## **ORIGINAL**

1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
2	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
3	
4	In re: Senate Bill 1843
5	Mandatory Registration of Sex Offenders
6	****
7	Stenographic report of hearing held
8	in Room 22, Capitol Annex, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
9	
10	Wednesday, November 30, 1994
11	10:15 a.m.
12	
13	HON. THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, CHAIRMAN
14	
15	MEMBERS OF HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
16	Hon. Jerry Birmelin Hon. Kathy Manderino Hon. Mark B. Cohen Hon. Albert Masland
17	Hon. Gregory C. Fajt Hon. Frank W. Yandrisevits Hon. Timothy F. Hennessey
18	non, rimoung r. nonnessoy
19	
20	Also Present:
21	Karen L. Dalton, Counsel Galina Milohov, Research Analyst
22	Dan DeLash, Committee Secretary Darlene Zelazny
23	
24	Reported by: Kimberly L. Intrieri
25	Reporter-Notary Public

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I'd like to start the public hearing on Senate Bill 1843. There has been a packet that has been distributed with some comments and observations from the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association and the ACLU, and that's included in your packet.

One of the things I wanted to mention is that according to the Omnibus Crime Bill that was passed by U.S. Congress within three years the states have to comply with some type of registration program or they will be penalized losing approximately 10 percent of their funding source.

That's one of the carrot stick pieces that we have to comply with. And my very good friend from the Senate, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Stu Greenleaf, is here with us today. He's the prime sponsor of this legislation.

This of course was an issue that was raised in committee. And due to the lateness of the hour and session days being what they were with just a couple days left members felt that there needed to be a public hearing to discuss the proposed legislation knowing full well that this issue will have to be dealt with at some time in the next session.

And there's the possibility that this

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

would be one of the issues that would be dealt with in the special session that will be called for by Governor Elect Ridge, and I think this is the first -- Stu and I were talking earlier -- the first time publicly that any hearing had been held on this issue to specifically address the legislation.

2.2

And at this time if Chairman Greenleaf would come forward and --

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Do I sit there?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, I think the press --

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I want to take this opportunity to thank the House Judiciary Committee and its chairman for holding this hearing on a very important topic. It's a topic that has gained the attention of obviously this state and New Jersey and actually the nation of the -- and the unfortunate events that occurred in New Jersey that called this matter to all of our attention, although I know that both you and the Senate have looked into child abuse and other related issues over the years very intently.

But this particular incident has called attention to a way -- a specific way at least to deal with this particular problem. So I'm pleased to appear before the House Judiciary Committee this

morning to comment on legislation I've introduced; namely, Senate Bill 1843, commonly referred to as Megan's Law.

Senate Bill 1843 provides for the registration of sex offenders and the notification of neighbors that the sex offender has moved into their neighborhood. I consider this legislation a top priority for the session beginning next year. And as the Chairman has indicated I'm hopeful that during the special session on crime that has been called by Governor Elect Ridge that this and a number of issues that relate to it will be addressed and will be a high priority.

The legislation is named for Megan Kanka, a seven-year-old second grader in Hamilton, New Jersey, who was raped and murdered by a neighbor; a twice-convicted sex offender who lived across the street from Megan's family with two other sex offenders.

Megan's family did not know about their neighbors' criminal histories. I introduced a Megan's Law bill in Pennsylvania to protect Pennsylvania children who, like Megan, may become the victims of sexual offenders.

Senate Bill 1843 has four key provisions.

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

The first provision of the bill requires any person who has been convicted of a sexual offense against a child to register with the chief of police for the municipality in which he is living. If there is no local police department, the sex offender must register with the State Police troop which has jurisdiction over the municipality.

The sex offender must be notified of the registration requirement by the trial judge at the time of sentencing and by personnel at the correctional facility at the time of release. The sex offender's probation officer must notify the local police department that the offender is residing in the municipality.

A sex offender has seven days after his release to register. Failure to register is a misdemeanor of the second degree. A sex offender convicted in another state and moving into Pennsylvania has 14 days to register. The Department of Transportation must provide written notice of the registration requirement to any person from another state who applies for a Pennsylvania driver's license.

And also an offender who's required to register may petition the court of common pleas to be relieved of any duty to register if they feel that

there's sufficient grounds for such an excuse.

The district attorney shall be the respondent in the petition, and the court must consider the nature of the sexual offense and the criminal and noncriminal behavior of the petitioner both before and after the conviction.

The court may relieve the petitioner of the duty to register only if the petitioner shows with clear and convincing evidence that registration is not necessary to protect the public. Unless the offender is relieved of his duty to register by a court he has a lifetime requirement to register.

For purposes of the registration requirement Senate Bill 1843 defines sexual offense as kidnapping, sexual offenses under Chapter 31 of the Crimes Code -- this includes offenses such as rape, statutory rape, indecent assault and indecent exposure -- offenses under the obscenity statute insofar as it relates to minor children and child abuse. The victim must have been 16 years old or younger at the time of the offense.

The second provision of Senate Bill 1843 requires the chief of police or State Police to provide notification of the registration of a sex offender to any person residing at a residence

adjacent to the address at which the sex offender registered his intent to reside.

Notification must be written and given within 72 hours after the person registered. In some cases the police may determine that notification to adjacent -- or notifying adjacent neighbors is not adequate and may use such other means of public notification as they deem necessary.

The third provision in Senate Bill 1843 requires professionals who work with children to report suspected sexual offenses against children to law enforcement officials. This is modeled after the provisions of the Child Protective Services law requiring professionals who work with children to report suspected child abuse to the Department of Public Welfare.

The report must be made immediately by telephone to the municipal police department or to the State Police troop with jurisdiction over the municipality. The police must make a written report of the phone call and provide the person making the call with a copy of the report in order to confirm the call. A person making a report under this provision shall be immune from civil -- civil or criminal liability for making such a report.

The fourth provision of the bill will authorize the sentencing judge to find that a defendant is a habitual sexual offender and to sentence that defendant to life imprisonment. To qualify as a habitual sex offender the defendant must have been convicted of two sexual offenses that are graded at least as serious as a felony of the third degree.

The provision includes other factors that a judge may use in making a determination such as the offender's prior criminal record, whether the offense involved multiple victims, whether the offender completed his prior sentence and participated in available programs for sex offenders and whether the offense included a display of unusual cruelty.

Even before the tragic death of Megan Kanka over 20 states had sex offender registration laws, and several of those states had public notification laws. The terrible death of Megan spurred the New Jersey legislature to enact a sex offender registration and public notification law.

The National Conference of State

Legislators reports that 40 states now require sexual

offenders to register with local police. In

California which has the oldest statute a study has

shown that 72 percent of convicted sex offenders comply with the registration requirement. A Washington state study revealed a similar compliance number.

The recently passed federal bill -- crime bill mandates that every state adopt a sex offender registration law within the next three years or risk losing 10 percent of federal crime fighting grant money.

While Senate Bill 1843 does not comply with every detail of the federal law I believe the bill provides substantial compliance, and I would be happy to work with you to make sure Pennsylvania's law meets all federal requirements.

