1	
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
3	JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
4	
5	IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING ROOM G50
6	HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
7	
8	PUBLIC HEARING ON HOUSE BILL 928
9	
10	MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2010 11:00 A.M.
11	11.00 A.M.
12	BEFORE:
13	HONORABLE THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN
14	HONORABLE JAMES E. CASORIO, JR. HONORABLE DOM COSTA
15	HONORABLE BRYAN R. LENTZ HONORABLE JOSEPH A. PETRARCA
16	HONORABLE JOSH SHAPIRO HONORABLE RONALD G. WATERS
17	HONORABLE RON MARSICO, MINORITY CHAIRMAN HONORABLE MIKE VEREB
18	HONORABLE GLEN R. GRELL HONORABLE KATIE TRUE
19	HONOKABLE KATTE TRUE
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR P. O. BOX 278
25	MAYTOWN, PA 17550 717-426-1596 PHONE/FAX

		<u> </u>
1	ALSO PRESENT:	
2	HONORABLE RICHARD T. GRUCELA	
3	HONORABLE MARK LONGIETTI HONORABLE SAM ROHRER	
4	HONORABLE CHRIS SAINATO HONORABLE DANTE SANTONI, JR.	
5	HONORABLE TIM SEIP	
6	WILLIAM H. ANDRING, SENIOR LEGAL COUNSEL (D)	
7	V. KURT BELLMAN, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT (D) WENDELL HANNAFORD, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT (D)	
8	KAREN L. DALTON, SENIOR LEGAL COUNSEL (R)	
9		
10		
11		
12	BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX		
2	NAME	PAGE	
3	INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING REMARKS	4	
4	REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA	6	
5	REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER	7	
6	MIKE MCMONAGLE PRO-LIFE COALITION	11	
7 8 9	MAJOR KEN HILL DIRECTOR BUREAU OF FORENSICS SERVICES PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE	27	
10	DR. DEBRA EVANS-RHODES PSYCHOLOGIST	39	
11 12	BRUCE CASTOR FORMER DA FROM MONTGOMERY COUNTY	63	
13	DR. JONATHAN R. PLETCHER CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF PITTSBURGH	102	
14 15 16 17	LOURDES M. ROSADO ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR JUVENILE LAW CENTER	112	
18 19	WRITTEN REMARKS SUBMITTED		
20	PENNSYLVANIA MEDICAL SOCIETY	134	
21	PENNSYLVANIA A CHILDREN AND YOUTH ADMINISTRATORS	137	
22 23	AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION	140	
24	CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF PHILADELPHIA	1 4 4	
25			

	±
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: This is the
4	House Judiciary Committee, public hearing on
5	House Bill 928. I'm Chairman Tom
6	Caltagirone. And I'd like to have the rest of
7	the committee, including the chairman beside
8	me, introduce themselves for the record.
9	We'll get started.
10	REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Good
11	morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12	I'm Representative Ron Marsico from
13	Dauphin County.
14	MS. DALTON: Karen Dalton, counsel to
15	the committee.
16	REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Hello.
17	Mark Longietti, Mercer County.
18	REPRESENTATIVE SAINATO: Hello. I'm
19	Representative Chris Sainato. I represent the
20	9th Legislative District, which is parts of
21	Lawrence and a small section of Beaver
22	County.
23	REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative
24	Dom Costa, 21st District, Allegheny County.
25	REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Good morning.

```
1
       Katie True, Lancaster County.
2
                 REPRESENTATIVE SEIP: Tim Seip,
       representing part of Berks County, part
3
4
       Schuylkill County, Cabela's and Yuengling
5
       district.
                 MR. ANDRING: Bill Andring, legal
 6
7
       counsel.
8
                 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Josh
9
       Shapiro, representative from Montgomery
10
       County.
11
                 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Bryan Lentz,
12
       representative from Delaware County.
13
                 REPRESENTATIVE VEREB: Mike Vereb
14
       from Montgomery County.
15
                 REPRESENTATIVE SANTONI: Dante
16
       Santoni, Berks County.
17
                 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Sam Rohrer,
18
       not a member of the committee but testifying
19
       this morning.
                 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: I'm Rich
20
21
       Grucela, also not a member of the committee,
22
       but it's my bill before the committee this
23
       morning. And I'm from Northampton County.
24
                 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you,
25
       gentlemen. As far as I'm concerned, you're
```

all part of the committee with the hearing that's going on.

