, if that's the case, is Children and Youth now the person that's being defined here as having the ball and is going to be prosecuted criminally under 6321, and/or can Children and Youth be prosecuted criminally under 6321?

The last point I want to make, and I think this is yet another absolutely critical point that the chairman needs to consider, is that understand when the report is indicated, it's in and of itself found that there's enough information of reasonable grounds. I think that that would give muster, even though I don't always believe what the indicated reports say, we certainly have constitutional tests and checks and balances with that. I don't agree with them all, but we have them there. The problem is when the report is founded or unfounded, it eventually becomes expunged. And to the extent that I tried to get information on those two particular reports, when the report is expunged, you cannot even get the information about what took place.

Let's say there's a pattern of abuse

charges. Under those circumstances, the defense attorney, and I am trying to prove, as we've heard here, six months ago I got the same exact thing took place to me. I filed a custody complaint. A year later the same exact thing happens to me, exactly the same from the exact same timeframe, the exact same time the exact same allegations are alleged. I've gone back to try to get that information just to try to prove to certainly show some sequence of events or to try to maybe prosecute the person. Expunged. The reports do not exist. And to that extent, I don't know if they are expunged how clearly under the laws of the Commonwealth they are expunged, they are not privy to the Commonwealth, the district attorney, or anybody else for that matter.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: It's been mine, and I hate to interrupt you again, but you bring up a very, very good point, where people have said that they have testified that certain things have been expunsed and yet in certain counties, and maybe a lot of counties, I don't know, the State testified yesterday from the Department of Welfare that when it's unfounded they get rid of the records. I'm just saying unfounded. But I've been told from a number of people that even work within these agencies, see they've got

1 some moles in there that have axes to grind and they've 2 been talking to me, that they in fact are not 3 destroying the records. MALE WITNESS: I would agree with that. 4 I would agree. 5 6 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: So at the State 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

level they do supposedly destroy. And I would think at the State level they do destroy because they have become so voluminous they wouldn't know what to do with it, but at the county level, not all counties are following the law.

MALE WITNESS: I agree with you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And they keep the files on people and here we go with that nonsense about Hitler and Germany and the KGB and you think to yourself, what in God's name are they keeping it for? For who's purpose? You want to jump in in the back here?

MAN IN AUDIENCE: Yeah. The Department of Welfare, I think they are a little nutsy themselves because years ago they used to go around and investigate to sec what was going on. They don't do that anymore. There's kids running this street, they are naked, they are dirty, you know. Somebody ought to be investigating the Department of Welfare what they're 1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

25

24

doing. Or they ought to have somebody to go out and do the investigation and--

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Investigate them.

MAN IN AUDIENCE: Yeah, because there's people in my neighborhood, I'm in a Hispanic neighborhood and you've got a woman there with five or six children, each kid to a different guy, first of all, they're all different. You don't know who's who, you know. And then she's a welfare. She's collecting welfare, food stamps, and medical and everything. She's got all these kids. At night the guy sneaks in. Where does he come from? You see him leaving in the morning, or you see a guy visiting. He says he's visiting or he's the brother or he's the uncle or That's got to be all investigated. The whatever. Welfare Department is not doing the way they were doing years ago. If you did something wrong or there was a man in that house, they investigated you or you were turned in from your next door neighbor. They came out. That is what they got to do. You got to find out what the welfare is doing. They're sitting on their hands.

MALE WITNESS: You know, again, I think that needs to be written in here, certainly. If it's going to be an exception to the rule, it needs to be written in here, but I don't know how it's going to be written in, because understand, and I think the chairman would agree and I don't want to put words in your mouth, that the majority of the cases that are going to fall under this purview in the cases of Children and Youth are going to be unfounded cases certainly, and if that's the case and we're expunging all the information, I mean, I don't see how -- they're contradictory. Because that information in and of itself may be necessary for the prosecution under this particular statute. Especially when there's a course of conduct involved. Yet you may be infringing on the rights of the particular defendant who actually got the thing unfounded. I mean, is actually unfounded, and under the laws of the Commonwealth it's supposed to be expunged, completely and entirely. Now, whether I would agree that the county certainly they'll file it, they don't follow it certainly to the extent that the State does, but in any event, can the county then produce information from an expunged file to be used in a criminal case?

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that in fact the very point that you raised has happened in particular cases from what people have testified to and have alerted me to that in fact that very thing is happening, that in cases where basically

in domestic but not related, they're not limited, I should say, to just domestic situations where this is brought up and rehashed again. And again, you're thinking to yourself, from what I'm reading and from what people have said to me, well, how can this be? If the procedure is that if those records are to be destroyed or they no longer exist, how are they then referring back to those records unless they still have them? Can they then now be prosecuted in some area of the law, either civilly or criminally, for a violation? I'm talking about the employees of CYS.

That's what I'm saying, that this would need to be, my own personal feeling is a perpetrator would need to be expanded to organizations, too. So in the case of the Governor, we still have some protection under this stand. Somebody wants to call anonymously, that's fine. If we're going to put the onus on Children and Youth to investigate it and to produce reasonable grounds to go forward and do a report—

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Exactly.

MALE WITNESS: —then the onus should be on whoever that is, whether it's CYS, whether it's whoever the investigating authority is, that's okay. If they want to calm anonymously—

1 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Should we revoke 2 immunity for reliability? 3 MALE WITNESS: Absolutely. 4 (Applause.) 5 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Because in all б honesty and sincerity, and there is concern and I can 7 see it from the other side of point of view. 8 MALE WITNESS: No. I can appreciate that. 9 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: You've got to be 10 able to afford them the freedoms to do what they have 11 to do, and I think there's not a person in this room 12 that wouldn't agree that we want to protect the 13 children from real abuse that's going on, irregardless 14 of what situation it may involve. I think we all are 15 in agreement with that. Now, to balance that, the scales of justice, how do you protect the people that 16 17 have to do that job? 18 MALE WITNESS: But, sec, there's the 19 contradictory. 20 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Sure. 21 MALE WITNESS: This is going to make it 22 criminal, but if we look on the scale, here's all the 23 reports that come in from schools. If there's no 24 reasonable grounds, is the school going to be held, the

hospital? Forget parents or guardians. Other

25

agencies, law enforcement. All these people who are 1 2 somewhat afforded immunity are people who make these reports. Are we going to just limit this particular 3 4 statute to, quote, spouses or people that are outside 5 the scope of immunity? 6 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: That wouldn't be 7 fair. MALE WITNESS: If that's the case, then 8 9 it certainly contradicts the fact that they have 10 immunity. 11 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, the prime 12 sponsor of the bill did mention this during the hearing yesterday, we kicked it around a little bit in 13 14 Harrisburg as to whether it should be in Title 18 or 15 Title 23. And he admitted, and I think rightfully so, 16 that there would probably be a series of amendments 17 that would have to be offered to this to hopefully clean it up, improve it, and define many of these other 18

MALE WITNESS: I understand.

issues that are being brought up. Because if we're

just going to play with something and not be serious

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about it.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And if we're hoping to make this law, which I know is my intent and I know the maker of -- I don't run anything out of my

I just don't waste my time or the members' time. But we certainly can do some work on this and I would ask the legal community and others to give us whatever assistance that they can, in addition to Children and Youth Services, because I do think there are some valid issues that have been raised in each one of these hearings about standards, qualifications, about ongoing education, that if we want to start to improve the system, there are other areas that we have to look to to improve it. In addition to the, and I've been making notes and so has counselor—

MALE WITNESS: I'm not critical about the bill. As a matter of fact, I would certainly support. House Bill 826, as many of the people here. I'm looking at it from a practical standpoint in that—

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: What do you think about this chilling effect that we keep hearing? I mean, that word is devastating the prime sponsor of the bill because he took great offense to that word being constantly used yesterday, chilling, chilling, chilling and I'm thinking to myself, everybody is kept out in cold freezing to death while they're saying that this little piece of legislation that would try to put a level effect to the justice and due process is going to

have such a chilling effect, you know, and I think to
myself, what are they so worried about? Why don't they
try to help the system and help us to improve it so

that that nonsense is stopped?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MALE WITNESS: I certainly would be in support of it. There certainly are some things that need to be considered and especially the expungement issue. I think if the unfounded reports are the ones that are going to be the real problem, the records that are expunded, it's being to all be for naught anyway. I don't see how anybody is going to be able to prosecute. You can't even get the information for civil case let alone for a criminal case. And for that matter, that's the whole reason for expungement. So to that extent, the guy calls in the false report on the Governor, goes away and it's founded, unfounded, and the whole thing is swept under the table. I mean, if there's a police officer standing there and maybe, I mean, if that was the actual case that could possibly prosecute the individual, it's going to be trouble getting those files. In fact, it goes away.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And who is going to be responsible?

MALE WITNESS: Why does it go away? It goes away to protect the Governor. Because this way

1 this particular report that says the Governor was 2 accused of abuse isn't going to be used in a criminal 3 case all over the front page of the Inquirer, because 4 now people are going to say, well, maybe it is, maybe 5 the it isn't. It's actually to protect the Governor, 6 if you think about it. The whole purpose of 7 expungement is is it founded or unfounded, and the 8 Governor's name is on this report and we're going to get rid of it. We don't want it to be used. Now it's 9 10 going to be used in a criminal case and you're going to have lots of problems with that. That's the actual 11 12 perpetrator of it. I think there's some good in the expungement purpose, but it's going to be contradictory 13 14 to try to prosecute people criminally when you can't 15 even do it civilly.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: No doubt there's going to be a problem. The question is whether we have a problem that needs to be addressed and how can we best address it right now? We try to do the best we can. If you have any language as you go through the bill--

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MALE WITNESS: I would be happy to submit it to you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yeah, we would like to get the best bill we can.

1	MALE WITNESS: Thank you. I appreciate
2	your time today.
3	MALE WITNESS: I hate to run, but I have
4	to get back to Chester on another matter.
5	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Sure. Thank you.
6	MALE WITNESS: If there were some
7	questions that you wanted addressed, let me know.
8	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. I
9	appreciate your time. Thank you.
10	We're going to take a 5-minute break.
11	(The audio tape next picked up at this
12	point:)
13	
14	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: This is very
15	interesting. We're getting just about every county
16	across the State represented. Like I keep saying to
17	people, we're just scratching the surface. We've been
18	flooded with phones
19	MAN IN AUDIENCE: If you stop the system,
20	in other words, I think the judicial system is the
21	prime accomplice of abuse. In other words, the court
22	can do anything. The mother can do anything. The
23	father, if he wants to do anything like this, he
24	wouldn't be sitting here.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: But you see what

happens, let me share this also, and for the benefit of my colleague here, who is new to the system up here.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: New in Harrisburg. I've done this kind of thing. I've seen this kind of thing for years.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: But what they do in Harrisburg to you, if they don't like what you're doing, they will end up attacking you. This bill isn't even my bill.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: And you're being attacked by it, you say?

the social activists and the others who have their own agenda. They start making it personal, and before you know it, they start lobbing missiles over at you so that the press and other people can question your motivations. You know, and I said to the one lady reporter that there isn't a single legislator on the Hill either in Harrisburg, Washington, or any State Capitol, that isn't requested to put in legislation either by individuals because of a problem, lobbyists, or because somebody thought of something because of some injustice or to try to amend or appeal some kind of a problem. That legislation is put in. This isn't my bill. And the committee, as I think you can altest

to, it was mentioned by the members, the newer members really, that they wanted some additional information and two or three of them said, well. let's hold some hearings on it, and I have it was voted. Dave Heckler, Attorney Heckler, made the motion, Representative Manderino seconded it, and it was unanimous, 20 to 0, to hold hearings. I mean, and all of a sudden this is go have getting glued all over me and I'm saying to myself, it's not my bill. I didn't ask for the hearings. You know, what's going on here? Why isn't that reported?

22 .

The bill, the history of the bill and I'm going to repeat it again, in the last session, identical bill, identical prime sponsor. My name isn't even on this, but it was voted out 21 to 1. Kevin Blaum was the only one that voted against it. This session, identical bill. The flap was, this is where you got to understand the history of what's going on here. 1001 will greatly expand the powers and authority of Children and Youth and the reporters and everybody else. This goes contrary to that, basically. And they are trying, others inside and outside the legislature, to do everything they can to stop this, but hold no public hearings, mind you, on 1001. Which I find to be incredible. And in the hearings yesterday

in Harrisburg they said, well, we don't feel there's a
need publicly to hold any hearings on that legislation.
Wait a minute. Something that's going to be as broadly
encompassing as that piece of legislation, and it's
about, what, 15, 20 pages, 1001?

MR. KRANTZ: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Somewhere around there. This is a two-pager, really. One side, the other side. And yet even with three statewide hearings, and you want to accommodate people because there are large numbers of people that couldn't afford to go to Harrisburg.

MAN IN AUDIENCE: That's true.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: So we went one for Pittsburgh, one for Harrisburg, one for Philadelphia.

To make it accommodating for the people in those three regions.