Senate Bill 1843 passed the Senate earlier this fall by a 49-0 vote. I am hoping that Pennsylvania will follow New Jersey with a Megan's Law early next session. I appreciate the House Judiciary Committee's consideration of this important issue and look forward to working with you in enacting a Megan's Law in Pennsylvania.

Let me also make some additional comments, and that is why we need a notification law. I spent some time going over the details of this legislation. For probably at least ten years the -- I'm sure both

these committees and in particular the Senate

Judiciary Committee have looked into sexual child

abuse.

And the people who are involved in this activity who we might call a pedophile are people of a high degree of recidivism. This is a life-long activity for them. They hunt down and seek young children.

They -- there was recently -- I believe it was U.S. News and World Report did a study and an article on child abusers. And they're interviewing this gentleman -- I think he was at that time in Virginia. He was in his 30s I believe, and he had already molested somewhere over a couple hundred children. And he had a long life ahead of him.

Some people say, well, why do we need notification. We need notification because if you've been convicted of a child sexual abuse, probably you've committed hundreds of crimes before you've been convicted because the situation is that the conviction rate for child molestation is very low.

And that's why -- one of the reasons why
I've been pushing for that bill to allow children to
testify under closed circuit TV to at least level the
playing field for children. I'm hoping we'll pass

that next year. We have it on the ballot as a constitutional amendment next year.

But it's clear from talking to law enforcement agencies and others that there's a very low conviction rate for children that have been abused because they're not good witnesses. You know, they're three-year-olds or four-year-olds or five-year-olds.

It's not reported. When it is reported, it's not taken seriously. And then of course when they go to court, the children don't want to testify, they're not good witnesses and there are no convictions.

So if you have a person who's been convicted of a serious felony child molestation conviction, you've got a guy who has been involved in it for a long time and will continue to be involved in it for a long time.

And when they're released, the people next to that home and that resident should have the protection of knowing that that person is next to them. If they had had this law in New Jersey, I would doubt whether the parents of Megan would have allowed her to be playing in the back yard or be inticed into his home and then ultimately molested, strangled and -- and killed.

Because of the high recidivism rate there's a need for -- for this. There's a need for registration requirements in Pennsylvania. And as I say I look forward to working with this committee and the chairman in developing that legislation. I'll be happy to answer questions.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Senator Greenleaf. Representative Birmelin has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: Senator,
Representative Birmelin, fellow Republican from Wayne,
Pike County.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: We had a hearing -- a public hearing on Representative Ruth Rudy's bill sometime earlier this year which I guess you're aware of was similar to yours, but there are some differences.

And there were some questions that were raised that I'd like to just run by you real quickly, if I could. The first was the inclusion of the offense of indecent exposure as a person who would have this lifetime requirement to register.

There was some feeling on the part of the Committee that indecent exposure was somewhat different than the other ones in that it did not

violate anybody else physically.

And I was wondering if you had any thoughts on whether or not that should still be included in the lifetime registration requirement.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I think that it's not a major blow to the legislation if it was removed, but let me tell you why I include it in -- I included it into the legislation. And I certainly would -- if you wanted to delete that, I would have no real objections to that.

The reason I included it in the legislation is you'll notice that it's not adult offenders or it's not an adult perpetrator on an adult victim. We're talking about an adult who is committing his offense against a child under the age of 16 years of age.

If they are doing that, then I believe that they're also involved in other activities and they're involved in -- in child abuse. And so I thought that it was important to include that in that they were not -- this is not a situation where they're exposing themselves to an adult.

They're exposing themselves to a child.

And I believe that that's as much as anything a sexual activity that we don't want our children exposed to.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: I would agree we don't want them exposed to that. I'm just questioning that there may be a difference between that sexual offense and the others.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Well, I think -there's no question about it. When there's physical
contact and all, I mean there's no question about it
that that's more serious.

And if in the House's wisdom or this

Committee's wisdom you feel that that's not

appropriate to continue to include it in the

definition, I don't have any problems with that being

removed.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: The second question I had for you was dealing with the third provision of this bill which required certain people to report suspected offenses.

As you know we passed House Bill 1001 in the waning hours of session, and I was wondering if what you're attempting to do in this third provision has somehow already been taken care of by House Bill 1001.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Well, I -- one of the problems as we -- I know we have -- presently we have a law that requires certain child -- people dealing

with children generally -- not generally, but specifically like child care providers I guess. With the present law now they have to report child abuse, if I remember right.

But I -- it's my belief that anyone who's dealing with children should be required to report suspected sexual offenses against children to law enforcement officers.

Right now we have a situation where people are reluctant to do it for a variety of reasons or they don't feel compelled to do it for a variety of reasons, and so I don't -- I would believe that we should expand it as much as possible to require that reporting.

Now, whether that's covered by the House bill, I don't remember.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: I don't remember, and that's what I'm asking you.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I haven't had a chance sit down and compare the two.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: Well, I know that 1001 did do that; did expand the reporting provision. But I don't know whether or not your bill was a duplication of that or not.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I can't answer that

right now because I have not compared the two.

on the reporting section. This is something I've been concerned with for quite some time. And I included an amendment in the House Bill 1001 which required the Public Department of Welfare to do a one-and-a-half year survey of false and malicious report and then to come back to the General Assembly with the results of not only what they feel are the causes of it and how it's done, but what we can do to prevent that.

I know that we need to report child abuse. We need to stop it. And we need to make sure that when we suspect it in good faith, report it; that it's done so. But I also have a concern that it's being done by some people to destroy the lives of others. And I'm sure you're aware of that as well.

And I'm wondering if in your legislation there ought not to be a provision somewhere along the lines that we protect people from the false and malicious reporting that we've seen happen in the child protective service system currently which hopefully maybe House Bill 1001 and its mandated study by the DPW will result in some positive steps.

But what is your attitude on that?

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I don't -- I don't

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

disagree with you on that. I think that I have seen that in particular in domestic matters; that there has been an increase in the number of allegations of child abuse made by spouses on both sides. And some of them may be legitimate allegations.

Some of them I suspect involving the court personnel at least in Montgomery County, they strongly suspect that some of them are frivolous allegations made in order to gain an advantage in a domestic relations matter. But that's a matter for the courts to decide. That's a matter for fact finders to decide.

I think that if someone does make a false and malicious allegation such as that, there should be very severe penalties for that person because what they've done is they've undermined the justice system. They've also undermined those people who have legitimate complaints about sexual abuse, and they've caused a cloud over those complaints.

And I don't think that those people should get the -- the punishment could not be severe enough for them when they make those kind of allegations because they've hurt children and they've hurt their own children and -- or the children involved in that matter. And they hurt other children who are truly

being abused.

And so if we provided some very serious penalties for those people who make such offense allegations, I'd welcome that. I think it would be a constructive issue.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: The history of this legislative initiative on my part was that in the last session I introduced a bill to do that. Chairman Caltagirone had a public hearing on it, and we were vehemently opposed by the district attorneys among others who said that in any way to do anything that would diminish the number of reports would be wrong.

So they're saying -- they were saying in essence let all the false reports come in, we'll just have to sift through them and find the real ones. And I disagreed with them. I felt that does a disjustice -- a disservice to the justice system.