Like to start off with Representative Grucela and then Representative Rohrer for comments for the record.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And my thanks to you and the members of the committee for this hearing on House Bill 928. House Bill 928, although with a different number, has been around for other sessions. Representative Tom Yewcic, who has retired last session, and Representative Rohrer have actually worked on this really a lot more than I did, but I was merely a cosponsor. But in this session, and speaking with Representative Rohrer, I took the lead as the sponsor of House Bill 928.

Essentially -- and you've seen the analysis -- essentially it's a reporting bill. House bill 928 requires the physician or healthcare practitioner who treats a minor with respect to prenatal care, delivery of a baby, termination of a pregnancy, or any sexually transmitted disease to obtain

credible written evidence that the minor is thirteen years of age or older. So it's essentially a reporting bill.

And, again, there will be people here testifying today, little bit more in depth about the bill, but at this time, I would like to call on my colleague and friend, Sam Rohrer, for some further comments on House Bill 928.

Representative Rohrer.

REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Thank you, Representative Grucela.

And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling the hearing today. And I'd like to thank all the members and staff, advocacy groups and members of the public who have traveled to be here this morning.

I'm grateful for the opportunity to address the committee about an issue that's very serious and also very emotional. The sexual abuse of children in our commonwealth is a tragedy and one that we would like to believe doesn't happen but does. Due to efforts to combat these horrific cases of abuse, legislation has been passed on both the

federal and state levels in order to strengthen the penalties and empower our police to crack down on these predators.

Previously enacted legislation has expanded the mandated reporting requirements for child abuse in a manner that requires the reporting of pregnancies of girls who are under thirteen years of age to county agencies. Unfortunately, however, despite these laws, a significant number of child rapists and other child predators can avoid detection and punishment because the age of the child is not determined.

When I first became aware of this loophole in the law, I sat down with former Representative Tom Yewcic, who was mentioned, to draft legislation that might provide law enforcement with the tools they need to further prosecute child predators.

When a child in the under thirteen
years of age has a sexually transmitted
disease or is pregnant, that is evidence that
a felonious sex crime has been committed. The
premise of this bill is to require that a
healthcare practitioner who treats a minor for

pre- or postnatal care or with an STD to ascertain the age of the child, and in so doing, greatly strengthen Pennsylvania's ability to protect children under thirteen years of age against child rapists or other sexual predators.

The legislation specifically addresses the unique role that healthcare practitioners play. As physicians and other health practitioners may see evidence of sexual abuse or a felonious sex crime, these individuals have concrete knowledge that a crime was committed.

The requirement to share this knowledge was codified in the law so that young girls and young boys might be protected and their abusers punished. This is already the law. Requiring that the age of the child be determined is an enforcement mechanism that will further serve to protect the children of our commonwealths.

From a policy perspective, this legislation is necessary to ensure that the laws against sexual conduct with those under thirteen years of age are properly enforced.

Knowing a child's age keeps a large class of girls and boys from falling through the cracks.

The child rapist and predator detection legislation would not create any new law, but rather would correct a loophole or a structural deficiency overlooked in the original legislation.

Because of methodology and the difficulty of quantifying such statistics, some organizations do not or cannot measure the victimization of children age under twelve or younger. Additionally, the relative dependence and immaturity of these children make it difficult, in many cases, for the children to report abuse.

When children do come in contact with health care professionals then, there is evidence of abuse, that makes all the more necessary for law enforcement to be given the proper tools to track down and to punish these child predators.

When drafting this legislation, we were careful to bring in people and organizations involved with this issue for

1	their comments and concerns in order to draft
2	fair and comprehensive legislation. We have a
3	few people representing these organizations
4	here today to testify to the absolute
5	necessity of this legislation.
6	Children who have been victimized by
7	sexual abuse are perhaps some of society's
8	most innocent and vulnerable citizens. The
9	very least that we, as legislator, can do is
10	to ensure that those who perpetrate such
11	heinous crimes are caught and punished. Our
12	children deserve nothing less than this.
13	Mr. Chairman, those are my comments.
14	Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.
16	We'll next move we'll next move to
17	Mike McMonagle, Pro-Life Coalition.
18	MR. MCMONAGLE: May I proceed,
19	Mr. Chairman?
20	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes, sir.
21	MR. MCMONAGLE: Good morning. Thank
22	you, Mr. Chairman and Representative Rohrer,
23	Representative Grucela and all the members,
24	for coming here.
25	I'll minimize my comments not to

repeat what Representative Rohrer said, in

my -- I have two-page testimony, and it

highlights. And I refer to enclosures in

this. Which, I'm heartened by the good turn

out, based on the predictions, Expedia's

predictions, so I don't have -- I only made

ten copies. So for the enclosures, we can get

them to you, if we have to.