WOMAN IN AUDIENCE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And they would only approve, Itkin, the Majority Leader, and I'm not fighting with him. It was quoted in the paper this morning that all my party leaders opposed me. That is absolutely not true. Absolutely not true. The Speaker of the House talked to me on the podium just this week and said, you're right on target, Tom. I agree with

1	you 100 percent. The Majority Leader, because he was
2	pressured by the social activists and the liberal
3	element of the Democratic Party and some other liberals
4	not to allow these hearings to be held, to muzzle this
5	bill, to stifle it, and that's what it's all about,
6	stifling free debate, that they wouldn't authorize
7	these other two hearings, and only after I had
8	suggested to him I would hold hearings with Youth and
9	Aging, Kevin Blaum's committee. He's just a new
10	chairman. Kevin at first said, no, I don't want to
11	co-chair any hearings, and only after the insistence of
12	the Majority Leader that this would be a compromise of
13	some sort, I don't know how that's a compromise, that
14	they would allow us to hold a joint hearing in
15	Harrisburg yesterday. That was approved. This one is
16	not approved. Now, does that make sense? I mean
17	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Well
18	MAN IN AUDIENCE: Well, isn't it your job
19	to supposed to be doing that, in statutes?
20	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes. Yes.
21	MAN IN AUDIENCE: Some legislative
22	oversight to have these hearings?
23	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Exactly. I
24	followed that to the letter of the law, to try to make

sure that when we're developing legislation, now you

1 heard the back-and-forth and we're going to hear a little bit more this afternoon about why that's needed, 2 to try to improve the legislation. We don't write 3 4 perfect law. We're not rocket scientists that know the answer to all these questions. I don't think anybody 5 does. And that's the purpose of trying to have input 6 7 to make these bills better so that if they do become 8 law, it's a good piece of legislation. Okay? Thanks for your observation and that we 9 10 actually are doing our job. Too many people tell us 11 the legislature doesn't do anything. REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: They didn't 12 13 tell us that at 11:30 the other night on Monday and 14 Tuesday when we were there. 15 MAN IN AUDIENCE: Some of the legislators 16 don't do anything. 17 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well. that's 18 probably true. You can't tar us all with the same 19 brush. 20 MAN IN AUDIENCE: Well, I could mention a 21 few names. 22 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay. 23 MR. TARUD: My name is Sol Tarud. 24 been in the divorce process since 1986, and I've been

in support groups for separated and divorced people and

25

I chair Fathers and Children Equality, even though I have primary custody of my daughter. My concern is with the system that is basically biased, and I appreciate this law as a starting point. I don't think it will change anything, I just think it's a starting point.

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

My divorce is basically a financial divorce from my wife. I was cleaned out of the marriage. I raised my daughter since she was 2 years old in 1982, and then 1986 after it became evident that my wife wasn't being responsible as far as financial goes, so in other words, I believed her as a person who was honest, I sought the divorce in December of '86. We were still having physical relations, sexual relations if you want to call it that, and in June of '87, six months after the divorce started, she filed sexual abuse charges against me with Children and Youth in Luzerne County. I was shocked. I told Children and Youth, this is rid. There's nothing -- you know, I'm naive at that point. So they just asked me if I would cooperate with them, and I said, of course. I believed in the system. It did work for my case.

I brought my daughter up. I was going to see my attorney in Wilkes-Barre, I live in Hazleton, an hour away, I brought her up, left her with Children and

Youth for two hours while I saw my attorney. I asked my attorney if these charges proved to be false, what happens to my wife? They said, oh, her credibility goes down. Her credibility never went down. In other words, after I heard about the charges I asked my wife about it I said, how can you sleep with the abuser of your daughter? She shrugged her shoulders like it's part of the game. It goes on all the time.

Children and Youth investigated. I was fortunate that I had professional help. I had gone through counseling with Dr. Lynn Marcetti of Drums. She had counseled our family for a couple of years prior to the divorce starting. So I had her on my side. There was nothing that happened. It was just charges brought up and they investigated it. So finally they said it was unfounded.

Six months — oh, during this time, while we were waiting for the six-month period to get it expunged, my wife brought my daughter to Victim Resource Center, trying to convince my daughter that I abused her. I went to Victim Resource Center twice. I said, I'm a so-called abuser, I would like to talk to you and I'll answer any questions you have. Their answer to me was, we can't talk to you. It's confidential. But I said, I have primary custody of

the child, why not talk to me? They said, because your wife brought her in, not you. Therefore, you're out of it. Finally I went to the attorneys and they finally stopped this game. The only thing that Victim Resource Center told me was the following, that your daughter is unhappy. I told this to my psychologist. The psychologist said, of course, with what she's being subjected to she's growing up too fast. She was 7 years old at the time. She just turned 7.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So this is what -- in other words, you can write all the laws you have, but this domestic relations is unbelievable. In other words, you have the power, meaning the judges the lawyers, to set things right. Change custody, take action, don't accept crap that goes on. That's all it is, it's a lot of crap. You've heard it over and over. I thought mine was a serious case. I've seen worse cases. I've talked to people. I've talked to lawyers. I've switched lawyers because I thought I was be being treated right, and I found out I was. Even though I took a lot of abuse, this is normal for a man to take abuse. I wish you had a brother or a son that went through this. I've heard of an attorney in Denver or somewhere in the midwest that walked into a courtroom and just shot up everybody. Have you heard of that?

MR. KRANTZ: Um-hum.

MR. TARUD: What drives a man to do this? His son was going through a divorce. There's another case in California where a father went into bed with his 4— or 5—year old son and lit the bed on fire because he couldn't see — his wife says you won't be able to see your son anymore. He got away, the father. The son was burned badly. I saw the son on TV recently with the mother. I mean, of course this is wrong, but the point is, why are normal minds driven to the extreme? That's my concern, and I hope you people would start this examination of the whole process. I don't understand. There must be an explanation. I don't see it. I fail to see it.

In looking at the system, I've heard of many cases, I've heard lawyers tell me when I looked for another lawyer like PFA, I am a member of the parent association of MMI. When I heard PFA I cringed. There's a law that lawyers tell me I use it, it's a lousy law, but it's good for the women. It gets the husband out of the house, it establishes precedence. She's got the kid, she's got the house, out goes the husband. Just by filing it. In other words, I mean, you're not going to work on that, I understand that, but I'm saying this chilling effect I don't understand.

Let's bring some balance back into the system. That's all I'm asking for.

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

The other question is why is it when we go through a divorce all of a sudden the men become abusers? Everything was fine up to that point and then they become the abuser. Don't the judges ask themselves this question? Or does Children and Youth ask this question?

Okay, that's my story on the, in other words, I've been, it took me three years to get custody of my daughter. We went through three psychologists. A family psychologist testified on my behalf. Then the court-appointed psychologist testified on my behalf. We went through two sets of hearings. One in one year he gave a verbal report. That wasn't good enough for my wife. We went back. I asked, why did we go back to the same one? He already gave you a negative response. She said, I've changed. She thought she could fool the The guy still says he's still the better system. parent. He's raised her since she was 23 years old. She goes off in college, I put her through college, she got a Master's degree at Lehigh, she went on to work in Long Island. In other words, she did her thing and became financially independent. I took the hell in a bag. This is my second marriage. I said, I'm going to

make this work, I'm devoted, I'm going to put all my effort into making this marriage work. I lost everything.

What's the other point? I'm sorry. I've talked with Children and Youth social workers and I say, I asked that question about why do the fathers become the abusers? And this girl, all she did was, there's a lot of abuse, I know it's going on. In other words, it's — what I see is the abuse is Children and Youth don't do their jobs. We have cases in Hazleton, Pennsylvania, Wilkes-Barre, in our area three or four cases of children being killed. One of them was the case of a baby that was beaten up by the mother and then the stepfather, or whatever it is.

MR. KRANTZ: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. TARUD: The end result is, the parents were smart. They would keep the baby awake and awake. They were notified when the Children and Youth were going to come and investigate then they wrapped up the baby, put her to sleep, Children and Youth workers come and say, oh, he looks so cute. Don't wake him up. Take off the clothes and look at him. Look at his bruises. I mean, the people are smart enough there and Children and Youth seem to have a bias towards the woman. I mean, are we protecting the child or the

woman? That's what I'm concerned about.

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

And, I mean, I've been before Judge Muroski and we laugh when we see each other now. I've been before him so often. He says, I like to keep a balance in this, but I see the balance pointing 90 percent towards the woman and I don't have any say in what goes on. In other words, after my wife accused me of beating her up, of sexual abuse and so on, and I have pictures of where she scratched my face, a bite in my arm and I went to the hospital, got a report. had a fight the day I filed for divorce, she was mad with me. She attacks me and then goes out to the police. I even notified the police I said, a woman is going to come down and report I've attacked her. So I said, okay, they called me up, the chief of police, and says, all right, I'll be down. I just have to check with the hospital. Got mysclf taken care of and he saw the scratches on my face. I took pictures as any same man would do and I got a bite in the arm. The hospital worker laughed. This was funny. My wife bit me. dropped it. My wife left when she heard I was coming down to the police station. But two years later she has me in court again. And I don't understand what's going on. I was supposed to testify, she could say anything she wanted, and I was to agree that I wouldn't

touch her anymore, things like that.

So, anyway, what I'm saying, I have is I don't understand the system. It encourages when two people have loved each other to go to the opposite ends. It's incredible. Okay, that's my basic case. I laugh at what's going on. In other words, when I get divorced, hopefully within the year, I'll have a divorce party so I can celebrate.

(Applause.)

MR. TARUD: These two cases involve
Children and Youth, and the system beats on the father
and the child. If you could read it, I would
appreciate it. I have a couple of copies.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Let me just take the opportunity to say, while the reporter is out of the room, so this is not for kinds of publicity purposes, not every lawyer is out there trying to tell people in divorce actions they should file for protection from abuse and the child abuse charges as a way to gain leverage in a divorce case. There are certainly people out there like that, and we'd all like the system to be able to identify the spouses that are willing to do it and the attorneys that are willing to recommends it to try to find a way to win.

There are any number of people out there

to abuse the system. We try to identify them, but, I mean, you can take it at face value, in 20 years of being a general practice attorney I don't think there was ever a case where we filed a protection from abuse — well, we filed protection from abuse petitions sometimes when we thought it was appropriate. We never filed any that we were charged child abuse. Not that we wouldn't have. If I thought that there was something that was appropriate.

I guess basically what my point is, you can hear horror stories and it's the kind of situation where you can probably run out of numbers if you start handing them out, where people want to come in and start talking about how bad the system is and how the system never works. There are attorneys out there. believe it or not, I'll speak for my profession just a bit, that don't abuse the system and don't think that winning at all costs is the ultimate point of going to court. As a matter of fact, from my experience, most of the good attorneys will keep you out of court and get things settled in a way that the family doesn't get permanently scarred. And the advice I used to give to people is, look, you can fool the kids all they want when they are 3 and 4 and 5 years old or 8 and 10. When they're 16 or 18 years old, if they end up hating

you because of what you've done, then you've brought it on yourself.

MR. TARUD: That's very true.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: And when you're dealing with people that want to hurt the other side, and you got a lawyer that will facilitate it, it will be a bad situation. If you're dealing with spouses that simply want to get apart and separated, you can have the kind of situation which I think it was Mr. Pulcinella said that you know you could have four parents and eight grandparents, or whatever. It can work. And so while we're hearing all from one side today, there are possibilities to get some balance in the system.

It sounds like I've opened up a raw wound here. Not with you but—

MR. TARUD: No, but there must be a reason why the system is the way it is and that they see it as fair. I don't see it.

WOMAN IN AUDIENCE: The system isn't working. I'm going to present some of the other side that it isn't working because basically the system is not set up with qualified people who know what they're doing. They're inept.

SECOND WOMAN IN AUDIENCE: Well, any

rational person would expect, but then the head of southeastern region would certainly interfere and rectify or find out or take steps, but then she would have to admit that there are errors, and she doesn't wish to admit them. So the easiest thing is to then just cover up in both sides.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I'm not here to be an apology for the system. The systems always break down, they always have and always will. But what we're focusing here is the abuses in the system and try to find a way to get to the bottom of some of it. But we're not going to make a perfect system, no matter how hard we work.

woman in audience: No, I think most people start out and do many things thinking that a breakdown in the system is an occasional thing. And then when you unfortunately, and you never dreamed that you're going to be in the system at all because that never happens to your family. That happens outside the family. Then when you are caught up in the system, you suddenly realize the safeguards, the bottom line is the safeguarding and the safety and welfare of the child without parent alienation syndrome. A child can be very mistreated but will still love that parent. And when you interfere with that, it does harm to the child

itself. And yet the system is set up to break up families, to allow that interference by people who are not trained. The bottom line is they're really not trained. There are no safeguards that in their emotional well-being. You have, I'm not saying that there are not plenty of social workers out there and to condemn the entire system for some. I am sure that there are probably saints in the system here and there who are doing all they can, that they are overworked, but unfortunately I think that they are not well-trained. I mean, here were phone calls that I made, and I will save that in my report. They're not being trained. You can see physical abuse but I hear, I hate to get my report before it, but--

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Why don't we let you go through and then we'll hear you.