And the best I could do was the amendment to have DPW do a study on it in House Bill 1001. But I'm concerned that that's not going to be adequate and that there are people -- you know, in our rush to protect children -- and we should be trying to protect them -- we're also trampling over potentially the lives of others.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I agree with you. And

I think that it would not reduce the number of reported cases because if you make a false report to police, that's already a criminal offense in Pennsylvania.

б

By passing a bill such as yours as you're proposing, all that would do is give you a specific bill dealing with that type of offense, and hopefully it would act as a deterrent for people.

And if someone was prosecuted under it, I mean it wouldn't be an easy case to prove. If you're prosecuted and convicted for something like that, I mean you really have a very egregious situation because that's the kind of case that is very, very difficult to ever prove.

I mean sexual abuse cases are hard enough to prove. And then to prove that the allegation itself was untrue and malicious and amounts to a criminal offense is even harder. So I don't see many people being convicted of it.

But hopefully it would act as a deterrent. So if they're going to make a false allegation to police, that's already a criminal offense in Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: Well, that's true, and -- but it did not specifically apply to the

false child abuse reporting, just in general false reporting.

And I asked the district attorney representatives who were there at the public hearing that day how many cases have you ever taken to court or convicted on in Pennsylvania, and the answer was none.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: On what kind of offense?

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: On a false child abuse report.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Absolutely.

what it told me was that, No. 1, the law is not clear enough, not specific enough; and, No. 2, the district attorneys in essence were turning their back to the problem.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Well, I understand why. I spent seven years in the DA's office as an assistant DA, and I -- it would be a nightmare. I mean it's a case that would be very difficult to prosecute. But I'm not saying you couldn't.

If you had a specific statute dealing with it and you had -- and a situation where the child finally came out and said under clear and convincing

statements that, look, I was told to do this and say it, then it would be I think an appropriate matter to prosecute because it's something that we have to -- to discourage.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: And my attitude was that if this law were in place, then it would discourage it in the first place. We're not looking so much to get prosecutions from it, but we're looking to prevent the false reporting in the first place. And I think it would have done that.

One last subject I wanted to ask you about. You had mentioned in your notes here that 40 states now require sex offenders to register with local police including California. A study showed that 72 percent of them comply with the registration requirement.

Have there been any studies to show that sex offenders who register with local police is working to reduce the amount of crime that those who register -- obviously it doesn't matter for those who don't register, but have we done enough -- have we done any studies to show that guys who don't register commit more repeat offenses than those who do?

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I don't have any statistics on that available to me, but if they don't

register, they're going to be back in jail. 1 2 So they're not going to be committing any 3 crimes because it's going to be a violation of their 4 probation or their parole or the law -- under this 5 legislation it's going to be a criminal offense. So 6 they're going to be back in the jail, and they won't 7 be able to commit any crimes if they don't register. 8 At least that's my hope. 9 What it does do though is it at least 10 allows people to protect themselves. If they know 11 someone is living adjacent to them, that they're not 12 going to let them out in the back yard playing with 13 that guy's dog which happened with Megan. So I don't know of any studies that 14 indicate the impact of these laws, but --15 REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: I'd be 16 17 interested in seeing that. SENATOR GREENLEAF: We'll look into that. 18 19 And if I come up with that, I'll send it to you. 20 REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: I'm planning on 21 staying on the House Judiciary Committee next session, 22 Matt Ryan willing. 23

Good. SENATOR GREENLEAF:

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: And I'm interested in this legislation, and I'm certainly

24

25

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

going to be interested in working with you on it.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: Maybe we can come up with something by the end of the next two years that we can introduce.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I'll supply you with infor -- I have a lot of information. I don't have it with me in this file, but I will supply it to you. We have a fair -- a fairly large file on this. And, if you don't mind, I'll send it all over to you.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: Okay. Thank you very much, Senator.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator, my concerns go to the area of the law which is most troubling to me, but it's the one that the general public wants the most. I'm concerned about the practical ramifications of the notification to residents provision.

One issue, when I've heard people discuss it, but I've heard no one address is the whole issue of liability of local police departments if somebody -- if they failed to notify somebody next door, if they failed to notify somebody who thought they were

close enough that they should have been notified, if after they notify the current resident and somebody else moves in and out and the police weren't aware of it. And then all of the sudden you have folks -- God forbid, something horrible happens -- suing local police departments for failure to notify.

And I wonder if you would address your thoughts about the liability issue.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: It's my intention that there be no criminal or certainly civil liability on the municipality, on State Police or on the local police for the extent of their notification because under the legislation it requires them to notify the adjacent homeowners.

We wanted to be as reasonable as possible in regard to the notifications, unlike I believe the state of Delaware where they put this notification in the paper. And someone told me here this morning that -- your research analyst here -- that I think it was Alaska they post the sign on their front yard.

We don't do that. We try to be as reasonable as possible as far as the notification requirements, and that is to notify the adjacent neighbors. Then though I think it's important to give them discretion, and that's where the problem could

come in; where we give them the discretion that the police chief has the discretion to notify other persons.

We did that for a number of reasons. One, we thought it was important for them because under certain circumstances other people feel it's necessary; necessary to notify. And, secondly, I thought it would deal with that -- this liability problem because in a situation where he would have the discretion to go beyond the immediate neighbors because then someone else could say, well, you know, we should have been notified and there's some things that he should have done. And hopefully that would relieve it.

The third area that I believe they should be immune from suit -- from civil suit -- for -- from someone coming in and saying, well, you should have notified the whole community or you should have sent a letter out to everybody in the community or you should have sent -- or you should have put it on TV or should have put it on radio. I mean there's no end to that, and so we don't want to get them into a -- that kind of quadmire.

So, you know, it's my feeling that they should be immune from civil suit unless there's a

clear, intentional refusal to abide by any provisions of the legislation. And that's another matter. But for a pure, plain negligence suit I would feel they should not be -- they should not be liable for civil suit.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Along the same lines how do things like our current hate laws dovetail or do you see them not dovetailing with this?

I anticipate -- and it would only be natural -- that if I was notified of somebody next door, I mean I could see the pickets developing or a community activism type of reaction to I don't want this person living in my neighborhood.

What is the liability of neighbors when we do something like this and they take some sort of action? Would a person who has had to register but has shown no further criminal acts at this state, would they have a claim in the hate laws against neighbors who are trying to drive them out of their neighborhood?

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Well, first of all, there's no immunity for neighbors for taking the law into their own hands. I mean we don't -- I don't condone that, and I don't think this legislation would do that. And I don't think anyone here in this room

would want to do that.

I agree with you. This is merely a notification so they can take offensive, protective steps on their own, not that that -- they can remove that person from their neighborhood or do anything else that is illegal or criminal or civil or a violation of anyone's civil rights. This is not the intention of that.

They have a right to live in that home, and they will continue to do that. That's why we haven't provided it be put in the paper, for example. We don't want to create a hysteria.

Secondly, I don't believe that that will happen because I have not heard any reports that that has happened in other states. And I don't believe it would happen in this situation.