so the first part, I don't want to repeat, except for the issue of a court definition of an STD being a serious bodily injury. That has legal ramifications. Under child abuse reporting, a serious bodily injury has to be reported. So under state law, an STD is a serious bodily injury. Plus I would add, the attorney general, the current attorney general, has issued two memorandum about pregnancy twelve and under and STDs twelve and under, and his interpretation of the law, that they must be reported and is a reasonable basis to suspect child abuse.

So other than that, to the extent of the problem, how big is this? And a comment about determining numbers. The numbers of abortions on ages twelve and under are very

exact, and the reason is that we have tested

AGs going back to Fisher and Pappert and then

Corbett, that under the Abortion Control Act,

if law enforcement asks, the health department

will break it down, because they only report

fifteen and under abortions, so to get twelve

and under, you have to precede that.

The others, we just picked two STDs and childbirth, there's -- over the years.

Members of this committee have the right to go to the health department and ask for very specific breakdowns. But you can see the numbers; this is not a minimal problem. This really exists, if you add up these numbers.

These children, these little girls, are victims of sexual assault, just based on these numbers. And it's not being reported.

I mean, this body passed Senate Bill 1254 in late 2006, which made it clear who's a mandated reporter, and if you have a reasonable basis to suspect abuse. So pregnancy in a girl twelve and under is a reasonable basis to suspect abuse, but it's not being reported.

Why not? You can tell by the title

of our group, you can guess where we stand on the issue of protecting unborn children from abortion. Abortion facilities have a vested financial interest in not reporting this. And if you are aware of any of stories in other states that they're — they tell minors either not to tell the age, you know, quote — this is from an Indiana abortion mill — I don't want to know your age. Don't tell me that. When the girl told him she was thirteen. So they avoid officially determining age.

And, you know, part of law enforcement, to be candid, to get to the next section, they -- they'll actually support the abortion industry, don't want to challenge it.

And there's no one here from

Philadelphia, but I'm a native of

Philadelphia, and I'll speak candidly about

Philadelphia. This problem is not

proportional around the state. Philadelphia's

at the heart of this problem. And, therefore,

you would think the Philadelphia District

Attorney's office would be all over this,

trying to do something about it. But that is

not the case.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Keep on. What their policy is -keep on -- if a twelve-year-old girl shows up in an abortion mill or a school nurse pregnant, does the Philadelphia District Attorney's office require that healthcare provider or abortion provider to report that? The answer's no. No. Believe it or not. this is the reason: There's an itsy-bitsy chance that the male who got this girl pregnant could be twelve or under, and, therefore, we don't know who the victim is. This, I literally got from the mouth of John Delaney. He's the head, the number three quy in the DA's office. And this is their rationale.

And maybe this will change under the new management, I don't know. But this is -- this is what's happening and what happened.

I mean, many of you probably read,

two years ago, about this time, it was

reported in the Inquirer on the Arnesx Honore

case. This sexual predator got a fourteen
year-old girl -- between the ages of fourteen

and seventeen -- committed repeated sexual

assault on her, at least one baby born, at least two babies killed by abortion and never reported.

And so you would think the first time that girl got pregnant, when she went to the hospital and gave birth, under this bill, that healthcare provider would have been required to report that sexual assault and take a DNA sample to be up with the DA -- with the unit that's going to be created in AG's office. So, this -- this is an example of what happens in our commonwealth, particularly in our lead city.

You know, I wish the bill would go further. I wish it would protect fourteen and under, and I wish -- because I don't see the Philadelphia DA's office changing any time soon, I which the AG's office would use concurrent jurisdiction to enforce it. But this is a good first step.

And how much time do I have? I just read some of the comments critical of the legislation. And I'd like briefly to respond to them. And one is very anticipated, and that is, this legislation would deter minors

from seeking medical treatment. Nonsense. I mean, if you buy that, I'll convince you -- in other words, a twelve-year-old girl, pregnant, we don't want to tell her parents that she's a subject of rape. I mean is this what you guys want the policy to be? Is that because she won't get treated or she won't get treated for an STD. A twelve-year-old has an STD and we're not going to tell law enforcement or her parents? I mean, I just trust your common sense on that to reject that argument of the ACLU, which is their testimony.