MR. KATRA: I had one short question on attorneys you mentioned. There are lots of good attorneys and lots of bad attorneys like in every profession, but it turns out in family law we have more than fair share of bad attorneys. It just turns out that way. It's easy to get into family law than to get into corporate law. And we do have a little more number of attorneys that are not — don't believe in integrity, and my personal experience has been that.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I wouldn't 1 disagree with that to some extent. You got Shakespeare 2 3 back in whenever who said kill them all. 4 MR. TARUD: Once you get divorced you 5 realize what Shakespeare meant. REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Just keep in 6 7 mind we're trying to make the system better. We're not 8 likely to get it to be perfect. 9 MR. TARUD: I don't know how you could 10 change the bias in the system though. That's what it is. Ninety percent of the law is the judge's 1.1 interpretation, the caseworker's interpretation. 12 Thev 13 feel what they see on Oprah Winfrey, Geraldo, Donahue 14 represents the American population. REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I don't know 15 16 too many lawyers or judges who watch that show because 17 they are usually at work. I don't watch them. I got better things to do. 18 19 MR. TARUD: I've heard the judge say 20 about too much Catholic schooling and we fought over 21 what school she would go to. Too much schooling. 22 said Catholic, she saw Catholic girls go off the wrong 23 end and things like that, she saw that on Oprah

Winfrey. Every time a girl comes through and says, I

went to Catholic school and look at what I am now, that

24

25

1 girl, and she's up there because she's unusual. doesn't represent the primary, you know, the normal 2 person, pardon me. 3 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay. Let me just 4 5 say this for the witnesses to follow, if we could just summarize. If you do have written statements and then б 7 state your case, because I know there are probably some 8 time constraints and some other people that have been 9 very, very patiently waiting to testify here today. 10 MR. TARUD: All right. The other one is 11 guys being beat up by the system. If you could read 12 it, I would appreciate it. And I have supporting 13 documentation here while you read it. It's quick. 14 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We can read it. 15 MR. TARUD: This is very strong. I'm 16 saying that here's Children and Youth, here's a child that has been abused and the Children and Youth were 17 18 trying to get the child back to the mother. 19 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I saw the 20 pictures. You were trying to get them to do something 21 about that. 22 MR. TARUD: Who beat up the child, with 23 her husband. 24 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yeah. 25 MR. TARUD: I mean, this is incredible.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are you going to submit those pictures?

MR. TARUD: I submitted those pictures.

I mean, please, this is serious.

I'll show you what Children and Youth gave to the judge. There are reports here if you want them of the police reports that came in. They're in date order.

MR. KRANTZ: And these deal with Schuylkill County. They were given six months ARD and then it's off the record.

MR. TARUD: Children and Youth asked the father to return the child to the mother and the stepfather, even after their reports. The child was beat up. He had internal bleeding for two weeks.

That's what they submitted to the judge. Their report.

Just so the people could see it. In other words, their report on the subject. They said he would have to stop before they gave him a full report. Who are they protecting, period? Most of the transcript is in here. I cite the transcript on the first page where she says, I beat him up and I just couldn't control myself, I had a bad day at work, et cetera, et cetera. They both admitted it. And the ultimate kicker is right now he's being subpoened to go back into court so she could get

custody of the kids again. 1 2 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are you saying 3 this is what the judge saw? 4 MR. TARUD: Yeah, the judge. REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: So the judge 5 was all blanked out as well? 6 7 MR. TARUD: Yeah. And then she files a 8 petition now on June 1, he's to appear in court because 9 she wants custody back. She has the original order in 10 force. How can any intelligent, I don't understand 11 that. That's what I'm asking. A lawyer is filing a 12 petition on her behalf, knowing all this is going to be 13 presented. She even had abuse charges. She said, I've 14 done well. She already admitted to it. If you want 15 the whole transcript, we'll gladly make copies, if that 16 helps you. 17 (The next audio tape picked up at this 18 point:) 19 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Next what I would 20 like to do is have the next that are going to testify 21 next come forward, and that would be Sol, John and 22 Sheila, and I know that John had two other individuals 23 with him. They can sit right here and we can try to

speed the process up a little bit.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Mr. Chairman, if I

24

25

wanted to say, because it seems that there a number of people here who are interested in this issue, and I just want to say that, and I don't know if this was done, but I think we commend Chairman Caltagirone for going on and having this hearing. Because it's very difficult, you know, to have these hearings and then all of a sudden they not be so-called authorized. But he took the initiative to go on and have them. And as I can see, there's a concern. When there's a concern on any issue affecting any systems or any citizens or a number of citizens in our community, we need to have hearings, and I just wanted to commend you and I think I'm glad that you're going to have it and I welcome you to welcome you to my district.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you,
Representative James. And I also want to thank the
University of Pennsylvania, as I have the University of
Pittsburgh, that afforded us an opportunity to have the
hearings at a location inside the city, because we
weren't sure whether or not we were going to have a
place to welcome us, and I want to thank Representative
James and the University for allowing us to appear
here. Thank you again.

If we could start off with John and then

Sheila, and I know that there's George and Joseph. I don't know if they want to also come forward.

MR. PULCINELLA: Mr. Caltagirone, I was requested, quite the contrary, I was requested to bring a couple of people to support the position that I'm going to present. They're two separate areas so there tale will be of a broader perspective, in finer detail than I may perhaps give relative to these issues. So if they could in conjunction with my presentation or after my presentation fill in all the gaps that I'm sure I'll leave, I think they will benefit.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: All right, we'll hold any questions until all of you testify and then we'll open it for questions. So you can start off.

Just identify yourself for the record.

MR. PULCINELLA: My name is John
Pulcinella. I'm currently president of Fathers and
Children Equality, a statewide child advocacy group.
We have representatives in 42 of 67 counties in
Pennsylvania, representing tens of thousands of parents
and children who are affected by the domestic relations
branch of our government. When this bill was
introduced, as president of this organization I was,
needless to say, got a number of phone calls, hey John,
great, there's this bill, finally they're going to

criminalize false accusations of abuse. And with reservation I waited until I got my copy of it, I saw that in fact this bill was limited to only false accusations of child abuse, which is a very horrendous offense. Both child abuse is horrendous and false

accusations of child abuse is horrendous.

To address the bill specifically, before I go off on my tangents that I'm known to do, I would like to say, well, first of all, thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having the strength of character to buck the political pressure concerning holding these public hearings. We thank you tremendously. And thank you, Representative James and Representative Hennessey for coming here.

Let me start out by saying that the bill, it's incredible to me that 135 words, 15 lines the actual text of this bill, has created such an uproar. That must say something. The false accusations of child abuse has skyrocketed over the last few years. To use Mr. Kaira's own statistics, you can see that in the groups that refer these cases, the two highest reports come from hospitals and schools, people who will suffer civil liability if they don't report. I think that's a key issue. They are covering themselves and everybody knows that teachers, lawyers, doctors,

are all protecting, all practicing defensive medicine, defensive strategies to protect themselves.

6 '

Then the next group, the next four where the reliability factor is the least involve people who very, very often get involved when the situation is divorce or custody actions. I think that's important. And if you add those four together, it outnumbers greater than the first two together. So I think at a glance we see there's a major problem here. We can subtract, I think, the top of schools and hospitals because they are maybe attune and practicing defensive measures, and I think that if there's real evidence of abuse, these people would still report it. But by making it mandatory, you're implying a liability, a civil liability, so of course you're going to get more false reports from there because people aren't going to take the chance.

Let's in fact go to the people that testified first, I have a couple of comments. As you can see, I'm not presenting my testimony from a written text because I don't feel I need to. The issues as I see them as president of this organization and my involvement over the last five years in this group actively, these particular issues, when I say they don't really affect me, they can never come to play in

my case so I feel I have a certain objectivity. We've talked to tens of thousands of people and you're correct, there are no funding means to help the falsely accused at all. So we get a significant number of those people and regardless of financial ability, I must say that no one can afford to defend against these charges. I tried to look at the mechanisms in place for investigating child abuse and I said to myself, wait a second, who is in favor of child abuse? Nobody. Nobody wants child abuse. Should child abuse be punished? Absolutely. To the fullest extent of the law. Or greater.

I think we have to agree with Rama, they should be hung, even though our laws don't provide for that. But what about the false accusations of child abuse? What does that do to the child? I've been forced to learn about a system, much unlike any system that I was taught in school in civics class. God you could have thrown that case out the window because it's not reality. Certainly Perry Mason and LA Law isn't reality. The reality is that we have this agency that invests child abuse called Children and Youth Services. We already have testimony, you have much testimony from other areas of the State that the people that do these investigations have no qualification requirements, none

whatsoever. We know that there's a lot of false reporting. We know that by their very focus they're looking to verify the abuse because that's their job, as verifier. And they've got the qualifications to do the verifying.

What's the problem here? Wagner and Wigfield, two noted psychologists out in Minnesota, have done exhaustive research over the past 20 years about the false accusations of child abuse, and what's interesting is in their statistics and their findings they have found that the investigation itself is more traumatic than full child abuse. What are we doing here? There's got to be some protection for our children. For our children. Yes, it is a crime to involve a child in making false accusations. Yes, it should be a crime. The person making false accusations should be subjected to penalty under the law.

The problem I have with this bill, and I support this bill, but that you made the mistake of saying it could be amended to include anything so I will give you a hundred amendments. There needs to be some sanctions. The people that were here said earlier we have plenty of laws. We have plenty of laws. We have perjury laws. What a joke. Has anyone ever been prosecuted for perjury in domestic relations? Never.

It doesn't happen. I could pack this room with hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of people where perjury, admitted perjury, is on the record, nothing is done. I have someone here right now who will say where his own attorney got an expert witness, turned out it wasn't an expert witness, to recant all the testimony that caused this man to be taken from his children for, well, it turned out forever now. Said that she lied about her qualifications and her knowledge and the judge never even looked up from the desk.

So aren't you concerned about providing a penalty in the legislature which your intent is wonderful, but I'm telling you it's not going to get carried out in the judicial section of this government. It's not going to happen. Lawyers aren't going to prosecute it, district attorneys aren't going to prosecute it, and why? Because the system is overburdened. I don't want to point the finger at Children and Youth and say they're all bad. I do not believe they are all honorable people, but like every area of government, they're all overworked, they're underpaid, very little appreciation, and they've got the spotlight on them. You don't hear about the good job they do, you hear about the one kid that turned up dead that they didn't investigate on. Well, no wonder

that they're looking to find child abuse everywhere.

Of course they are. They're covering their asses, like everyone. That's all they're doing. So, what can we do?

And, you know, their qualifications, no qualifications. The bill says, okay, if it's a false report, you're guilty of this crime. Well, what constitutes verification of a false report? An unfounded finding with Children and Youth? The very agency chaired and run by people who aren't qualified to run? I don't understand. So where are we going to determine what's real and what's not real? I think what you're going to have is what you have already. You're going to have the random recommendation that that may or may not be false that could possibly have been decided just as easily by flipping a coin, in absence of any real hard evidence.

What else is wrong with Children and Youth? We have an unaudited body of people who has the power of God without any oversight or answer to courts. I have seen child abusers who have been convicted, spent time in prison, child abusers get the kids back by alleging child abuse against a custodial parent. Incredible. And how does it happen? A simple anonymous phone call possibly, Children and Youth comes

on, takes the children away, they're gone, put in the case of where it's parental battling—and it's a shame where that happens, and I have a solution for that, too—put the child back in the hands of the abuser.

I've seen that happen more than once. We saw it here. He will testify. He's not on the list. It happened to him exactly. It took him three months to get his kids back from Children and Youth. Of course, they didn't have time to write the report, even though they found it unfounded. Sorry. It's a very emotional issue for me, as you can tell.

So what constitutes confirmation of a false report? An unfounded report? Okay. There's a distinction here in this bill between the false report and the malicious false report. I don't understand the difference. How can you possibly falsely accuse someone not maliciously? I don't understand the difference, quite honestly. I think any false reporting is malicious intent. But how do we prove it? That's all I'm asking to summarize what I'm saying about the bill specifically is please, put some teeth into it. Don't leave it up to the judiciary to enforce your legislative intent, because it's not going to happen. It's not going to put some sanctions in there and clearly define a mechanism whereby false

allegations can be verified. Because it's not going to happen otherwise. And the bill has great intentions, but it's just not going to happen in the courts. My experience with thousands of people tell me that.

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

How can we fix this system? We can fix this system by taking family and children seriously in our society. If you look at it from the child's perspective, if you really want to fix the system in domestic relations, and that's what this is, it's amended to Title 23, the domestic relations. I don't care if that parent is the worst parent. That's mom. That's dad. Ask the child. That's my mom. That's my daddy. They don't understand divorce, separation, custody. They don't understand that. In the child's ideal world, mom and dad are together forever. Now we know in our real world that's not true. Two out of three marriages end in divorces. No longer 1 out of 2, 50 percent. It's 2 out of 3. It affects everyone. And children are the biggest losers.