Thirdly, from my observations where there have been knowledge in particular neighborhoods -- in particular I know of a case in Montgomery County where that happened where there was an individual, you know, who actually molested one of the neighborhood kids, and we couldn't get the police involved in it. That's why I'm telling you about the problems of prosecuting these cases.

But after looking into it, the background,

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

we found he did have past problems -- past molestation problems. You know, what happened was the neighbor moved out. You know, the mother and the father with the child, they moved out and moved to another community; an adjacent township. That's more likely to happen than the perpetrator moving out.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: This is a question out of ignorance. The federal crimes bill and how to deal with this, does it have a notification to residents requirement?

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I believe that it does. I looked at a summary in one of the publications, and, if I remember right, I -- there was a notification, however --

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: This is maybe just a comment to the extent that your staff may have it or to our chairman to the extent that our staff may have it.

But I would be interested in seeing of the other 40 states that have enacted notification laws or of the states that are currently going to enact them, how are they dealing with the notification to residents. What's the gamut, and how it's being enforced?

SENATOR GREENLEAF: It varies. We have

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

that, and I'll provide that to you. It varies. As I say, there's -- research staff told me about posting on the front yard. We looked into it and found that Delaware publishes it in the newspaper. There's others where there's letters sent out to a larger group of neighbors other than just adjacent ones.

But I think this proposal is a much more modest proposal with some discretion to go beyond immediate neighbors and the police chief. But we have that information, and I'll supply it to the Chairman and to you.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Senator

Greenleaf, in some of the hearings we'd had and some of the therapists and clinicians that I've spoken to there's been some concern about how this is going to impact on families getting back together, if there is intrafamily offenses, if there's abuse by a mother or a father.

They go to therapy. They try to get their act together and try to hold the family as a stable unit. And there's concern that notifying neighbors across the street or on either side or behind them is going to only add to the pressures that the family is going through and also in a sense stigmatize not just

the perpetrator but also all the members of the family.

Have you given any thought to exempting those kinds of situations or has a decision been made not to do that for any particular reason?

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I've given -- we've given some thought to the interfamily situation, and we didn't think it was a frequent a situation to particularly address. If you can craft something that would get into that, I would have no objections to it.

But I suspect that what this bill is primarily aimed at is those people who are involved in third-party abusers, if you want to call them that, not interfamily although they're just as serious.

And I suspect -- I don't have any statistics to prove this, but I would suspect that the number of convictions -- remember, you have to have a conviction for this -- the number of convictions on a felony matter for this type of child abuse when you're involved in interfamily matters are very -- I would think it's a very small number, No. 1.

Secondly, all too often what happens is that the child is the one who is -- who is the one who is removed from the family. I remember holding a hearing in Philadelphia City Hall one time where this

young girl had been molested. And she's the one who was put into foster care. The rest of the family was together.

She reported the event, and nothing happened to the father. He wasn't even prosecuted. The mother stayed with the father because all too often that happens because they don't want to see the family fall apart. So the child is then removed because -- by the social agencies and ends up in a foster family situation.

So I -- the reason I mention that example is that I think it's -- it's not -- I suspect that it's not a major occurrence. It's not a major concern, and that's why I didn't address it in the legislation.

If you feel that it is and you can craft something to address that problem, I'd welcome that.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that there wasn't a conscious decision to avoid that kind of an exemption in your -- SENATOR GREENLEAF: No.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: -- in your

deliberations or the Committee deliberations --

SENATOR GREENLEAF: No.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: -- when they

(717) 564-6969

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE

consider this.

Also let me ask you about the lifetime registration requirement. On page five of your bill you create a possibility of relief from that -- it's up near the top; lines four, five and six I guess -- from that requirement I guess, you know, envisioning that some changes will be made over the passage of time in the person's conduct or habits.

But I guess I wondering about the language -- the choice of language that you've used. I've been trying to figure out what a person could possibly do to give clear and convincing evidence to a court to convince him that there's no need for them to register any more. And I thought perhaps it was just done, you know, as a way of trying to meet a constitutional requirement with that language.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: My feeling is it's going to be pretty difficult to prove that because my feeling is that if someone's been convicted, they have a long history and a lifetime of child abuse. And it's very difficult for them to overcome that and to -- and to stop that type of behavior.

But we thought it was appropriate to at least put that provision in the law to at least allow some process in which if someone can prove and

establish in some way that they have -- they've overcome their -- this propensity that they have, they should at least have that opportunity to establish and prove it.

If I remember right, there was some other states that also had a provision such as this. And I thought it was a -- a reasonable provision to put in the legislation.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: As I said I was just having some difficulty in trying to figure out whether or not a person could ever meet the standard providing -- and I gather that it would be --

SENATOR GREENLEAF: If I was -- you know,
I guess -- you're involved in the law. If I was -REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: And I was
thinking back a few minutes ago. There was a case

like this we tried years ago.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Yes. In Montgomery

County there was a case such like this. I would say

that, you know, you'd have a psychiatrist and psychologist and behavioral science people and behavioral science and past records; how long has it been, has it been 30 years since he was convicted, for example.

Those are -- the type of offense and some

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE

(717) 564-6969

of those criteria are put in the statute. And maybe at that point the court might be convinced to believe by clear and convincing evidence that -- that this person's likelihood of committing another crime is very, very low.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: If I could direct your attention to the criter -- the standards on page eight and nine; how you define a habitual sexual offender. On the top of page nine you talk about whether the offender completed the prior sentence and participated in available programs for sexual offenders and any mental illness or mental disability.

In looking at this I was having some difficulty trying to figure out whether or not completion of a prior program -- therapeutic program of some sort -- if a person had done that -- had completed such a program -- and then got himself involved in another offense, is that an enhancing or mitigating type of criterion because it says that the court can consider that, but it doesn't indicate whether or not -- how that should be viewed.

And also the next one; mental illness or mental disability. Again is that something that would excuse the conduct or something that would make it

more likely for the person to commit again, and, therefore, should be classified or labeled as a habitual offender?

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Well, I think you could probably do both. It's not limited to I think either one. There are factors the court could consider in deciding. It's not -- I didn't want to have a mandatory sentence here because I think that certainly a life -- life imprisonment is a very serious sentence.

And it was my thought that we would set forth certain criteria that the sentencing judge could take into consideration; for example, the age and how long -- it might indicate how long they've been involved in this type of activity. Obviously there are prior criminal records. They may have been involved in similar offenses that may not be involved in the definition of a sexual offender in this statute but in related activities.

I think it would be important for that judge to determine. That would be obviously an aggravating circumstance. And the AIDS situation could be a mitigating or aggravating circumstance.

They could be very young, for example, and that might be a mitigating circumstance under those -- under that

particular situation.

You know, obviously the multiple offenses and the -- as far as the -- whether they've completed a prior sentence, whether they participate in a -- in a sex offender program, that could be a mitigating circumstance obviously because they're looking for assistance, they're looking for help and pursuing that. So it depends on the particular circumstance. They could be used either way.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Yeah.