And the other ones, yeah, this will hurt the abortion industry, that's why we're supporting it. I'll be very candid about that. But you should -- if you describe your position as pro-choice, you should be for this bill as well, because you don't want little girls being sexually assaulted and being covered up, which is happening right now.

So I'll stop. Thank you for listening. And please pass this great legislation.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Would you hold for questions.

1 Members, are there any questions. 2 Yes, go ahead. 3 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Thank you, 4 Mr. Chairman. 5 Thank you for your testimony, Mr. McMonagle. It's -- I have the utmost 6 respect for Representatives Grucela and Rohrer 7 and what they're trying to do. Unfortunately, 8 9 they invited you to be an advocate for this 10 bill, which I think undermines it quite substantially. 11 12 Just your final statement there about the parents, alerting the parents in the case 13 14 of rape. I believe that was your testimony 15 that you think --16 MR. MCMONAGLE: That should trump. 17 That should be trump. 18 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Are there 19 incidents in Pennsylvania where the rape of 20 that child occurs as a result of the parent 21 perpetuating that rape of that child? 22 MR. MCMONAGLE: Sure. 23 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Do you have 24 any idea how -- what the percentage of that 25 might be?

MR. MCMONAGLE: No, I don't.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Two, 3

percent maybe, a small amount. I gather if

you think we should be letting the parents

know, you would think they would not be

involved in the rape and, thus, they would be

a protecting and comforting factor for the

child; is that correct?

MR. MCMONAGLE: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Okay. So would it surprise you, then, to know that our own Department of Public Welfare suggested 27.3 percent of the offender relationships to your child victims are parents? So you would alert one-quarter, more than one-quarter of those who actually rape their own children under this bill. That would be a good aim of this legislation, according to your testimony; is that correct?

MR. MCMONAGLE: Under the bill, the notification goes through the police. So if a twelve-year-old girl is pregnant and shows up at a healthcare provider, they notify the police.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: And

parents --

MR. MCMONAGLE: No. Then the law enforcement provides parent. I apologize for that mistake, if I lumped it. It's not a parallel thing; it's a series thing. Law enforcement's notified, and law enforcement notifies the parents.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: So here you have a traumatized twelve-year-old, to use your example, who's been raped, more than a quarter percent of the time of all the cases, by a parent, and you are now going to subject that child -- take them away from the comforts of their healthcare provider, who they know, who can provide confidential comfort to them, and instead involve them in the judicial system, in the legal system, as well as bringing in closer to them the person who committed that rape in the first place, the father, in most cases. Right? I mean that's the underlying bill.

MR. MCMONAGLE: What's the alternative? This twelve-year-old girl has been raped and you don't tell law enforcement? And if she says, Hey, it's my

Right.

father who's the perpetrator, then law enforcement would take action.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO:

Under our current standards, which allow for practitioners, for doctors, for pediatricians to go out and if they -- if they see evidence of this abuse, report it to the authorities, as they do now, here you are mandating that that process take place involving the parent, in at least one-quarter of the time where the parent should not be involved. And you're taking that discretion away from the doctors.

question. And those of you who are coming to testify, I'll probably ask you this question as well. What is broken about the current system? How is it today that physicians are not doing a good enough job reporting this? What evidence do you have to suggest, as the underlying bill suggests, that it would greatly strengthen the commonwealth's ability to protect children under thirteen years of age, to take away this discretion from the physicians? Where's the evidence of that?

MR. MCMONAGLE: The evidence is the

number of abortions, the number of STDs, the
number of childbirths being to girls fourteen
and under, and more specifically, twelve and
under. And -
REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: I accept the

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: I accept the fact that you and I may not agree on the issue of abortion. And I truly respect your position on that. This is not about abortion. This underlying legislation suggestions that something in the current system is not working, and that this bill would strengthen it. And I'm asking, how would this strengthen it?

MR. MCMONAGLE: The age requirement.

That right now healthcare practitioners,

particularly abortion facilities, are saying,

Don't tell me your age. And they're looking

the other way. And this would stop under this

bill.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Okay. And what evidence do you have that that is happening?

MR. MCMONAGLE: Undercover investigations in other states and just the mere lack of reporting.