Nobody is truly advocating for the child. False accusations of abuse not only in sexual abuse but also in domestic abuse has been used as a weapon in divorce. And why is it used as a weapon in divorce? It's used as a weapon in divorce because it's an easy way to gain all victories in divorce. It gains you

custody, it gets you possession of a house, it gets the other person put away, out of there, out of the picture. Never, ever are these allegations made and custody actions made without disapproval, so the whole issue of divorce is settled at once. And there are numerous agencies that will enhance and support the abuse of this process. And it's a shame, who are the losers? The children are the losers. How do we stop this vicious cycle? Easily. Don't make children a prize to win. Get them out of their hands.

part and most of the judiciary that that sits and hears these cases they're coming from the "Leave it to Beaver" days of the '50s when divorce was not as common a problem. Divorce is no longer a marital status that is stigmatized negatively in society. It affects everyone. So why not make it an issue of family and not an issue of law. Let's get it out of the courts by a real meaningful divorce mediation bill where the people are compelled to come to an agreement and if the one party is not warranted, that will then go against them in any decision. Let's make it real. Let's not make children pawns to be fought over, where these allegations can be made to win, and that's what we're doing. Look, we live in a litigious society where

we've got to win, regardless of truth. Perjury is not even prosecuted, this won't be prosecuted. No way.

(Applause.)

Divorce is a part of the new family experience in America. It can't be viewed positively. Children can have four parents, eight grandparents. It can be viewed positively. Children can have four parents, eight grandparents. Look at all this love that could potentially be available to our children, this positive input so that they can succeed in life. Now we don't have that. We have a system where because of a breakdown in a personal relationship, regardless of the reason, families are divided and children are now held up as the prize. And the best you buy and the more money you can throw at it, the better chance you have of winning. And guess who loses. The kids. The kids don't want that.

Make shared physical custody a legal presumption. And tie that together with mandatory meaningful divorce mediation and you're going to solve a lot of your budgetary problems too. The courts are going to empty in family law areas. Children and Youth won't have nearly the number of cases to investigate because there's not this prize. And they won't be coming to you for more money because they won't need

it. And maybe they can focus their time on these people down here where the true abuse is happening and where the children really do need protection. are so many false accusations of abuse, even the investigators, they don't know anymore. They don't know anymore. So everybody becomes suspect. So like they say themselves, continue to err in the favor of the child. Err, and who is the victim of that error? Three out of four, we're to believe any of these statistics that we've seen here. I don't understand. Children and Youth can come in, take your children, by their word they can overcome any court order for an indefinite period of time for any reasons. 

Our schools are encouraging our children to turn us in for being parents. I mean, it sounds crazy. You referenced Nazi Germany. It sounds like Hitler youth or the KGB, turn in your sisters, turn in your neighbors. What are we doing to each other? Who is to be destroyed here? Our children are being destroyed. Do we care about our children? Yes, we do. Get rid of all these false reports. Get rid of all these false reports. Get rid of all these false reports by getting rid of the incentives for making false reports too often, too often have to do with the custody or divorce action. I think any report

made during the course of the custody and divorce 1 2 action should be looked at highly suspiciously, and they're not. Not at all. Unfortunately, it is a 3 4 nuclear weapon with divorce and it wins all issues and it alienates children from parents and it destroys 5 these parents for the rest, the rest of their lives. 6 7 We have a court system whose only legal basis currently for deciding custody is what? Status quo and the best 8 9 interest and welfare of the children. Best interest 10 and welfare of the children. That's a really vague measure. I mean, who's to determine that? Okay, we 11 12 have precedence, we have cases, we have all this law to 13 decide for us what's in the best interest and welfare 14 of the children. And I am constantly amazed at one 15 resource that we are greatly lacking in this country in our courts and in our government - common sense. 16 17 do we have to be told how to think as parents? Sure, 18 there's fringe. There's fringe everywhere and we have 19 laws to cover that, but the dissolution of the family 20 and the handling of the custody of children is 21 affecting everyone because of the few, and that's 22 wrong. It's wrong.

We've got to get this issue out of the courts again. I didn't plan on getting quite as emotional as I just did and it has affected my

23

24

25

presentation slightly and I apologize for that, but I have six children, the oldest of which is 9. Five of those six are products of divorces. It's a blended family. And I love those five children. I love all six, but the five who are affected by this, I see a trauma that they experienced. And I see parents, just sometimes broken up parents who are willing to cooperate with each other and make the situation better but they're too worried about, wait a minute, they're going to call their lawyer to see if they can negotiate this for the children if it's appropriate. If it's appropriate legally. I mean, come on. That is, I've got something to do tonight, can you take the kids or would you be available to babysit or can I have them, I'm going somewhere? Why can't our parents talk to each other? No, our system doesn't allow it. We've got to go with the lawyers negotiating in court, all of whom don't really care about the children.

## (Applause.)

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

I'm also impressed from all the hearings that I do attend and people that I talk to, I'm also impressed by the fact that very often the forces that from my perspective are working against children seem so fanatical and close-minded. I don't understand that. The people that we heard from first today,

they're the ones that got me in this mood because I couldn't believe I was hearing what I heard. gentleman here, he knows -- if he truly does what he says he does for a living, he knows the number of false accusations there are. Why? What's his agenda? What are you really doing? He said nine times--I counted--he said, I'm a child advocate. Well, then yeah, don't you understand that false accusations hurt children? No, he doesn't understand. It doesn't happen. Wait a minute, what's wrong with this man? you get paid for what you're doing? Is this increased budget going to help you? And I don't get paid with one penny and the issue doesn't affect me and I'm outraged. I'm in it because of what I've seen, and I'm outraged, quite frankly.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You see, I had this, you know, this stupid belief that our courts—and my first experience with court, by the way, was with domestic relations, and I figured, okay, I'm going to go to court, this beautiful building with marble pillars and this wise old man with the wisdom of Solomon, gray hair, black robes, he was going to somehow listen and come to the best decision here for us easily with no big deal. What a shock. What a shock. They didn't care about me, they didn't care about my ex-wife, they didn't care

about my children. In fact, we couldn't get in there. We had to pay big bucks for people to talk to us in language we don't understand. Is that what our founding fathers wanted? I don't think so. I don't think so. But that's the system we've created. We've created a system that destroys families. We've created a system that creates deadbeat dads. We've created a system that seems very insensitive and uncaring. How ironic, I find, that the very system, the very courts, the very judges that so nonchalantly break up families, the effects of which devastate the children for the rest of their lives.

You've heard enough testimony, I would just be repeating myself. Other testimony, if I told you told you, the plethora of life problems that children experience as a result of divorce and single parenting, we all know. Isn't it interesting that when a child turns 18 and exhibits some of the results of that disadvantaged upbringing, a judge will put them in jail. What are we doing to our kids? If we don't think this is all interrelated, we're blind. The prison population is far overrepresented by children from single families, single parent families, much more than should be statistically possible. It is related. Get this stuff out of the courts. Don't make children

a prize to be won and fought over. And get rid of the brainwashing that happens in between and criminalize false allegation of abuse, absolutely.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I also would like to see that this bill be expanded to include penalties for false accusations of domestic abuse, because that also is a weapon that is really clouding the issue. There are truly battered people out there that are getting lost in the crowd, the crowd of people making false accusations, and it's really a shame. It's really is a shame. We need to protect, have measures to protect people but we are far off target, much too far, and all along we are ignoring victim rights, real victims, and the real victims are the falsely accused. In no other area of the law I defy anyone with children, any other area of the law where you are guilty until proven innocent. And the punishment is immediate. You're extracted from the lives of your children. And you're guilty until proven innocent. Hearsay is admissible. Read the statute. Hearsay is admissible. No standard of evidence. None whatsoever. The investigative body is not required to have any qualification. Woe. I had to look at the front to make sure it was the United States when I read this. I couldn't believe it.

Thank you very much.

## (Applause.)

MR. McCOOK: Hello. My name is George McCook. I'm going to tell you one of the stories of how sexual abuse allegation can be used to a disgruntled spouse's advantage.

November of 1989, my wife and I had separated. We had a daughter, Courtney Ann, who was 3-years-old at the time. After our separation I was seeing my daughter one day a week, every other weekend, and whenever I was needed to help my wife out in taking care of my child. It was as peaceful as a situation could be, considering the stress of divorce and separation, but it was working.

On June 28 of 1990, I went to pick my daughter up for a regularly scheduled visit and I was told that she wasn't there, that I wouldn't be able to see her again and to not bother coming back. And I continued to make attempts by phone to contact my wife to try and re-establish the contact between my daughter. To no avail. On July 19 of 1990, my attorney and I filed a petition in Delaware County courts for emergency relief to restore visitation between my daughter and I. This motion was heard the following day on the 20th. This was held in front of judge George Koudelis.

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

At this meeting, allegations of sexual abuse were made by my wife's aunt, Christine Antonelli. She was accepted onto the stand by the judge as an expert witness with an expert in child sexual abuse. The credentials that she cited, among many, is that she was a doctorate in social work, that she had extensive work experience in this field. During her testimony, she described the situation that my daughter had disclosed to her and illustrated it with drawings that my child has supposedly drawn. When I looked at the drawings, there was absolutely no question in my mind as to whether they were drawn by my daughter or not. My attorney was livid, objecting to her even being let on the stand let alone these pictures being admitted into evidence based on the fact that we didn't know anything about this woman outside of the fact that she was a relative to my wife. At the end of that hearing I was not permitted to see my daughter by the courts. CYS investigation had just begun. As a matter of fact, CYS wasn't really formally notified until the day after the hearing.

The hotline was called. The hotline in Harrisburg was called the evening after we had set our hearing date by Christine Antonelli. The timing was very good. In August, I met with CYS, and I liken it

to a McCarthy hearing, to an inquisition. It was fill in the blanks. I was presumed guilty and now they just needed to fill in the questions to prosecute their case. I was offered a lie detector test, which I was more than willing to cooperate with, but I was hoping that they would also give a lie detector to the person making the allegations, to my wife and to see if they could get to the bottom of what was going on. I was informed by the CYS caseworker and the detective from CID that my wife was not the one being investigated, that I was, and that they had no reason to worry about whether the allegations were true and correct, they only wanted to find out from me what was going on.

On August 18 of 1990, CYS completed their evaluation and determined that it was an unfounded case, meaning that there was no evidence to support the allegations. At this point, with the support of my family, my stepmother, my father, we decided that we were going to contract our own expert in the field. We interviewed several child psychiatrists and psychologists. We wound up selecting Dr. Marshall Schechter. Dr. Schechter expressed that he wanted to meet with both me, my wife, my family, and to try and get to the bottom of this. My wife refused to cooperate with this and naturally we needed to obtain

court orders. We obtained three court orders and she still never cooperated. On a petition in front of Judge Koudelis again for a contempt of court against my wife for failure to comply with these court orders, the judge decided that his best action at this point was to order court-ordered evaluations by Rick Schroeder, a psychologist. This was to be done both on myself and my wife.

On January 19 of 1991, Rick Schroeder completed his evaluations. In his report about me he stated, quote, "I see no clear evidence both in court records which I examined or on the psychological evaluation that Mr. McCook is a perpetrator of incest with his daughter." In my evaluation of his wife, he concluded that she has a paranoid personality disorder and he, quote, "seriously questions her allegations, unquote. On February 14, with these reports in hand, we filed for another hearing in front of Judge Koudelis. Again, we were attempting to restore visitation. At this point it had been nine months since I had seen my daughter.

On February 21, one week after we got our new court date, another set of allegations of sexual abuse was filed again with CYS. This again was one week after we had gotten a new court date. On February

28, we have the hearing in front of George Koudelis. At this hearing we were very limited by time. The only person that was able to testify was Rick Schroeder. He recommended restoring visitation. At the end of the hearing, when the judge was to make his decision, the judge replied, quote, "I don't feel it would be right for me at this time based on one-sided testimony, I don't think I'm in a position to make an order concerning the supervised visitation that you requested, unquote. I couldn't even get supervised visitation, despite one unfounded investigation by CYS and a court-appointed psychologist saying that he doubts the claims of sexual abuse and did feel that I was no threat to my daughter. And what was really interesting was that the judge felt that this was one-sided testimony. Dr. Schroeder was picked by the judge, he was a court-appointed expert to do this evaluation. Apparently he didn't tell the judge what he wanted to hear. That's the only thing I could see.

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

As I mentioned before, new claims of sexual abuse were also filed just prior to this hearing. CYS decided that they couldn't cope with the case. They didn't have the expertise to deal with it. So they decided to farm it out to a Sandra Steicher, who was a social worker. I must say Sandra Steicher's

investigation was pretty thorough. She met with me, my family, my wife, her family. During this investigation, there became questions who the perpetrator might have been. The investigation into my me by Sandra Steicher was unfounded. CYS issued that on April 23. The second investigation into me was unfounded. However, Sandra Steicher felt compelled to file a CY-47 against my wife's live-in boyfriend, feeling that there was suspect that he might have been the perpetrator. It was interesting how the way he was treated in the system and the way I was treated in the system differs now.