Interesting, with that last example I would think that

-- I can sort of envision a judge saying, you've had
your chance, you've gone through the program and since
you failed and been a recidivist, you're going to be
automatically classified.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Right. In that circumstance it could be an aggravating circumstance. And in another area it could be a mitigating circumstance because that person -- let's say, they had gone through three years of a very extensive behavioral modification program inpatient, let's say, and that in that case -- and had very high recommendations from the program and a very high success rate. In that circumstance it could be a mitigating circumstance.

1	REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you.										
2	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you,										
3	Representative Hennessey. Representative Masland?										
4	REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Thank you. Thank										
5	you, Senator Greenleaf. If I could just pick up where										
6	Representative Hennessey left off, in my opinion the										
7	way you've worded it is the correct way because I										
8	think it's basically saying to the judge it's not a										
9	mandatory sentence unless you find this person to be a										
10	habitual offender, and these are some factors to										
11	consider.										
12	It's almost it makes me think of the										
13	laws on equitable distribution, laws on alimony where										
14	we have a long laundry list of things to consider.										
15	And I guess you could add or subtract some of the										
16	items on that list, but I think the importance of it										
17	is to say these are some things that you should										
18	consider, among other factors, before you give										
19	somebody a life sentence. So I think that's actually										
20	a strength of it.										
21	Just a couple minor things. You in the										
22	first in 3108 (a) you refer to the Pennsylvania										
23	State Police										
24	SENATOR GREENLEAF: What page?										
25	REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: as having the										

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

responsibility --

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Which page are you referring to?

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: That's on page two. Basically if there's no municipal police department, it's the duty of the person to register with the State Police. But you don't have anything thereafter in the bill which specifically says that that State Police trooper or State Police sergeant is the one that's going to have to notify people.

And maybe a little language change there early on to say that, you know, hereafter where we refer to chief of police, that this is also a duty of the state trooper would clear up any problems because that could be a problem, although I'm sure that --

SENATOR GREENLEAF: That's a good suggestion.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: As far as the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children Act -- the federal crime bill -- it does have some specific language in there dealing with release of information, and it sets pretty broad guidelines.

But those were incorporated -- and again this is just for your consideration in the next session with you and your staff. Those were

incorporated in House Bill 3106, Representative
Tomlinson's, soon to be Senator Tomlinson's bill where
it basically sets some wide parameters on notification
and also does contain some language on immunity which
I think could be included.

Just one question though that I would add on that. I think you need to give a lot of discretion to the police chief or the State trooper as to whom they're going to notify. I don't think -- I think that was one of the weaknesses in one of the House bills to be considered where it said a two-block radius if you're in an urban area or a half-mile radius if you're in a rural area.

Well, how do you define urban? How do you define rural? That's pretty tough. Some chiefs of police may take this discretion and run with it fearing that they won't notify enough people and notify the world. That's a problem there, but certainly something that we'll be able to discuss next session.

One thing though that has come up previously is the concept of specifically saying something in an act to say that you would notify the school district or that you would notify -- and this is something I just got a letter yesterday. You may

have received it from an attorney in Carlisle who practices down the street from me who suggested possibly notifying children and youth services in the county. Just one other thing to consider.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I think they're -- I think they're good suggestions. One of the -- there's a group in Bucks County that has been very, very active in this area, and also they involve a mayor. I believe it was Upper Darby or Media. I'm not sure which one; what community it was.

And they're very supportive of that type of a provision to make sure that other -- other institutions within the community are notified who have -- who are involved with children so that they could also take -- not only parents could take protective steps, but also these institutions could take protective steps as well. So I'm very receptive to those kind of ideas.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Yeah. Again, on the whole I think it's a good idea, and I like the general framework that you have. I think it's important to give some discretion to the local police. They're going to know the neighborhood, they're going to know the rural area.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Such as, for example,

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

what if they live in an apartment? You know, there's so many scenarios you just can't anticipate. Even this bill as limited as it is -- even if you're in an apartment, I mean who are the adjacent neighbors?

I mean I think I know who they are, but depending on the configuration of the floor and whether it's a two story, whether it's a townhouse, whether it's a garden type apartment and all that, that could be -- that could become difficult.

I don't want to raise red flags on the legislation here, but I mean they're the kind of things that it's better to give as much discretion as possible to the local authorities than to be too restrictive and too specific on who the notification should go to because I don't think we can really write legislation that deals with all of the living arrangements that people find themselves in.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: And that's why personally I'm glad that we didn't rush to pass something in the last minute of the session because I I think it's important to consider those issues as much as you can.

We may not come up with any better solution than what we have right now in the first couple months of next session, but at least we ought

to know what the possible red flags are. So I commend you for your work. Thank you.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Could I just have a quick follow-up on that? Getting back to the issue I raised earlier about immunity I see Representative Masland's point about the validity of notification of other entities, for example, or a school district.

But I think any time that we deal with that issue we also have to remember to address the immunity issue and how far does that extend. I mean I've had an instance in my district just in the past couple of months where a parent of one of the children going to school was a sex offender and the school knew but didn't tell any of the other parents whose children were going over to this person's house to play.

And everyone got up in arms when they finally found out that the school knew and didn't tell them. The school's concern was I didn't have any authority or right to tell you.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: Absolutely. And I think we try to deal with that in this legislation because that's a complaint that we had from that group

is that -- is that they're reluctant to disseminate that information because of potential liability and because they don't have any real authorization now to do it regardless of the liability aspects of it.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And then again I'm playing, but getting to Representative Birmelin's concerns any time you start extending -- and that's why I think it's not a simple issue.

Any time you start extending immunity from liability for such reporting then you have to deal with the issue of false reporting no matter where it's coming from; an institutional or an individual concern.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: I think you can deal with that. I mean you can provide immunity under certain circumstances that there is immunity, but if you go beyond a certain point where there's actual intentional, malicious action, then that's a different matter. And I think that would be enough of a deterrent for someone to know that to be concerned about in issuing false reports.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Just briefly if I could just follow up on that. The Wetterling Act says immunity for good faith conduct which I think is important. But it just limits it to law enforcement

1 agencies, employees of law enforcement agencies and 2 state officials shall be immune from liability for good faith conduct under this section. 3 4 So as to whether or not you'd want to 5 include school employees or school administrative staff, things like that, that's another question. 6 7 Certainly we would have to make these people immune in 8 our act, but whether we wanted to go beyond it is 9 something else. 10 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative 11 Cohen? REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you. 12 13 Senator, continuing the discussion of the practical concerns both in terms of notification and in terms of 14 15 liability suppose someone sells their house and next 16 door there's somebody who's been convicted. Do they 17 have a duty to explain that to the buyer of the house? 18 SENATOR GREENLEAF: 19 REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Should they have a 20 duty to explain that to the buyer of the house? SENATOR GREENLEAF: 21 No. REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: The realtor should 22 23 have that duty?

with that issue at all. This is a public duty.

24

25

SENATOR GREENLEAF: No. It doesn't deal

law enforcement agencies and parole and probation agencies have that responsibility.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Would they have the responsibility to inform? I mean the guy moves next door, say, in 1994. Someone sells the house in 1996. Should the public agencies have a duty to the person when the person buys the -- when the new person buys the house?