1 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: And have you 2 provided that to Chairman Marsico or Chairman 3 Caltagirone so that we can see that evidence 4 for us, or should we just take your word for 5 that? MR. MCMONAGLE: You could do your investigation. I'm not asking you to --7 8 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: You don't 9 have any evidence to suggest --10 MR. MCMONAGLE: I can't give you an undercover videotape of an abortion facility 11 12 in Pennsylvania, but I can refer you to 13 stories what's happening in other states. 14 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: I'm mean, 15 I'm all ears. If there's some evidence to 16 suggest that the current system needs to be 17 strengthened, I'd like to know what that is. 18 You're suggesting to me you've done some 19 cohort operations and can't share --20 MR. MCMONAGLE: In other states. 21 you're --22 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: In other 23 states. 24 MR. MCMONAGLE: But you're ignoring 25 my comment about --

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: It's not an 1 2 issue here in Pennsylvania. MR. MCMONAGLE: -- about 3 4 Philadelphia. In other words, if you're a 5 school nurse in Philadelphia and you treat a twelve-year-old girl, should you have to tell 6 law enforcement? 7 8 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: I guess what 9 I'm suggesting to you -- and you have not been 10 able to rebut this -- is we already provide the latitude and the discretion to our 11 12 healthcare providers. You're suggesting in your testimony and the underlying bill 13 14 suggests that the system is not strong enough 15 and needs to be strengthened. I'm all ears. 16 This is an informational hearing where we're 17 here to learn. I'm just trying to find out 18 what needs to be strengthened. Where is the 19 system not working? 20 And you tell me you've got some 21 undercover thing and --22 MR. MCMONAGLE: The proof of age. 23 But, you've avoided my question, which is the 24 heart -- Philadelphia's the heart of this

problem. And you have law enforcement in

25

1 Philadelphia saying, a healthcare provider or 2 an abortion facility in Philadelphia does not have to tell law enforcement if they treat a 3 4 twelve year old girl. That's how it's 5 broken. REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: I'm -- first 6 off, I ask the questions; you don't ask the 7 8 questions. 9 Second off, those providers have discretion under our current law. You're 10 11 suggesting that they should not have 12 discretion, that they should be mandated to report. And I'm suggesting to you -- I'm 13 14 asking you why that mandate? What is not working in this the current system? 15 16 MR. MCMONAGLE: As far as current 17 law, there's other people who will testify to 18 that. But my understanding of law is, that there's no discretion. They have to report. 19 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: So --20 21 MR. MCMONAGLE: A healthcare 22 provider --23 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: So today, if 24 a twelve-year-old child comes to her 25 pediatrician and demonstrates or displays

1 evidence of sexual abuse, you're saying that 2 doctor doesn't report that? 3 MR. MCMONAGLE: Yes. Oh, yeah. 4 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Really? 5 MR. MCMONAGLE: Yes. REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: And do you 6 have any evidence that suggest that that is a 7 8 fact? I mean, I see former District Attorney 9 Castor here, who I know has been involved in 10 many cases where he successfully prosecuted 11 folks based on physicians in Montgomery County 12 coming forth to provide that to him, to Risa 13 Ferman, his first ADA who's now our district 14 attorney. We have several success stories on 15 our books in Montgomery County and across the 16 state where physicians have provided a tip to 17 law enforcement 18 You're suggesting that doesn't 19 happen? 20 MR. MCMONAGLE: Yes. Very much so, 21 in Philadelphia. 22 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: okay. Well, 23 look, I appreciate your opinion. 24 Unfortunately, it's -- at least according your 25 to testimony today, it's based on no facts

1 whatsoever. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the 2 committee's time, and I'll follow up with more 4 questions later. Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are there other questions? No. 6 7 MR. MCMONAGLE: Thank you, 8 Mr. Chairman. 9 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you for 10 your testimony. We'll next hear from Major Ken Hill, 11 12 director, Bureau of Forensic Services, 13 Pennsylvania State Police. 14 MAJOR HILL: Good morning, 15 Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. 16 I'm Major Ken Hill, director of the 17 Bureau of Forensic Services of the 18 Pennsylvania State Police. 19 On behalf of Colonel Frank Pawlowski, 20 commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police, 21 I want to thank you for the opportunity to 22 speak with you today about House Bill 928, 23 child Rapist and Predator Detection. 24 Before I specifically address this 25 legislation, I would like to give you some

insight into our current and past operations
regarding convicted offender registration and
forensic DNA casework. These are the two
sections that we operate at the DNA
laboratory. At present, Pennsylvania has over
two hundred twenty-one thousand convicted
offenders registered in the National Combined
DNA Index System, or CODIS.