Meanwhile, all along I have still yet to see my daughter. My wife's live—in boyfriend is still living in the house. He's still seeing my daughter regularly. I was told by CYS that Megan Fulton was the caseworker. I was told by Megan Fulton that she had told my wife to keep her boyfriend away from my daughter. Yet that wasn't happening. He was there in the house and my daughter was there. After phone calls to CYS I was informed by them that they're not a police force and they can't sit there and watch to make sure that he isn't around my daughter. My attorney made attempts, I did everything that I felt that I could do to try and make sure that if this guy was abusing her

1

that the two were separated, but no one did anything.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On July 30 of 1991, there was another hearing scheduled, again trying to restore this visitation. This hearing lasted two days. Numerous experts testified. I brought in my people, my wife brought in her people, I brought in every court-appointed expert. During this testimony, Courtney's aunt testified again. In between the time of the first hearing when she initially testified and this second hearing we had a chance to compile extensive information on my wife's aunt and we found out that she didn't have the educational background that she pretended to have. She had not completed her doctorate degree at the University of Pennsylvania, when she testified that she had. She had no extensive work experience in child sexual abuse. In fact, her Master's thesis was on a relationship between spousal abuse and pet abuse. I didn't see anything in her records that indicate any kind of expertise in this field of sexual abuse.

On the stand she recanted that my daughter had drawn these pictures. She said, well, I drew them. She drew them with my help. I assisted. Any professional in this field would know that you don't assist a child in drawing these types of

pictures. The judge sat there. She recanted her education, she recanted her testimony, she recanted a lot of testimony, and the judge sat there, never looked up. My altorney stopped at one point and turned to the judge to see a reaction. There was none. He again repeated the questions about her testimony and again the judge didn't stir.

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

At the end of this hearing the judge decided that the case was too complicated for him to make a decision. He requested that my expert Dr. Marshall Schechter make an evaluation and recommendations to the court. Dr. Schechter conducted his investigation, made his evaluation and his recommendations. He recommended that treatment for Couriney, Joanne and myself, both together and individually. He recommended that Joanne's family be prevented from making up stories and planting false things in my daughter's mind. He also said if the family did not comply with these court orders that the child should be removed from the household. This order was -- this report was submitted to the judge, who waited three months and there's nothing. I had written letters to the judge, my attorney wrote letters to the judge, Dr. Schechter wrote letters to the judge trying to find out what his ruling was going to be.

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

filed in Orphan's court. This is in front of the President Judge, and it's a petition stating that I'm not the biological father of my daughter and requesting a blood test. I was at a point now where my wife had shown that there was nothing that she was not willing to do to get me out of her life and out of my daughter's life. She had to testify on the stand as to how she knew I was the father of my child. This was a no-win situation. The court weren't going to make a decision. I had been in court for 19 months at this point trying to restore visitation and was never, ever able to get a decision from the judge. Despite unfounded reports, despite psychological evaluations, questioning my wife's stability. I was reminded by the wisdom of King Solomon and I had to make a difficult decision. Was I to pursue this, was I to go through a blood test, was I to subject my daughter to a blood test? Was I to continue this? Was this an opportunity to stop the case? I decided at that point that I was going to go relinquish my parental rights.

In November of 1991, a new petition is

In February of 1992, there was a meeting with the President Judge, at which point I was to sign the papers terminating my parental rights. I refused to sign those papers. I disagreed with it. I told my

my objections, that afternoon President Judge terminated my parental rights. This matter is now on appeal in Superior Court, has been there for a year, and to date the only progress it has made is that the opinion was issued two months ago by the judge. I'm still waiting to hear from Superior Court.

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

We pursued several other venues in this case. The perjured testimony of my wife's aunt we took it up with the DA. We met with CID and we told them our case. We had the copies of the testimony. We had the copies of her vitae. He we had the pictures that my daughter had allegedly drawn and current pictures that my daughter had drawn. There was no comparison. Despite all that we offered to the DA, they didn't feel that it was enough to prosecute. I believe the words that were used was that it was a gray area. We went to the judicial review board with what I felt was the judge's misconduct and his inability to make a decision. After three hearings, after incredible amounts of reports, the judicial review board felt that there was nothing with the judge who couldn't make a decision to restore visitation in 19 months. basically said that there was nothing that they could do.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Apparently, no one is liable for their actions in this case. The judge isn't, the attorneys aren't, CYS isn't. No one has to answer to anybody. Meanwhile, I'm denied access to my child. When this first started I figured, well, it will just take some time to get to the bottom of it. This system will work. Maybe I won't see her for a few weeks. After 6 months, 9 months, a year, 19 months, it's now been 3 years since I've seen my daughter. I doubt I will ever see her again. And what is there left anyway? She's been turned against me, she's been convinced of lies. It's a no-win situation. No one will ever win in this situation. The way you're treated, you're guilty, you're unable to prove yourself innocent. You can't walk away from these allegations. You're left in a position where you have to defend yourself. I didn't feel that the system was capable of finding the truth. The punishment that you receive for having these allegations made against you is that you don't see your child. I don't think there's anything worse that you can do to a parent. If I was in jail for murder, I would still be entitled to see my child. I was accused of abusing my child sexually by a disgruntled wife. was denied access to my child. It has brought a lot of anger at the system for allowing this to happen. A

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

system that was supposed to intervene. The system that was supposed to see and know all. It's not there I was incredibly disillusioned by what happened.

CYS is a cursory. They're incompetent. They're not prepared to deal with these situations. Ţ don't know if it's entirely their fault. You can't expect someone with a Master's degree to understand the incredibly complicated nature of these types of allegations, and I believe they are only more complicated when they are false allegations and when there is a custody battle being waged at the time. You need more than a Master's degree to delve into this and to get to the bottom of what's going on. They're not prepared to do it. CYS illustrated that by not handling it themselves at the second set of allegations by having someone on the outside do that. They were saying right then and there that they couldn't handle it. My daughter was stolen from me, and she did it with the courts and false allegations. The courts and CYS were used by her and they don't even seem to realize it. She was the vehicle that she used to obtain her means, and the games that she wanted, and that was for me to not see my daughter any longer or be involved in her life.

I spent \$3,000 of my own money in this.

I don't regret that. I know I've had to deal with it. I couldn't have walked away from my daughter when this first started. The financial loss, the emotional loss, I lost a job over this. It recks have on your life. My life was a mess for almost two years over this whole situation. And there is no end to it. My daughter will still always bear the scars of this. I don't know what her life is going to bring to her. I don't know what her future is going to be. What I do know is that we had a very close relationship, that I enjoyed her company and she enjoyed mine, that I was a caring parent and a caring father, and what I know now is that someone else convinced her that that wasn't true. And it's got to cause a lot of confusion for a 5-year-old child.

I don't know the answers. I don't know what to say. I think the system is seriously lacking when it comes to dealing with this. I think the system needs some qualified people beyond a Master's level, beyond a bachelor's level. You need doctors, you need psychologists and psychiatrists that are qualified in people's behavior. This is a step in the right direction. I think that it's got along ways to go. I know I'm not one of the more common cases, but nonetheless, they do exist and there are children

paying the price for what's going on. And I think that that's the biggest crime that's being committed.

That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. LAMONACA: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. My name is Joseph Lamonaca. I'm a member of the Bar of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I practice in the area of domestic relations and abuse defense. I'm going to keep my comments today strictly to House Bill 826 as I see it as a practitioner.

I have practiced in this area for quite some time. I've done many defense cases in the area of abuse, and as a tool, I'm looking at 826 primarily as an attorney defending people who have abuse allegations, which could be anybody in this room or any member of the chair, for that matter. Initially, I must state I think it's well-intended. I think there's some things to be considered. As I read through 6320 on itself and starting with line 9, the first problem I ran into was an adult. I don't think there's any question with the judiciary as to what an adult is, but I think there would need to be some clarification or definition as to what we're looking at as to whether it's an individual or an adult. And the reason for

that is because, one of the reasons is, and I'm going to look at sources of referrals, I'm going to refer to Rama's chart for a minute. As we look to the referrals, and as you go across the bottom line, any one of these people could be the individual who is making a report. In fact, the report itself could be a coroner, could be the school, could be an individual in the school. Certainly, the target for unlawful persuasion or in the case of false reporting would be those anonymous reports, or in the case of Domestic Relations spouses. However, any one of those individuals as either an organization or an individual could be the person either unlawfully persuading or making a false report, and it's my interpretation that I think some definition would need to be in there as to who exactly we're targeting this particular law to.

"reasonable grounds," which, and I'm going to support this in just a minute, certainly need to be defined.

Does "reasonable grounds" mean that the person is required to investigate? If I were to — if a child who for the primary cases that I defend, and probably the majority of them is the child would be the only witness, the only material witness we have in these circumstances as to whether mom persuaded, the school

persuaded. In that respect, one of problems in every single case that I try to defend in these abuse allegations, I'm trying to prove these two points. I'm always trying to prove, and my client comes to me, whether it be anybody in this room and says, its completely false, it never happened, then if I'm to believe my client and I'm trying to convince either the Department of Public Welfare in front of Mr. Parcy or a particular Court of Common Pleas that this is the case, I'm actually trying to persuade one of these two things has happened. That either there's a false report or there's a false persuasion or some combination thereof.

One of the problems is this wording here, "reasonable grounds." What is required of a person that whether it be the school, whether it be mother or whoever, what is required for them to meet that burden of reasonable grounds? Do they have to independently investigate or is it simply enough that they take the information that they've been given from the child or whoever, and in this case probably being the child, and pass it along to the authority being Children and Youth or the police? Without investigating anything, if the child says, dad did something to me or mom did something to me, if they take that quote and pass it along, have they met the burden of, quote, "reasonable

grounds"? That's one of the problems we've had up until this point is that everybody sloughs it off on somebody else. The child said this, quote. In the majority of the cases that I've had before Mr. Parcy, again in DPW, and I certainly won't mention any case cites, although if the chairman wishes I'd be happy if I can get releases from my clients to forward with any information that you so desire.

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

Those quotation marks have become one of the biggest questions we have in any of these cases. If you look at the CY-48, which are the indicated reports, and in almost every one of my cases it's not uncommon to see the child said, quote, that a phrase about what abuse took place, unquote, and certainly that would fall within the purview of this particular statute if in fact that allegation was unlawfully persuaded or some person performed that or it was falsely reported as to what the child said. In fact. those quotation marks are usually just what's passed the law and it winds up passing its way down from the reporter to some other source to an investigative source and we find that sometimes those quotation marks are not in fact quotation marks. The child may not have said, quote, unquote, this is not what took place. but somebody as it went down the line the child

indicated that maybe touching certain areas of the body and it was held as a quote. Is that person to be held to the standard of this particular act? I don't know. I mean, in just reading the act, I don't know. It a doctor or a school nurse passes along a particular quote to Children and Youth, Children and Youth fails to reasonably investigate, are they going to be the target of the act or is it going to the doctor or is it going to be at some point down the line?

within the judicial system with me I can testify that many people have handled this case from one end to the other and I don't know to the extent of who's going to be the target of this particular act. I've looked at this and I looked it over after I got the facts any I looked it over and I said to myself, looking at even the cases that I'm trying to do this now, who would be the target of the unlawful persuasion, or if reasonable grounds, who would be the target of the false reporting? To be honest with you, I haven't been to come up with an answer because of the vagueness of the definitions themselves, provided that does it qualify that we just pass the information down the line.

Now, the third thing that I wanted to

mention, and this just may be a technical issue, but we go through the first part from line 9 to 12 and we're going to call that, and that gives the standard of potentially knowingly causes or persuades a child. Then line 12 adds malicious intent. Now, in my interpretation of it, and of course I didn't write it and I may be wrong, but that adds a significant level or another level to lines 9, 10 and 11, or excuse me 9 through 12, but yet the grade is lower. So in my interpretation, the first four lines are going to be a grade second degree, but now we're going to add now malicious intent, so we're going to say the act now if it was done with malice, okay, clearly with malice is going to be a lower grade. And it's not either/or. We look at it I it—

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: A misdemeanor of the first degree is more serious than a misdemeanor of the second degree.

MR. LAMONACA: But in comparison, I'm looking in comparison between the two grades. I understand, yeah, it is a higher degree with the malice. Is the second part of the act supposed to be either/or, or is it simply going to be increased? If it's done with malice, then it's simply going to be increased.

Ϊŧ

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I wasn't the 1 author of the bill, but it seems to me that if you use 2 3 "malicious" you are committing a more serious offense and subject yourself to greater punishment. I 4 mentioned earlier that there were no penalties in the 5 act. By classifying the action as a misdemeanor of the 6 7 second degree or a misdemeanor of the second degree, 8 automatically the penalties for the misdemeanors are 9 included which says jail, fines, or a combination of 10 the two. MR. LAMONACA: 11 Right. Something unique 12 happens here that this is being placed in Title 23 rather than Title 18. 13 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: That was pointed 14 15 out yesterday. 16 MR. LAMONACA: And that's why I'm raising these issues because it's being placed not only in 17 Title 23 but it's being placed under 6300s, which is 18 the Children and Youth section of the child abuse 19 section. 20 21 As I move on to the second part of this, 22 which is your 6321, false reporting, false reports

could fall within the heading of the 6100s; which are

protection from abuse, which occurs I would say if not

more at least equal to the Children and Youth.

23

24

25

placed in Title 18, it's being placed in Title 23.

I've been up and down Title 23 and this is unique in that they're going to give rise to a criminal statute new in what has predominantly been a civil statute from one end to the other. There are certainly civil contempts and civil penalties associated with Title 23, but this is the most unique of what now we're going to be having enforcement and that may create another question of who is going to do the enforcement to this particular act?