SENATOR GREENLEAF: No. The requirement only deals with when that person takes up residence anew. It's not an ongoing requirement that anybody moves in, although as we've discussed here there is discretion with the police chief and local authorities to notify those people they think are appropriately notified. So that could be a continuing responsibility on their part if they think it's appropriate.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: In other states where we passed this kind -- where they passed this kind of legislation has this led to demand for other disclosures such as murder convictions, rape convictions?

SENATOR GREENLEAF: No. And there's a completely -- there's a significant difference between the two as we discussed prior. I think you

came in a little bit later.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Yes.

SENATOR GREENLEAF: These types of offenses are -- there's a very high recidivism rate for pedophiles. And it's a life long activity on people who are involved in pedophile activities. And if they've been convicted, they've been involved in it for a long time and probably have gotten away with it for many years with many victims prior thereto.

So the reason and the need for this legislation is to recognize that; recognize the high degree and possibility of additional acts and to allow those people who have children who are exposed or have potential exposure to that person to take offensive action -- not offensive actions, but defensive actions to protect themselves and their family.

There's no desire on my part or anyone else I know of to require registration for any other offenses. And I don't think there's a need for it.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: This offense is unique?

SENATOR GREENLEAF: This offense is unique because it involves children, and they prey on neighborhood children, you know -- or, you know, they seek out children. And so this is a unique situation.

1 There is certainly no move on my part or anyone else 2 that I know of to require registration for any other 3 offense. REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you. 4 5 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Any other 6 questions? 7 (No response.) 8 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Senator 9 Greenleaf. I certainly appreciate the time you've 10 given us this morning. 11 SENATOR GREENLEAF: And thanks for having 12 me here this morning. I should say you put me through 13 my paces -- that's for sure -- but very 14 constructively. We will certainly provide the 15 information that the members have requested, and I'll 16 also take your comments which were very good into 17 consideration in redrafting the legislation. So thank 18 you. 19 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We look forward to working with you again in the next session. 20 21 We're next going to hear from Brenda Roberson from the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape. 22 23 MS. ROBERSON: Thank you for the 24 opportunity to provide testimony on Senate Bill 1843.

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

My name is Brenda Todd Roberson, public policy

25

analyst, Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape. The coalition is a network of 47 sexual assault centers which provide services to victims and survivors of sexual violence in all of Pennsylvania's 67 counties. And we have an additional several hundred supporting members as well.

PCAR is in agreement with the intent of Senate Bill 1843; however, the coalition cannot fully support the bill in its current form. There are several issues which PCAR would like to address.

One, any legislation or registration and community notification should include language to protect the confidentiality of the victim and include specific regulations relating to the release of information included in the registry.

Two, the proposed bill allows the chief of police to use such other means of public notification as he deems necessary in addition to the specified notice to adjacent neighbors. This is of concern to PCAR. We think that it's overly broad in authority and raises problems.

PCAR recommends that in the best interest of child sexual assault victims and their families that any provision for the dissemination of information to the public be specifically detailed.

Third, the bill should include funding provisions for professional training and prevention education programs in order to significantly impact the incidence of child sexual assault.

During the last fiscal year ending June 30th centers served -- our centers that is -- served more than 8,000 child victims of sexual assault. In addition, counseling and other support services were provided to many, many family members of these child victims to help them deal with the devastating impact which this form of abuse has on their lives.

We know that the largest increase in categories of adult victims seeking support services is in that of adult survivors of child incest and sexual assault. This victim population -- the adult survivors -- requires a longer period of counseling due to the complex nature of the impact in many areas of the victims' lives which the sexual offenses inflicted.

Thus, PCAR has a vital interest in legislation which serves to protect children from devastation of sexual assault. PCAR has for the past twenty years been the leading advocacy group for all victims of sexual assult, and we support the efforts of legislators who take action to protect children in

particular from convicted sex offenders.

PCAR recognizes the need for this legislation and is in agreement with the intent of the proposed bill; to reduce the number of sexual offenses against children under the age of sixteen. We support the registration of convicted child sex offenders but with the development of guidelines and procedures as to the release of information contained in the registry.

A factor which weighs heavily in this issue is that of sex offenses against children being predominantly perpetrated by relatives of the victims; fathers, stepfathers, brothers and other relatives.

Nationally fewer than 20 percent of children are abused by strangers according to a study by the National Resource Center on Child Sexual Abuse of 1993.

Intrafamilial assault is by far the highest percentage of child sexual assault with a rate of 85 percent of child molestation being perpetrated by family members or by persons known by family members. Then the cite is given.

PCAR is concerned about cases of incest being included under the sex offenses within this bill. Cases of incest must be excluded from community

notification in order to protect the identity of the victim.

It is because of this fact that registration and notification of community members is not a solution to the problem of child sexual assault. Only a few offenders will be identified as convicted child offenders while the majority are unconvicted and unidentified.

When consideration is given to the fact that only a small percentage of all sexual assaults are reported to the police and, therefore, a low percentage rate of convictions are made, it is clear that any legislation -- I'm sorry -- registration or notification law will have only a minimal effect at deterring child sexual assault.

According to a survey of currently incarcerated inmates conducted by the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, their research bureau, as of the end of October 1994 -- last month -- there are 3,380 inmates serving time on a current sex offense charge. Of this number the sex offenses involving children are incest, twelve; sexual abuse of child, eleven; and statutory rape, 145.

Although the number of offenders currently incarcerated is low and indicates that only a fraction

of child sex offenders would fall under the requirements of the proposed bill PCAR, however, agrees that if such registration and notification would result in preventing the victimization of even a small number of children, this would be a worthwhile effort.

The trend for states to enact such legislation is a reecnt development, and in fact PCAR has only recently begun to research the issue on a national level. It appears, however, that it is yet too early to determine how effective the laws have been at lowering the incidence of child sexual assault.

At least 38 states have passed laws requiring registration. Of those only ten states have included various forms of notification. The Federal Crimes Bill enacted in September of this year requires that all states adopt laws mandating registration within three years or risk the loss of federal crime control grants; however, under the federal act states have some leeway in how this information in state registries will be released.

The crime bill states that local law enforcement agencies have the authority to "release relevant information that is necessary to protect the

public concerning a specific person required to register." The Attorney General is charged with establishing guidelines for states to follow in developing registration programs. As far as I know they are not yet in effect.

PCAR takes a cautionary stance regarding the type of notification to residents of the community which would be utilized. PCAR has a long history of focusing on both public policy and public education as a means to more effectively address the problem of sexual violence in society and to protect and support to the fullest extent possible victim/survivors of sexual assault.

A primary focus has been to emphasize the responsibility of the offender for his or her behavior and to focus on that behavior. This bill fits the category of making the offender accountable for his or her behavior; however, by publicly labeling offenders in a community the focus on the need for extensive community education on issues of sexual assault may be diverted.

PCAR's concern is that while labeling a few offenders may be minimally helpful, it may not serve to prevent all labeled offenders from committing additional offenses. In fact some specialists in the

treatment of offenders purport that offenders will become ever more subversive and, therefore, more difficult to treat. Offenders may simply go further underground or seek out children who are at a greater distance from their neighborhoods of residence.