Over the past three years, 2007 through 2009, we have averaged approximately twenty-five thousand samples received and uploaded per year. Over the past five years, there have been two thousand three hundred forty-four hits to the state database, and sixty-one hits -- I'm sorry. Two thousand three hundred forty-four hits uploaded by our laboratory. In 2009 alone, there were six hundred seventeen hits to the state database, and sixty-one hits to out-of-state offenders through the national CODIS database.

At the end of 2009, our backlog was just over three thousand samples, which is approximately a one-month delay from receipt to upload into CODIS.

The casework section analyzes samples

obtained from crime scenes for DNA. As the technology becomes better understood by investigators and prosecutors, and as the success stories mount, our casework has risen from approximately twelve hundred submissions in 2006 to over twenty-one hundred cases in 2009. This increase, along with attrition of scientists and the current negative fiscal picture, has affected our ability to keep up with that casework. At present, our turnaround time for DNA is one hundred eightynine days. We expect DNA casework submissions to continue increasing.

Our DNA analysts are trained,
educated, and certified to interpret results
that identify the DNA of the donor only. In
this legislation, the analyst would be
required to interpret results from the fetus
or donor and extrapolate those results to
identify the sperm donor. None of our
analysts are certified or trained to conduct
that interpretation.

Given the extent of our current workload, we do not have the luxury of taking analysts off the bench to train, educate,

certify, and accredit the new process proposed in this legislation without a significant loss of production. I estimate it would take approximately three years to obtain accreditation for this process, at a cost of nearly ten thousand dollars per analyst.

There are other laboratories that specialize in forensic relationship testing, are accredited, offer easy access for users, and often receive federal grant funding to offer limited free testing to law enforcement. Marshall University in West Virginia is one of such labs.

Since we do not conduct forensic relationship testing, I recommend that the state police be removed as a regulating body and promulgating authority for this particular section.

Given the very specific nature of this legislation, it would not be cost efficient for the state police to undertake this additional task and would add further delays in providing results to law enforcement. Further delays in providing the identification of often violent criminals to

	31
1	law enforcement translates to those criminals
2	remaining on the streets, free to committed
3	further crimes while their DNA sits untested
4	in the lab.
5	Were there no other alternative, we
6	would, of course, take on this role. However,
7	there are very reasonable alternatives
8	available to accomplish the goal of this
9	legislation faster and cheaper and with no
10	negative implications for the state Police or
11	the citizens of the commonwealth.
12	Again, I thank you for the invitation
13	to discuss this subject and will be happy to
14	answer any questions you may have.
15	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you,
16	Major.
17	Members?
18	Tim.
19	REPRESENTATIVE SEIP: Thank you,
20	Mr. Chairman.
21	Thank you for being here today,
22	Major.
23	MAJOR HILL: Thank you, sir.
24	REPRESENTATIVE SEIP: I'm not I
25	was hoping that maybe we would have somebody

from the Department of Public Welfare on the agenda or perhaps some somebody from children and youth, more specifically. But I'll ask you this question.

I'm a mandated reporter myself, as a licensed social worker, and I would think that if some of the situations that were discussed earlier about a student coming before a licensed school nurse and in a pregnant state or believed to be pregnant state, then that that school nurse would have an obligation to call children and youth services or ChildLine to report that is a suspected child abuse.

Certainly, my understanding of the law is that you don't have to have evidence, you're not supposed to go out and gather things on your own. As a mandated reporter, you're supposed to be mandated to report anything that you think might be child abuse.

So, I guess my question is, is that what your understanding of that type of situation would be?

MAJOR HILL: Yes, sir. That's -REPRESENTATIVE SEIP: That would be a
reportable instance to Children and Youth

1 Services on ChildLine? 2 MAJOR HILL: Yes, sir, I believe it would. 4 REPRESENTATIVE SEIP: Okay. Thank 5 you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. 7 Chairman Marsico. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Thank you, 10 Mr. Chair. The chairman and I were just 11 12 discussing your testimony and -- thanks for 13 being here, by the way. 14 MAJOR HILL: You're welcome, sir. 15 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: It seems to 16 us that the -- one of the reasons for your, I quess, not wanting -- for the state police not 17 18 wanting to take a role in this process is the 19 cost of per analyst. You had mentioned ten 20 thousand dollars per analyst as well as three 21 years accreditation. 22 And you mentioned in your statement, 23 on page two, the bottom of page two, that 24 would be at the very end of your statement, 25 you mentioned that there are other reasonable