Assume for a minute that, let me just backtrack a minute, and the reason why I mention that is because of the standard of proof that everybody else has brought up. And I won't put my lawyering abilities on the line, it is extremely difficult under the act as it's written right now, and again, we're always trying to prove unlawful persuasion in civil actions, it is extremely difficult to prove under the civil action by a preponderance of the evidence that this has taken place. Once Children and Youth gets involved during the PFA side, because in civil it's only a preponderance of the evidence. It's extremely tough to prove or disprove it with the standard being a preponderance of the evidence.

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, it appears, and correct me if I'm wrong, that this is going to give rise obviously to a criminal act, and I would imagine then that the burden of proof, and I guess it just goes without saying that it's going to be beyond a reasonable doubt. And if we're going to give rise now to beyond a reasonable doubt. I really believe that this is going to have to be spelled out in depth as to who in fact the act is going to be intended to, who is going to be -- is it going to be the attorneys? In the case where I have a client who says it hasn't happened, it can't be done because it's totally contradictory to the fact that I can't get reports, I can't get the CY-48. I'm going to have to go crazy to try to get anything. I never know. Even during the civil case I never know who the accuser is, and that's a major issue in a civil case, so I don't know who the accuser is. I have no way of proving or disproving or moving forward with any type of a criminal act let alone civil. It just won't happen. And so to that extent is it going to be the district attorneys on responsibility and information and is the district attorney going to be privileged to information that I am not going to be privileged to as a member of the Bar? Again, as with most crimes, if we're going to put that into the purview of the

1 district attorney or whoever the authority is going to 2 be, why--3 (The audio tape cut off and picked up 4 again at this point: } 5 MR. MORETTI: I don't understand the system. Here's the date, this is the order of the 6 7 court that the judge in Schuylkill County says he's 8 giving back to the father. He had to go to court to 9 keep the child. Why couldn't Children and Youth say the best thing for the child is let the father take 10 care of it? He had to go to court because he said, 11 12 you're going to back to jail if you don't return the 1.3 child to the mother. 14 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: In all honesty, I 15 have to ask this question, what does this have to do 16 with 826? 17 MR. MORETTI: What it has to do with 826? 18 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yeah. Because the 19 question is going to be asked--20 MR. MORETTI: I don't think it will 21 change the system. In other words, I want 826 as a 22 starter. The chilling effect, I would think the 23 chilling effect would be against, how do you say it, I 24 think there is no chilling effect. I don't understand 25 the chilling effect. There is so much false charges

that's going on that's accepted behavior on the part of 1 2 the women. It's simple as all that. I cannot leave Hazleton. I'm an engineer and I've got a Master's 3 degree. And I deliver pizza, I do taxes, I do any work 4 I can find. I'm 57 years old and I can't get work in 5 Hazleton because of a blue collar town. There's 6 nothing wrong with being a blue collar, but the point 7 8 is I can't leave Hazleton because the judge's order 9 says if I choose to leave Hazleton more than an hour 10 away I have to go back to court to see if it's okay with the wife, the ex-wife. Well, hopefully soon to be 11 the ex-wife. I'm stuck. You would never do to a 12 woman. I'm saying "you" as a judicial system. 13 14 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: This order 15 gives Mr. Moretti, so you, so you don't disagree with this order because it gives you the custody. 16 MR. MORETTI: No, it's just that I find 17 18 it incredible. 19 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: She wants to 20 change that? MR. MORETTI: Well, she wants to change 21 22 it.

All right, I thank you very much. As far as, I mean, I don't think the law is going to change anything because the judge, my question is, if — how

23

24

25

1 do you prove that if I file a charge, I can't be prosecuted unless it's obviously -- if I file any 2 charge, it doesn't have to be in child abuse or 3 anything like that. And outside Domestic Relations law 4 can I be prosecuted for lying or bringing on false 5 6 charges or whatever you call it? 7 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: We have a 8 statute that says it's improper and a crime to make 9 false reports to law enforcement agencies. 10 MR. MORETTI: So why doesn't it apply to child abuse? 11 12 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: To some extent 13 it may already. The question is whether or not we should pass or report 826 out of committee after we 14 amend it to make it this, to make the penalties 15 stronger and make more of a point that this kind of . 16 17 thing is a problem that has to be addressed. MR. MORETTI: It should be in domestic 18 court as simple as all that. Generally both parents 19 20 love the child and why tear the child up. 21 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I don't think 22 that it's intended to be tried in domestic relations 23 court. I thought it was criminal. 24 MAN IN AUDIENCE: From what I understand,

the concept of Children and Youth, it's supposed to be

25

-- it's supposed to be Children and Youth. So the agency lost the consent of children. It's supposed to be Children and Youth, so don't they do anything, why didn't they do anything for my 3-year-old son that was . beat up, why didn't they do nothing for me? Children and Youth helped the mother. They gave her six hours of intensive programs, they called. One hour a week they went to her house. Now she graduated. Now she's cured. Sexual molesters never will be cured. Probably 5, 10 percent go through intensive therapy will be cured. The basic nature of a human doesn't change.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: She would like to testify.

MR. MORETTI: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

Appreciate your time.

MS. BEHR: Chairman Caltagirone, members of the committee and guests, before I start, this of course is not really very long. What I did wish to say, since I am — my name is Sheila Behr, and I'm currently teaching kindergarten here in the city of Philadelphia, and I've done so for 22 years. I have 63 credits above my Master's degree as well as a supervisory certificate, and my classroom has been

described in "What Works in the Classroom, Practical Strategies," edited by Walls and King, and also in the Helen Oakes Newsletter, formerly published here in Philadelphia.

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

Before I start, I did want to make two comments. One on the anonymous phone calls. If people don't make the calls anonymously, they can still call and say they're somebody else. They can call purporting to be me. There's no check-up on who is calling and that the person is indeed the person who they claim to be. There's no follow back or follow-up. So anyone can say that, and I would be remiss in my job as a teacher to not explain at least here in Philadelphia, the system by which children are Teachers do not call Children and Youth. reported. There's a chain of command, and that consists of going to the principal or the counselor and they are the ones In physical abuse, because it's so much that report. more obvious, that might be more obvious to report. terms of sexual abuse, teachers are woefully just as children as youth are, we are not really trained in that area either. We are not trained to recognize the symptoms, we are not trained to recognize the child. Fortunately, here in Philadelphia, some years ago I was given a book on sexual abuse recognition. This was

long before our problems started in children, but it was left to my discretion as to whether I read it, which I did, but that does not mean that every teacher in the system read it.

One of the symptoms to recognize a child in the classroom is withdrawal and shyness from his classmates. Unfortunately, if that issue isn't addressed in subsequent years, another teacher might take that withdrawal and with the child becomming a loner would recognize that as the child's personality when indeed it was not. So I did want to make those points because I think when we get into the area of school reporting, it's important to know that I do not believe that teachers are any more adequately, even though we're mandated reporters, taught to report or recognize problems in the children in terms of sexual or incestuous relationships.

In our case, I support Bill 826. I wish it were stronger. It's vital to keep people from making false accusations because then what happens is uncoached children are not believed. And people say, invariably the wrong way that they are the ones being coached. Presently social workers from Children and Youth Services are not adequately trained to make judgments concerning allegations of sexual abuse or

Indeed, local universities do not offer any training in this area. If universities do not teach anything about this subject, how do workers learn to recognize symptoms, do interviews, et cetera? Experts in the field know that trust must be established for disclosure to take place, yet CYS questions the children in the home with no safeguards or protection offered to them. These workers have some in-service courses offered, but by whom are they taught and what steps are taking to insure mastery of content? What type, if any, internship is there? No one would entrust his child to the knife of a surgeon who had only observed or taken in-service courses. Why then do we allow social workers to decide issues that the psychiatrists take years to learn?

Since social workers have immunity from prosecution, they may make any decision that they wish, including avoiding the board certified psychiatrist's report. They may do this with impunity, even though the law requires investigation by law enforcement officials. By law, an investigation must be launched within 24 hours of the filed report. The children may be forced to stay in an abusive situation for days permitting coercion or coaching, either/or, of the children. And therefore, a true assessment of what the

situation is is not being met.

Rape crisis has informed me that CYS frequently finds many cases unfounded, only later to discover that the children are seriously injured. CYS workers are so deficient in their knowledge of the law that they have testified in court that for a case to be founded, a child must be maimed; they have also testified that for a sexual abuse case to be founded, the perpetrator must gain sexual gratification. In addition, a Philadelphia CYS supervisor in a speech to a group of Main Line women stated that any party can obtain a guardian ad litem. She did not know that a judge must appoint such a guardian ad litem, it is not an automatic procedure.

CYS workers are unbiased and concerned with the children's welfare. Unfortunately, too often this is not the case. Even more unfortunate is the fact that the internal notes of CYS workers are not available to the families involved. Therefore, anything may be written without the input of concerned parties. It is the only place where you may not meet your accuser. Whether the charges are false or true, you don't know what is being said or what is being written. Under the cloak of confidentiality, no information is released to

those most involved. If by some accident these notes are obtained, the lies are evident. And I have some of those notes. The confidentiality clause protects only CYS, not the children. In addition, in direct violation of the law, CYS will frequently have exparte communication with the judge.

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

It is important to note that social workers act upon reports without thorough, expert. outside professional investigation. When they do so, they are, in effect, both perpetrators and abetters in the emotional, physical, and sexual abuse of our children. A child willing to disclose abuse, if you will protect me, quote, unquote, to a psychologist appointed to his case by CYS was never permitted to do so because the case has already been reported as unfounded. When asked how he knew this without having ever interviewed the child the psychologist says CYS said so. It is obvious the case histories are pre-determined and CYS gets what it pays for. Since CYS experts' income is determined by the agencies' referrals, a clear conflict of interest exists here. Indeed, a child who had been told and demonstrated to an expert at Bryn Mawr Hospital how he and his brother had been masturbated in the bathtub was made to apologize to the perpetrator for having disclosed by

the same psychologist.

б

the country believe that children are most frequently given to an abusive parent. The Children and Youth Services of Philadelphia County and of Montgomery County operate under a professional provisional license because of the poor quality of service that they are rendering. We must stop child abuse by the perpetrators and those agencies that are supposed to protect the children but do not. We must erase child abuse from the home and hopefully from everywhere by all perpetrators, be they parent, social worker, judges, the entire system. Thanks.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Can we have the next presenters come up? I think we also have yours to present and we have Ronald Williams, and Edward Onichimowski, and Elaine Collado. If we could get everybody that is going to make, is there anybody else back there that's going to make my any presentations yet? If not, we'll try to have everybody go and we'll go with any questions afterwards.

MS. COLLADO: Good afternoon. My name is Elaine Collado, and I'm here on behalf for my granddaughter. And at 3 years old she had informed me

that her mother's boyfriend has sexually molested her and due to that, I live in Philadelphia and my daughter lives in Jersey, and my granddaughter out of three years of her life spent three years in my home in Philadelphia, her and her mother, every day, and for the past year since February '92 they've been in Margate, New Jersey, with this man who is not the baby's biological father, and unfortunately, the baby's biological father I can't contact him because it wouldn't do any good for the child because he is an alcoholic, he takes drugs and sells drugs. There's no sense in going in that route.

The family -- I personally called DHS in Philadelphia and reported this. They informed me I had to call Family Service in Jersey and report it, which I This was on October 6th of 1992. I never did so. heard anything. The child remained with me. Her mother kept coming to Jersey, her mother works in the casino down in Atlantic City, and her boyfriend, Frank Malloy, works in the casino also. It's just amazing how Family Services asks DHS to interview my granddaughter because she was here in Philadelphia as a favor or however they work it. DHS got in contact with The social worker, Gloria Gooding, came to my me. house to interview my granddaughter, and the whole time

she was there my granddaughter kept saying, well, grandmom, don't talk, don't tell. And the social worker was saying to her, well, why don't you tell me? And she said, no, I'm afraid, I'm afraid. I'm afraid. So the woman said, well, let's not force her anymore. I'11 come back another day, shortly. And within a week. Okay, fine. That was only on, it took place November 9, and that same evening I had gotten a phone call from Christina Brock from Family Services in New Jersey who has only been assigned the case for four days, because I had checked all this out. I have proof of everything that I'm saying. She informs me that she wants me to know that my daughter is going to come back to Philadelphia to take her daughter back to Jersey to this Frank Malloy's house. She just wanted me to know this, that she will be there the next day. I said, wait a minute, what kind of investigation did you do? Did you talk to the baby's pediatrician, who was in Philadelphia? Did you talk to any of the services that the baby was taken to in Philadelphia? Well, no, she didn't know anything about that. The only one she spoke to was Frank Malloy, who definitely of course said he didn't do this. My daughter, who's in denial of it happening, and that was it. And I said, I suggest you get some facts and talk to these other

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

people. She says to me, and when she called me it was 20 minutes to 5:00 in the evening. She said to me, 1 listen, okay, now it's 5:00 o'clock. She said, my hours are 9:00 to 5:00 and I want to get home like everybody else. I said, well, that's fine. She said, well, give me the phone numbers and I'll get back to you tomorrow. She was very angry with me because I questioned her. Okay, fine.