Another result could be that of vigilantism as at least one such case gained national attention in the media last year. The case occurred in Washington state when residents held a rally after being notified that a convicted child rapist would soon be released to reside in their neighborhood and later the rapist's house was set afire.

Other types of notification related incidents recorded in the state of Washington according to a study conducted by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy included signs stating move or die placed on offender's apartment door, media coming to the home of the offender's relatives in an attempt to videotape their reaction to the notification, juvenile offenders being harassed by schoolmates and rocks thrown at offender's relatives.

That was all in the state of Washington.

Their law hs been in effect for four years, and this was a three-year study. The study found that as a result of sex offender notifications the offenders

frequently leave the community and sometimes the state. Therefore, any offender registration should be standardized, monitored, enforced and provide for interstate communication.

PCAR is concerned that by identifying a relatively low number of convicted offenders a community may be lulled into a false sense of security. While attention is focused on the few identified offenders the majority of sex offenders will continue to commit assaults.

Therefore, concurrent with the labeling of convicted offenders there must be an increased level of community education. These education programs include teaching parents, daycare workers, teachers, medical care providers and others how to recognize signs that a child is being sexually abused. It is our position that the bill should include funding for this prevention education component.

This legislation will not protect the children being abused in their own homes. It is our belief that through extensive educational programs to a wide variety of community groups, to children at all grade levels in schools -- preschool through college level -- and professional organizations there is a greater impact on the rate of incidence of sexual

violence.

Extensive training to the professionals are required in order to implement the provisions of Section 3109 of this bill dealing with the reporting of suspected sexual offenses. Again, the funding to provide the necessary trainings to professionals should be included in the bill.

And in conclusion although the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape cannot support Senate Bill 1843 in its entirety in its current form, we expect that it will undergo revision. PCAR would like to be invited to participate along with other victim service organizations in the development of guidelines or procedures related to the enactment of this legislation.

Thank you for inviting the coalition to provide testimony, and we look forward to working with you on it in the future.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

Questions. Representative Manderino?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Miss Roberson, you hit on one of my biggest concerns again from the average community living person point of view about legislation like this, and that is that I share your concern that this is going

to give a people a false sense of security and do more harm than good when it comes to the protection of their children.

I would like to ask you to share with us in more detail and with Senator Greenleaf in more detail the report or wherever it is that you got the fact about 85 percent of the child molestation coming from family members which after the Senator's testimony I have the impression that at least it was his belief that the numbers were probably reversed and that the greatest percentage of it was coming from strangers and --

MS. ROBERSON: No.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You know, maybe in looking at that and understanding it we can mold a bill that takes that into consideration and, therefore, provides the protection where the protection is needed.

I note that I'm going to stop there because I know that Representative Hennessey was -- also had some concerns about the intrafamily assault, and he's more experienced than me to ask pointed questions about that.

But my other I guess issue of -- only because from your criminal justice experience I meant,

Tim.

MS. ROBERSON: Let me just add I do have one other cite, and this is from the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare; their 1992 child abuse report. Of all abused children in Pennsylvania in 1992 65 percent of all the perpetrators had a parental relationship with the child.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Parental relationship. So not even a distant family relationship?

MS. ROBERSON: Exactly. Exactly.

MS. MILOHOV: If I could interject something I believe the Senator said that he didn't disclaim that it was intrafamily was the largest percentage of the actual assaults. What he said was intrafamily assaults did not come to a conviction.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Oh, okay.

MS. MILOHOV: And that's a serious consideration as you still have the problem, but you do not have the person convicted. You have the family -- the whole family configuring to try to solve the problem. And sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't. And you wouldn't have access to identify the perpetrator under that circumstance.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Ms. Roberson,

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

I'm also struck by that statistic that fewer than 20 percent of children are abused by strangers. Can you give us some insight as to why that occurs? Why is it much more frequent to be an intrafamily relationship?

Just the --

MS. ROBERSON: The dynamics.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: -- natural dominance of parent over child?

MS. ROBERSON: Power. Uh-huh. And the children being at a disadvantage wanting to seek the approval of a parental figure. And often of course it's highly secretative. The children are told that that's just normal and all families do this, but this isn't something you're supposed to talk to other people about. It's just within our family.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: The purpose of the legislation is to protect neighborhood children from a person who's been identified as a perpetrator. Given that as the underlying rationale for the legislation is there -- do we -- can we assume that a person in an intrafamily relationship or abusive relationship is either more likely or less likely to do something to some stranger on the outside in the neighborhoods to the neighbor's child?

(No response.)

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Maybe I didn't make myself clear. If a parent is abusing his own child, is he more likely or less likely to abuse a neighbor's child at the same time?

MS. ROBERSON: I don't think I have statistics to back that up. I wouldn't want to say. I would think that our -- if we can research the issue, that it would be surprising that he would be more likely to assault other children, but I don't have any data to back that up.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: It would seem to me that a parent in terms of his or her child has a natural domination or natural dominance so to speak and perhaps would be less likely to have that kind of relationship or power or whatever it may be over a neighbor's child, so perhaps there is less likelihood of that person acting out outside the confines of the family.

But I think it would be interesting to know that because if there is an indication that intrafamily abuse goes on this -- you know, to this high a degree, then it seems to me that we have to make a determination as to whether or not the perpetrators of intrafamily abuse have to be warned about -- I mean their neighbors have to be protected

in the same way that strangers who abuse children cause protection to be given to the neighborhood.

MS. ROBERSON: I agree that's something we need to do some research on.

MS. MILOHOV: Could I --

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Sure.

MS. MILOHOV: -- interject something in response to that? There is information as to the number of victims that a convicted pedophile has had. And in general the pedophile began as a youth with a sister, a cousin or someone like this.

They become obsessed with it; mentally obsessed with this activity. It extends into their own family. And once they get away with it in their own family, their own children, it -- their circle of victims broadens.

And we do -- we don't know, you know, how close the child in the next circle is, but we do know that a pedophile generally victimizes between 100 and 400 victims before they're convicted.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Are you relating that to the family or are you talking -- when I was talking to Ms. Roberson, we were talking about whether a parent is abusing a child, and the example you used was a child abusing another child.

MS. MILOHOV: A child -- oftentimes sexual offenders begin their sexual offense activity when they are juveniles. They carry through for the rest of their lives psychologically obsessed with this, addicted to it if you'd like to call it that. And these people are known to offend in much broader circles than just within their families.

And the longer they offend the more bold they become in attracting victims. And there have been studies and there is documentation that a person that has been convicted of pedophilia has had numerous victims. Not just that person's children or cousins or sisters, but many more than that.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Well, I guess the problem I'm having is trying to reconcile the statistics that we just heard because a person who has had some sort of abusive relationship hoisted upon him or her as a child and then acts out affirmatively to victimize other people within the family and then casts a rather broad net, you know, to hundreds of other children; victimizing hundreds of other children who are more or less his or her peers.

It would seem to me the statistic would say that 80 percent of the people of the child victims are victimized by strangers and not 20 percent. You

know, the way you painted the scenario the statistic should be reversed, and that's not what we're hearing from the national media, I guess the national reporting service here.