alternatives to this legislation. Could you 1 2 let us know what they are? MAJOR HILL: Yes, sir. Marshall 3 4 University is one such alternative. Public 5 laboratory that offers limited free testing for law enforcement for forensic relationship 6 testing, which is a process that they 7 8 currently do. 9 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: You 10 mentioned that in your testimony as well. 11 MAJOR HILL: Yeah. There are other 12 private laboratories that also offer similar 13 forensic relationship testing. 14 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Is that a cost to the commonwealth? Is that a cost to 15 16 the commonwealth? Private labs would be a 17 cost, I'm sure. 18 MAJOR HILL: They would, sir. 19 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Okay. That 20 is my question. You want to follow up. 21 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I'm just 22 curious about that. The workload that you're 23 experiencing now, and evidently it's being 24 compounded by the budget process. 25 MAJOR HILL: It is, sir.

enough analysts available or the training and certification that I would assume that your people have to have in order to appear in court to testify. They have to have that certification.

MAJOR HILL: They do, sir, certified and the laboratory's accredited.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: So this would present a burden, an extra burden, on the state police to be able to perform those extra duties.

Is it a matter of money, or is it a matter of time, or both?

MAJOR HILL: I think the money is the minimal issue. Money is always an issue, but in this case, I think it's the minimal side.

The matter is the time to undertake a new process, which we don't currently do, are not currently trained to do or currently accredited to do. And in addition, the time to take to obtain that accreditation and certification and training that would also cause the limited number of analysts we currently have to be assigned to do these

1 types of cases and take them away from the 2 caseload we're currently experiencing, which 3 is extensive. 4 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: You had 5 mentioned that this out-of-state college or university can do this? 6 MAJOR HILL: Yes, sir. 7 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: At no cost to 8 9 the commonwealth. MAJOR HILL: No cost for the 10 testing. They have federal grants that they 11 12 receive that allow them to offer law 13 enforcement limited, no-cost testing. 14 would be a cost to the commonwealth for the 15 prosecutor, should their analyst come to 16 testify. 17 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay. Do you 18 currently send any testing to them now on any 19 of the DNA tests? 20 MAJOR HILL: No, sir. We do not. 21 And on the tests that we currently conduct, we 22 do not sent DNA. We don't do forensic 23 relationship testing, nor do we forward that 24 to anybody. We have law enforcement directly

forward their DNA to appropriate laboratories.

25

1 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Your backlog 2 right now --3 MAJOR HILL: Yes, sir. 4 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: -- what are we 5 talking about in number of cases that you're dealing with? 6 MAJOR HILL: In DNA casework, it's 7 8 over eight hundred cases in the backlog. In 9 the convicted offender database, it's about 10 three thousand case. Three thousand cases translates to about thirty days from the time 11 12 we get the convicted offender sample until we 13 upload it into CODIS. The casework samples, 14 the eight hundred or so cases of crime scene 15 DNA, that's about a hundred eighty-nine days. 16 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: So before they 17 can get into court, you have to have these 18 tests completed? 19 MAJOR HILL: Correct, sir. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Before any 20 21 adjudication could take place. 22 MAJOR HILL: Before we were able to 23 testify. Often they plead guilty prior to our 24 testifying. 25 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay. Any

other questions? 1 2 Representative Costa? REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Yes. Major, 3 4 thank you again for being here. 5 In your opinion, do you see a need for this testing? Do you have many cases that 6 would require this type of testing? 7 8 Obviously, you haven't sent any out. Is there 9 a need in Pennsylvania, in the commonwealth, 10 for us to train people in this type of thing? MAJOR HILL: To train -- is there a 11 12 need for us to train state troopers to do this 13 kind of thing or for our forensic analysts to 14 do this? 15 REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Is there 16 enough cases that would require us to train 17 our troopers to do this without -- I mean, 18 even if we got a new batch of troopers that we 19 were going to train so we wouldn't be 20 backlogging the cases? 21 MAJOR HILL: I'm sorry. I misspoke 22 when I said troopers. Forensic scientists for 23 the state police. 24 REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Forensic

25

scientists.

1	MAJOR HILL: In my opinion, there are
2	currently several credible alternatives for
3	Pennsylvania to use that don't involve the
4	state police. As to the number of cases that
5	this type of legislation would affect, I would
6	only be guessing.
7	REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Okay. Thank
8	you very much.
9	MAJOR HILL: You're welcome.
10	REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Thank you,
11	Mr. Chairman
12	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you,
13	Major. Appreciate your testimony.
14	We will next move to Dr. Debra Evans-
15	Rhodes, psychologist.
16	DR. EVANS-RHODES: Good morning.
17	Let me begin by giving you my
18	credentials. I'm Dr. Debra Evans-Rhodes. I'm
19	a psychologist and a professor at the
20	Pennsylvania State University. Additionally,
21	I have been active in the area of domestic
22	violence, most recently serving on the board
23	of directors for domestic violence services of
24	Fayette County for the past five years and
25	currently serving as the president of the

board since 2008.