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

I felt in my heart that I did everything I could possibly do for my granddaughter. There was no more I could do. I sat her down beside me and I said Candace, mommy is coming. She's going to take you back to New Jersey. That's all I said. She said, she calls She said, Mom-Mom, is Frank going to be me Mom-Mom. there? This is how terrified this child is of this man. And I don't lie to my granddaughter. So I said, yes, he's going to be there. With that, she threw herself off the couch, was banging the back of her head on the floor, smacking her face, kicking and screaming, scared the hell out of me that I picked her up, I rubbed her head, now she's crying, I'm crying, I'm like, my God, what is going on here? I had raised three daughters on my own, myself, and have done a very good job of doing so. I put them through Catholic high school, they went through two years of college, which

they had dropped out, which was on their own.

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

What it amounted to is that my daughter is doing drugs. She's down in this fast lane in Atlantic City and has gotten hooked up with the wrong people. When I was hugging my granddaughter, I couldn't even think straight. I mean, I through clothes in the bag that like I had one sock, I didn't even have underwear for her. I was just so totally upset. And with that, I got her in the car, she was still crying and screaming because she didn't understand what I was telling her that she was wasn't going back. I kept trying to tell her, Candace, I'm going to make sure you're safe. You're going to be all right. With that, I have a friend that I've known her for 40 years, and she came into my mind because she had just called me a week before with giving me a new address that she had moved and I took my granddaughter and we ended up on her doorstep crying, this friend of mine is remarried, I don't even know her new husband. I thought, God, they're going to think I'm crazy. you know, being there, you know, thank God the husband was very nice and he was like more people should get involved and they don't, but you and your granddaughter can stay here as long as you like. And I said, I just want to, what my intentions then was the only thing I

could see is tomorrow I have to get her an attorney. I need to get my granddaughter someone to deal with this, to listen.

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

So with that, the next day I called the Philadelphia Bar Association, because I haven't dealt with attorneys and I didn't know anything about this. First, I had an accident last year and I have a herniated disk. So I have an accident lawyer. I called him and he referred me to call the Philadelphia Bar Association because he didn't really know anyone that does that. I called there, they hooked me up with this Nancy Kanter. And I informed her that as of now I'm with my granddaughter in hiding but I'm in Philadelphia. And I'm here because to try to keep the safety for my granddaughter. What can you do? And I gave her all the information and she said, okay, she said, now don't tell me where you are. I said, I didn't intend to. She said, okay, well, then you're going to have to call me back, but in the meantime, I'll do the footwork. Now, which she was very nice because I didn't even give this lady any money. hadn't even laid eyes on her. But she went over to DHS in Philadelphia and to talk to Gloria Gooding to find out if what I told her was the truth. Gloria Gooding said, yes, but she said, look, we don't understand.

Her supervisor was there also, and they said, we don't understand that Family Services in New Jersey called us and asked us to get involved and investigate with this child. We informed them that we need one more time to talk with this child and they said never mind, we have no founding. So forget it. So the lawyer said, well, as a courtesy to the child, would you interview her if the grandmother brought her in? And Gloria Gooding said, yes, she would do that. And her supervisor said, yes, she could do that.

So when I had called the lawyer and she told me to do this, I said, now I thought to myself, this could be a set-up, okay, I'm walking into a trap, but I will do anything for my granddaughter. So if this means, you know, I can't, I have to take a chance. I took my granddaughter, thank God there was no trap, but I took her there, my granddaughter was with Gloria Gooding, the DHS in Philadelphia, the Department of Human Services, she told Gloria Gooding that this man, Frank Malloy, sexually molested her not in words but in a 3-year-old words. She said, okay. But then they explained to my lawyer and myself that they do not have jurisdiction over New Jersey. So Philadelphia really can't do anything, even though the child told them.

Now, I don't understand that. So I get

24

25

back to Family Services, no, they closed the case. There's no findings, that's it. They don't want to hear nothing about it. I wrote a letter to Governor Casey, I've never got a response. I sent everything certified mail. I sent a letter to Governor Florio. He advises me that he sent -- I didn't get a letter back from him, it was from a commissioner that they're going to get in touch with the director Nicholas Scolaria, which I got in touch with his secretary back in December and she informed me that there was nothing that they could do. Okay, so now Governor Florio is involved in it. But still there's nothing that can be done. I went to Family Services. I spoke to the manager down there, a David Otis, and you know what he's telling me? Well, unfortunately, you know, you really kind of have to wait until the child is penetrated. What are you talking about? What about AIDS? And he's like, what do you mean what are you talking about AIDS? I said, we don't know nothing about this man. I don't know anything about him. granddaughter, you're saying wait until he penetrates her and then come back? You know, you're talking about her life and everything herc. What are you talking about?

Well, okay, now he's going in another

direction. Well, if you see bruises on her. What are 1 2 you talking about now bruises? My daughter put a smoke screen up. The sexual abuse with this man has never 3 been brought anywhere. She took me to court for 4 custody. She's always had custody of her child. 5 Nobody ever fought for custody because she has custody. 6 She took it into court as a custody issue. I'm totally 7 I borrowed \$2,500 for the lawyer, we get into 8 the court and my daughter gets on the stand, she admits 9 10 to the boyfriend drinking a lot, doing drugs, herself drinking and doing drugs on the stand, and I'm looking 11 at the judge like, oh, well, she's done it now. 12 13 response. But she continues to say that since this all happened with the baby, they quit. They don't drink 14 15 and they don't do drugs anymore. But this man has 16 drank and done drugs ever since she met him in February 17 of '91, but now December of '92 since this all came 18 about they quit. They don't do this anymore. Okay? 19 Unbelievable, and it's 61 pages of the testimony and I 20 never got to take the stand. My lawyer was so concerned about his skiing trip to Vermont, and the 21 22 good thing for me was I couldn't recall everything 23 until I just sent for the copy of the transcript that cost me \$137 and on the end of it there's my lawyer 24 25 saving to the judge, oh, I have this skiing trip in

Vermont.

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

So it's all there. Everything I've been saying is there. My daughter saying about the drinking and the drugs is all there. But my lawyer and her lawyer talked, they made some deal, and he came back and said to me, well, look, they're going to drop the charges. . What are you talk have talking about, what charges? What are you talking about? I don't understand. Well, they're going to drop everything but you're not allowed to see your granddaughter or call her on the phone. You're not allowed to have any contact with her. I said, wait a minute, I don't agree to this. He said wait, Elaine. You paid me, I'm your lawyer; he said, let me explain something to you. We just do this now, a week to 10 days we go back in for grandparent's visitation. What are you talking about? Well, I'm handling this like I would handle a divorce case. What divorce? What custody? None of this was ever the issue.

It's just been so, it's unbelievable.

And the whole thing is I haven't been able to get any kind of help, I haven't seen my granddaughter in five months. And she, you know, I worry every day, I pray all the time for her life to make, I don't know, I watch the news, I see these parents killing their

I get scared. I don't understand why -- I children. mean, I've gotten into like the law don't work, well, I want to take care of this myself, okay. My other two daughters are like, mom, don't do anything. Go by the law. Let's do this, but we want to go into court and we want to testify. I went to the FBI agent at Sixth and Arch. I walked in there, I wrote the complaint, they got the agent out, Christopher Salvatore. I spoke with him and he said, look, let me tell you now, this is not a Federal complaint, but since you walked in my office, you've made it my business. So let me help you out. He called Family Services in New Jersey. talked to Christina Brock and when she found out he was the FBI agent, she didn't want to talk to him. her supervisor. Okay. The supervisor talked to him. He said, and I stood there the whole time and he said, all I want to know is did you interview this child? No, we didn't. DHS in Philadelphia is supposed to do Okay. Well, DHS in Philadelphia did do this but it. you people have the jurisdiction and you closed the case. Well, we don't find any findings. But DHS did talk to the child. She told them. Well DHS in Philadelphia has the case open. No, they don't. said, wait a minute, the grandmother is right here. He asked me, I said no, DHS does not have the case open

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

because they said it belongs in Jersey. They don't have the jurisdiction. The natural mother is in Jersey.

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

So. I mean, I just don't understand the I mean, where is the rights for my system. granddaughter? She's not able to see me, I'm not able to protect her. You know, nothing is being done about it. And now the lawyer, I fired him. He won't give me any of my money back. So I made a deal with another lawyer here in Philadelphia, I'm supposed to get about \$30,000 for my accident case. And I told this lawyer, take it all. Take the whole \$30,000. I just want my granddaughter safe. You know. But what I want is, I want to go into court, DHS has to go in there and Gloria Gooding says she would be more than willing. She even talked to the FBI agent and told him the same thing. And she said to me, look, even though your granddaughier told you and she told her two aunts, she told other people doesn't matter. The most important person is that social worker at the DHS in Philadelphia. She's the most important person. is 100 percent for that child. But because of the jurisdiction thing, she let us know that she needs for her and the records to be subpoenaed into court. Well. so that means we got to get a court hearing together.

Well, the lawyer I had informed me, well, no there's not going to be a court hearing. We're just going to go, I'm going to go in for a conference, just her lawyer and me and we're going in for a conference and that's it. Well, my other two daughters and myself, we don't agree. And you know, there's no protection for the child.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, this is part of the reason that we're looking at not only the issue of false reporting, but on the other hand, and we've said this at each of the three hearings, that it seems to be obvious that where there is blatant abuse, and we've had two cases now, why aren't they intervening and why aren't they doing something about it? And these are different counties. I mean, this isn't just one or two counties.

MS. COLLADO: Right, but any person that makes a false statement should be prosecuted.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: But they do go after, and evidently very zealously, from what we're hearing, and we heard it yesterday, we're hearing it today and we heard it last week in Pittsburgh, those calls that are made. You know, it seems like it depends on whose ox is getting gored. It doesn't make sense. Now here you have a pretty good case. We also

heard a lot of cases the agencies are working overzealously and we also heard that many agencies aren't working at all.

MS. COLLADO: Not only that, but her case is the same way here in the State of Pennsylvania. You could go to one county, that perpetrator could go away. They moved from Montgomery County to Philadelphia. I have to prove that it's a crime now in Philadelphia. What I want to know basically is like where do I go from here? What do I do? I mean, because I have to be 60 and under to stop—

trying to find out. House Bill 826 was basically dealing with false reporting. We have allowed a lot of other testimony and we really have — I have given people a great deal of leeway in presenting their concerns. To be perfectly honest with you, to answer your question, I don't know at this point. You know, there's a lot of unanswered questions in all of these areas, and that's what we're trying to get a handle on. I can't say that we're going to come up with all the solutions. I don't know. But we will have this transcribed and we will share it with members of the committee.

MS. COLLADO: I mean, everywhere I turn I

1	run into a orick wall.
2	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Is your
3	granddaughter down in New Jersey now?
4	MS. COLLADO: She's down in New Jersey.
5	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Is that where
6	the hearings are supposed to be held?
7	MS. COLLADO: It was held down in
8	Atlantic City.
9	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Well, you're
10	talking about a new hearing coming up I thought?
11	MS. COLLADO: I don't even know about
12	that.
1 <b>3</b>	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: What about th
14	conference you're talking about?
15	MS. COLLADO: That was supposed to be on
16	April 23 in Atlantic City, but that didn't take place
17	because I fired the lawyer.
18	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: The same one
19	you had up here?
20	MS. COLLADO: no, the one in Jersey. I
21	only had that one at the time. I fired him and now I
22	have one in Philadelphia, but the deals work in
23	Philadelphia and New Jersey. So if it has to be dealt
24	with in Jersey, she can go there. But the thing is, I
25	just had such bad experience with that lawyer that I

1 don't know about this lawyer now, you know, because I 2 put the money upfront. She talked to my accident lawyer, they made a deal that you know, okay, she'll be 3 4 paid, but in the mean time, I don't see anything 5 happening. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 6 Okay. MS. COLLADO: Except that my 7 8 granddaughter is still in high risk. 9 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Could we move on? 10 If you don't mind, we have the doctor, and both of you wanted to testify too. 11 12 MS. COLLADO: One more thing I would like to say is that my daughter tried to say that I wanted 13 14 custody, which was not the issue, and that I was crazy. 15 I spent \$500 extra to go and have a psychological 16 evaluation done and I'm no more crazy than you are. 17 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, you better watch that. I've been labeled that. I'm not certified 18 19 yet. 20 MS. COLLADO: I mean, they tell children 21 to tell and when they tell, what happens? She got 22 punished. She's not a allowed to see me. 23 punished, I'm not allowed to see her. I have no way of 24 protecting her. Where is the law? Where is the

25

system?

1

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Doctor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. DUNSMORE: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Krantz and guests. I'11 try to be I'm Dr. Richard Dunsmore of Coatesville, bricf. Pennsylvania, a retired internist and cardiologist who practiced in Chester County for 32 years. During these years, on many occasions I heard painful tales on isolated patients concerning false accusations of sexual or physical abuse of children. Having complete faith in our democracy and democratic system, I initially did not take these complaints seriously. Subsequently, personal experience as well as interviews with numerous people has totally changed my mind. repetition of history is a well-known phenomena, and who would have predicted that in 1993 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania would permit the hysteria and ignorance that was exhibited in the Salem witch trials of 1692?