And I think we've got to get, you know, a real grip on that to determine whether or not neighbors have to be notified of incestuous relationships or abusive relationships within the family or if we can safely exempt those kind of situations from the notice requirements.

MS. MILOHOV: Well, I think it's an addiction question that you have to address. Also it is an addiction. And we have to understand the level of recidivism, repeat offenses and ways of dealing with it rather than just thinking that one law will solve and protect all of our communities.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Just picking up on that as some of you may recall at the first public hearing there were some victims that did testify, and it's my recollection that there was one victim who testified that she and her sisters were abused by her father who subsequently moved to Florida and started doing some of the same things down there.

So I think, you know, it's tough to say

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

from a statistic, but if somebody is a pedophile, eventually his children and his close circle of family, those kids are going to grow up. So that person is going to have to seek elsewhere for victims.

1.1

And as Ms. Roberson said certainly some will become even more subversive and difficult to treat. That's a possibility, but I think no matter what we do with this law -- whether we say people within a two-block radius, people within a ten-mile radius -- you're always going to have the problem or the possibility of that person going eleven miles away to find a victim. You're going to have that.

And I think that maybe we have to do some education in that respect, but I have to disagree that there's going to be some false sense of security. As a parent with three children certainly I'm not going to be any more at ease with these type of offenses or the possibility of this affecting my seven- or nine-or eleven-year-old simply because we have a law in place. And I think most people are going to understood that, but we can I think address that through education.

Just a couple brief comments. You talked about the need to exclude the victims, and I think that's something we should do. In the notification

under the Jacob Wetterling Act it specifically says except that the identity of a victim of an offense that requires registration under this section shall not be released.

So what we have to look at then sometimes is maybe we don't say that this person was specifically convicted of incest because when you say incest and the neighbors are notified, then the neighbors know, okay, who the victim was. The victim was probably right over there across the street too.

And if we want to protect the victims, I think we might need to just use a broader label. This person is a sexual offender. You know, that gives the full range, and, you know, maybe that can raise more questions in the people notified as to how bad this person really is.

But I think anybody who receives a notification that this person is a sexual offender, whether it's incest or anything, they're going to be worried no matter what you tell them. So I think maybe a general label could address that.

But you said again you think it should be specific. The Jacob Wetterling language is pretty broad in terms of the discretion it gives to the local agencies. And I'm not sure what the Attorney General

may come up with, but as it stands it's pretty broad discretion.

They may release information, and that's the -- I mean your quote from that on -- I forget what page of your testimony. I guess page four of your testimony. Release relevant information that is necessary. They may release information that is necessary. That's pretty broad.

So I'll ask you pretty much the same question I asked Senator Greenleaf in terms of, if we are going to put in some specific categories in addition to broad discretion, what is your position on things like notifying schools, notifying children and youth services, organizations like that?

MS. ROBERSON: We haven't done enough research on that area to make a recommendation. One of the ideas we've seen proposed, New Jersey established an advisory counsel made up of various professionals and victim advocates who advise the Attorney General in that state on establishing guidelines and procedures. And we'd like to see that kind of thing done in Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Okay. Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: One of the problems in Washington state I read in their study was that even

that law -- their law which is pretty stringent, the local law enforcement agencies still had a problem because it was a little bit vague and gave them discretionary powers.

They had difficulty with that and wanted that to be tightened even further. And I think that the law has been challenged, and it is going to be tightened even further. The police officers themselves felt that that needed to be made more substantive as to procedures that they were allowed to take. It left too much of the decision and power up to them.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: I just don't see any way around that to be honest. To have an effective law I think you have to have discretion within the local officials. I don't see how you can possibly just say you'll notify A, B, C, D, E and F and that's it or you'll notify people in this apartment building or on this block.

I live on a relatively small lot in the borough of Carlisle. Now, do I just notify the person behind? In front? I mean depending on how this works you could leave a lot of people unnotified who should be notified. And that's why I think you're going to have to have some discretion here.

MS. ROBERSON: Some states have even allowed publication in newspapers; local newspapers, for example, flashes on television on their cable station and that kind of thing. But it's not limited to just neighbors.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Just one other thing in terms of the possibilities you say that some offender will become ever more subversive. Hopefully they'll be able to catch some of these offenders, and I think one of the important things in Senator Greenleaf's legislation is the habitual offender provision.

So that if you do catch these people doing this a second time and they are determined to be a habitual offender, they can receive a life sentence because as we've heard at the first hearing somebody like this cannot be cured forever. They may be controlled, but they're not going to be cured. So that problem is always going to be with them and everybody around them.

MS. ROBERSON: Yes. One of the alternatives that we like is when we've seen stricter parole provisions so that the offender is trapped for life but neighbors are not notified.

And we feel that that would probably be

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

more effective at least for a specified number of 1 2 years; 20 years or whatever it would be. Most of the 3 other states, by the way, have made their registration 4 capped at ten years. REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: That's what the 5 6 federal act says. It has to be ten years, but that 7 doesn't mean we couldn't go beyond that. 8 MS. ROBERSON: Are there any other 9 questions? We'll be glad to provide any more 10 statistics, if we can, or help in your research. 11 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative Hennessey? 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: No. 14 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Oh. Okay. 15 Representative Cohen has a question. REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: You would not 16 17 support this kind of legislation for convicted rapists 18 who are released from prison, would you? 19 MS. ROBERSON: Convicted rapists what? 20 REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Who are released 21 from prison. If somebody sees that this is a great idea and I think -- and I think we ought to extend it 22 to convicted rapists --23 That had already been 24 MS. ROBERSON:

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

proposed. Representative Rudy's wasn't limited to

25

1	child sexual offenders.									
2	REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: That's already been									
3	proposed?									
4	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.									
5	REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Okay. I'm behind									
6	that.									
7	MS. ROBERSON: And there are other bills									
8	as well.									
9	REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: There are other									
10	bills?									
11	MS. ROBERSON: We liked the idea that									
12	Senator Greenleaf's was restricting it to child sexual									
13	offenders.									
14	REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: You do agree with									
15	Senator Greenleaf that child sexual offenders are									
16	unique?									
17	MS. ROBERSON: Yes. Yes.									
18	REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you.									
19	MS. ROBERSON: Are there any other									
20	questions?									
21	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are there any									
22	others?									
23	(No response.)									
24	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: No other questions?									
25	(No response.)									

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

1			CHAIR	RMAN	CALT	ragirone:	Oka	ay.	We'	11	
2	adjourn	the	hear	ing.							
3			(The	hear	ring	concluded	at	11:3	8 a	.m.)	
4											
5											
6											
7											
8											
9											
10											
11											
12											
13											
14											
15											
16											
17											
18											
19											
20											
21											
22											
23											
24											
25											

CENTRAL REPORTING SERVICE (717) 564-6969

## INDEX PAGE Senator Stewart J. Greenleaf, Prime Sponsor of Senate Bill 1843 Brenda Todd Roberson, Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me in the within proceedings, and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same. Kimberly L. Intrieri Reporter-Notary Public