House Bill 826, if passed, would redress some of these violations of the constitutional rights of our citizens who are currently fettered by a governmental body that assumes guilt before innocence. Falsely accused on five separate occasions of both physical and sexual abuse of my grandchildren, eventual exoneration did not relieve the months of frustration, anxiety, and despair that these accusations produced.

Only the innocent, falsely accused can convey the personal distress and anger so generated.

. 3

In our county, many schools have posted squeal boxes. If a student receives a poor grade, you may be assured that his teacher may well be reported for classroom abuse, thus inviting inquiries by Children and Youth Services. If your neighbor dislikes your dog or you have a boundary dispute, a complaint against you for abusing your child will ensure weeks and months of harassment by Children and Youth Services. Worst, we also found some innocent victims are badgered by CYS and urged to plead guilty in order to avoid jail terms. This is followed by enrolling the victim in a CYS-designed program to rehabilitate the victim at a personal weekly cost, the payments expanding the coffers of the accusing agency.

Based upon false information, children are often removed from loving families and are placed in remote locations and in substandard living conditions. These have been characterized by our group as orphanages for children with parents.

The frequency of these accusations with deleterious results to children and families has led to over 50 families in Chester County to band together and form Families For Freedom. It is our concentrated

effort to acquaint our legislators with the problems. We strongly support House Bill 826 as a first step toward the restoration of democracy by setting forth punishment to those who would abuse the system with frivolous or malicious accusations.

Following this, we would encourage the removal of power-mad supervisors who are more interested in increasing Commonwealth and Federal funding to enhance their private fifedom rather than concentrating on the care of our children and keeping the family intact. Furthermore, it is essential to eliminate poorly trained, poorly motivated caseworkers. Devious psychologists and lawyers, Masters and judges feeding at the public trough with little or no concern for children and their families.

It has been well-documented by us that most cases of false accusations are initiated by misguided zealots and vindictive spouses, but add to this list the ill-trained, self-important caseworkers who are aided and abetted by a secret closed court hearing with ensuing deleterious results.

Those opposed to bill 826 are captured in Lady MacBeth's advice to her infamous husband: "look like the innocent flower but be the serpent beneath it." She further suggested, how difficult it is to

 wipe away the stain of violent politics, although it's appropriate to note that she quickly boasted, "What need we fear who knows it when none can call our power to account."

-

Thank you.

(Applausc.)

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Doctor.

MR. ONICHIMOWSKI: Good afternoon. My name is Edward Onichimowski. I'm a resident of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, and I'm a registered voter. I'm here today because I'm a victim of a false accusation of child abuse and a Protection From Abuse order.

than three years ago, I entered into the world of divorce and a custody battle that all I wanted to do was be a father to my children. I've been in the court system and I've been in front of hearing officers, bail bondsmen, Masters, magistrate's, motion judges, judges, filed appeals to Superior Court. I just went through my 30th court appearance, and I have another one the end of this month. My wife was found from 1990 I've seen my children six days in 1990, two days in '91, five days from '91 to June of 1992, where my wife was found guilty of five contempts of all these custody

orders. She was sentenced to jail and fined moneys, but all the punishments were dismissed if she complied with the order. She was trying to change venue up in Bucks County because she wasn't getting anywhere in Philadelphia, and I had a stay granted to keep my venue in Philadelphia.

Approximately three months later, I was accused on a PFA of the abuse. I've been accused of taking my children to bars drinking, doing drugs with them. I was accused of shooting rifles and guns at my daughters. I was accused of going to kill my wife, physically abusing my children, beating them with sticks, leaving them home alone, phone threats, stalking, and sexual abuse of my daughters on protection orders. I've never been found guilty and I've never been arrested yet.

On October 23, 1992, my wife alleged that she called the police and made reports of these threats. On October 24th of 1992, my wife alleged that she made police reports to the South Hamilton police officer alleging physical and sexual abuse.

Approximately October 27, 1992, my wife, with the assistance of the Bucks County Legal Aid Society, filed a petition from relief under the Protection From Abuse Act alleging physical and sexual abuse. On November

11, I had a hearing scheduled in Bucks County before the Honorable Judge Kane. My wife was assisted by probono lawyer Mr. McCue, Meg Groff, and I believe an Eileen Manwaring, which I believe is from Women's Place or Women Against Abuse.

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

I had a continuous hearing granted from November 18. On November 18, the hearing was held before the Honorable Judge McAndrews, which he found merit to submit the hearing for a full hearing. February 5 of 1993, I had that hearing, and I made an agreement to consent without admission to take this protection order. During the trial, I always maintained my innocence vehemently and unconditionally denied the allegations. I had evidence, witnesses to prove and support my innocence. But the reason I consented to the agreement was because I was advised by counsel that if she seeks a protection order, she will get it. And the judge, with counsel, had an in-chambers conference and the judge, after reviewing her record in Philadelphia, stated during the hearing, warning my wife of her word against mine. He cautioned her against frivolous accusations. He stated about getting electronic answering devices there by raising the standard of evidence of her word against mine. I had to take the protection order and again being

denied access to my children.

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

These protection of abuse orders are tools used to discredit fathers and deny them the rights to be fathers. I do have a Constitution of the Pennsylvania Article I, Section 1, I won't get into it but I do have certain rights and I feel my rights were being violated. I have a right to be happy and I want to be a father to my children. I have a right to my reputation and that was tarnished by being accused. According to the law in Title 23, Chapter 26, we have laws governing reporting procedures, investigating of the reports, and persons required to report the suspected child abuse. All these people, the attorneys, social workers, Legal Aid, everybody, there was never any reports done. Nothing was ever reported. The police were called, Meg Groff from Womens Service, there are supposed to be procedures on reporting within 24 hours, an oral written report, investigating report, there's supposed to be 24 hours of commencement of investigation. The investigation has limitations after 30 days, they're supposed to be founded or unfounded or indicated. I never had a report. But I didn't get to see my kids. Chapter 63, it states the purpose for these laws, one of which to ensure the well-being of the children and to preserve and stabilize family life.

By false accusations, what we have are deliberate and willful criminal actions of child abuse that are exploiting the children, destroying the protective bond between parents and children and corruption of parental love, and raising our children and parents in fear of all manifestations of affection.

I have notes of testimony, protection reports and evidence to support my testimony today. And I just want to know where the accountability is. We're talking about the immunity in this bill. I think we should have accountability. And that's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, distinguished legislators. My name is Ronald Williams. I'm a member of the Pennsylvania Bar, the Eastern District of Pennsylvania United States Court of Appeals, and the New Jersey Bar. I have been a public defender in the city of Philadelphia, and I was also an Assistant City Solicitor in the city of Philadelphia. I also carry the title of a victim of false reporting of domestic violence and child abuse.

I welcome you to Philadelphia and thank your committee for beginning to investigate the issue of false reporting of child abuse. While this

represents a significant beginning into a problematic area of domestic relations, and I pray this bill will pass, I don't believe that the false reporting exists only in child abuse. The problem has expanded into false allegations of domestic violence as well. This area also needs attention. The result in false reports of domestic violence are no less devastating than the results of false allegations of child abuse.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In reading House Bill 826, I am especially concerned because I see that it applies strictly to the issue of child abuse. I would encourage the panel to hold the same sort of hearings and to propose a bill to the general body dealing with false allegation of domestic violence as well. listened to the first group of witnesses that testified this morning. They made some points in regarding protections which are afforded to people who would be identified as victims. I call them victims of false reporting. They first alleged that the tort law would protect these people. Let me tell you, I filed a malicious prosecution, abuse of process action against my wife, who is a -- my wife is a Deputy Attorney General for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Okay? I listened to, with great interest, the comment by the legislator that he does not believe that attorneys for

the most part would go out and encourage people to file

false reports.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESS

there are some that won't.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I said that

MR. WILLIAMS: Let me tell you that I'm an attorney, have been a criminal attorney, a civil attorney, a real estate attorney, any kind of attorney you can imagine. My wife is also an attorney. I've had attorneys, she has an attorney. We've had at one point I've even had my father representing me, who was a retired Commonwealth Court judge. And as a result of all of this, the attorneys still propound false allegations of abuse.

Going back, I have filed a malicious prosecution of process action. However, when a person is accused of abuse, they are identified immediately, they are put up a red scarlet letter. No matter what venue or form you go into to prosecute or to seek vindication of your rights, you find that often cases you do not prevail.

I don't believe that filing a tort action would remedy something which is criminal in nature, and that's false allegation of abuse. I have listened to the same witnesses testify that the family court itself would afford protection and therefore there's no need

of proposing criminal sanctions for people who bring forth false reports of abuse. I would tell you that I've been in family court twice, criminally prosecuted in family court twice. The first time I was convicted. We immediately appealed it to the criminal division, the conviction was overturned. I can submit to the panel a certified copy of the acquittal in the first criminal prosecution.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Is this for our files?

MR. WILLIAMS: I can make you a copy, if I may.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: I have then gone to, the day after the acquittal in this case we had a custody hearing in family court, my wife came in and made additional charges of false abuse or additional allegations of false abuse. The custody hearing was prevented. We appeared before a family court judge who had taken it upon himself to make phone calls regarding my character to third parties who had no association with the case. We asked that that family court judge recuse himself. He denied the recusal motion. He went forth and convicted me again on other charges. We are now before the Court of Common Pleas on a trial de

novo. We expect that the same results will occur in that case.

б

The point I'm making is that the family court judges themselves take the testimony of the female in most cases and take it as the absolute truth. In fact, the family court judge that heard my case specifically ruled I don't — I had three witnesses, she had none. The family court judge ruled specifically that I don't care how many people come in and testify for you, I believe your wife and that's it. We are now waiting to have the appeal heard before the Court of Common Pleas criminal trial division.

I don't believe that House Bill 826 should be an amendment to Title 23. I think that House Bill 826 ought to be amended to put it into the Title 18 Criminal Code provisions. I look at the entire bill itself as I guess another provision which is in the Crimes Code right now which is Title 18, Section 4904, dealing with false reports to — false unsworn reports to authorities which are typically amended to civil cases. I have yet to hear as both a criminal lawyer, civil attorney, of a case where a person was prosecuted for making unsworn false statements to authorities. I would greatly ask that the panel consider amending Title 23 to include a provision which would take

prosecutorial discretion out of it. I think the problem would be once it gets to the district attorncy's office you would oftentimes have district attorneys in various counties refusing to prosecute this sort of provision. I think there ought to be something built into the act itself that mandates prosecution where you can identify false reports of abuse.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm dealing -- excuse me, I'm dealing with an emotional issue and also attempting to be an attorney and professional. I listened to the issue of immunity, whether we should continue to have immunity for people who make reports. The difficulty with immunity is it gives them impunity. They know when they make reports that there will be no ramification from making a false report. In fact, I've even had my wife when I filed my abuse of process malicious prosecution action with the courts she submitted a motion for preliminary objections claiming that I have immunity, so what, even if I did do these things I have immunity. The trial court overruled the preliminary objections and said, no, this should go forth to trial. It did in fact go forth to trial and got before the factfinders. She brought in the same charges, and I have yet to hear what the disposition would be.

My point is that immunity takes the fear element out of the false reporting of abuse. The parties believe from the outset that so what? My objective is to get custody, my objective is to win in a domestic relations battle because of the previous bills propounded by the legislature I can say anything I want to say and prevail, because I will not be subjected to criminal prosecution or civil prosecution.

MR. ANDRING: Under what bases does your wife claim immunity? Because she is an assistant AG for a State agency

MR. WILLIAMS: No, she claims immunity by the statute itself. I believe in 23, Section 6100 series it specifically reads that anyone who makes reports shall have immunity from civil or criminal prosecution. So the basis of her immunity is not her job per se but rather the fact that she is making these reports, and therefore should be protected as a result of legislation. And I said, the Court of Common Pleas cannot buy the argument, but I think the argument is going to be thrown up even in the instance of with the passing of this bill. I would recommend that the immunity be — right now, it's an absolute immunity. I would recommend that the legislature take the immunity statute and make it even a qualified immunity or

eliminate the actual immunity itself.

In addition to that, I look at this statute and I have some difficulty, it's already been addressed, but I guess there's some difficulty with burden of proof. It's beyond my understanding how we can prove that or how a district attorney would be able to make a case beyond a reasonable doubt of false accusations of abuse just based on this statute alone. I think there needs to be some presumption which is built into the statute that if certain actions are not taken place or a quorum of evidence is not produced, that there will be a presumption that that alleged abuse is in fact unfounded and therefore false.

Otherwise, I see no way that we're going to be able to prosecute this act.

I listened to the first witnesses also testify about a chilling effect that it would place on bona fide reporters of abuse. My concern is that the chilling effect attaches to the victims of the false reports. Once they're accused, they have no rights. The accusers have all the rights in the world. As the chairman has pointed out, they're protected by numerous social service agencies, they are protected by the courts, and they're even protected by the legislature. I would recommend that that be given some serious

consideration and that this bill be passed and that it be reviewed and amended in accordance with the suggestions that I placed forth. Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. (Applause.) CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We'll conclude this hearing today, and I appreciate those that have testified and the University for allowing us to be here today. Thank you very much. Thank you.