I not only know what the effects of abuse can be, I have seen firsthand the devastation that such abuse causes. I am, therefore, in favor of House Bill 928.

It is important to distinguish what the bill does not do. The bill does not change the standards set by the Pennsylvania legislature and affirmed by our courts that those who provide medical care to our children are mandated to report suspected cases of abuse to appropriate authorities.

The bill does not expand the list of mandated reporters nor their duty to report.

The bill does not change the definitions for reporting standards. It does not address the defined ages for consent or statutory crimes. Those standard have also been determined by the legislature and affirmed by the courts.

The bill does not require mandated reporters to conduct investigations into the source of the sexual activity. That process has also been established by the law.

The bill simply seeks to assure that

those mandated to report sexual abuse do report sexual abuse.

Let's look at the numbers. According to the Pennsylvania Department of Health, there were three hundred ninety-five reported pregnancies to young women under the age of fifteen in 2007. Of those, one hundred eighty-six resulted in live births, two hundred six were aborted, and three unborn children died in utero.

This pregnancy rate averages out to one pregnancy per one thousand girls between the ages of ten and fourteen. This rate has been relatively constant since 2005.

Additionally, the Department of
Health statistics for sexually transmitted
diseases for 2007 revealed that there were two
hundred seventy-eight reported case of
gonorrhea, seven hundred and fifty-one cases
of clamydia, and four cases of syphilis in
children aged fourteen and under. This means
that approximately one thousand thirty-three
children in Pennsylvania were diagnosed with
just those three sexually transmitted diseases
in the year 2007. This does not include HPV,

genital warts, or pelvic inflammatory disease.

Unfortunately, this was not an anomaly.

that the presence of a pregnancy or a sexually transmitted disease is evidence of sexual contact. And since these statistics came from the Department of Health, they came from contact with a member of the healthcare profession. Therefore, we should expect to see at least one thousand five hundred reports of possible sexual abuse from healthcare providers for the year 2007. That is not the case.

The Department of Public Welfare reports that there were a total of one thousand five hundred and twelve reported case of sexual abuse in this age range for that year. This figure includes all types of sexual abuse such as indecent exposure and not just reports of physical contact. It also includes all reports, not just those from mandated reporters. In fact, the department reports that only 22 percent of abuse reports, or just three hundred thirty-two incident,s were actually reported by healthcare workers.

So, conservatively speaking,

approximately fifteen hundred children in the

year 2007 saw a mandated reporter with a

5 conduct had occurred and the mandated reporter

condition that absolutely proved that sexual

failed to obey the law and file the report.

7 And this happens every year. We must do

8 better than this.

House Bill 928 requires that mandated reporters ascertain the age of the young person who comes to them for treatment of a pregnancy or sexually transmitted disease.

The proof of age must be kept on file.

Obtaining proof of age is not overly burdensome, since this information is obtainable through a health insurance provider or other medical record.

This requirement is fully within the bounds of HIPAA regulations, which state that the privacy rule permits covered entities to make disclosures that are required by other laws.

The requirement eliminates the possibility of a child lying about his or her age to avoid a report. Again, the mandatory

1	nature of the report is already established by
2	law, and House Bill 928 does not change that
3	requirement. It creates a process to
4	facilitate following of existing law.
5	It also establishes penalties for
6	those who fail to acquire proof of age,
7	removing a loophole for anyone who is seeking
8	to avoid their legal responsibility to report
9	the sexual abuse of a child who has come to
10	them for care.
11	The damages to a child who must
12	continue to suffer because of the failure of
13	the adult who should have helped her are well
14	documented and serious. Sometimes they are
15	life threatening.
16	House Bill 928 is an important step
17	in protecting these children. I urge you to
18	approve it.
19	Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you,
21	Doctor.
22	Questions?
23	Thank you.
24	Excuse me.
25	REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: Can I ask you

1 questions? 2 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I'm sorry. Representative Waters. 3 4 REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: Thank you, 5 Mr. Chairman. And thank you to for being here and 6 giving testimony, but we can't let you leave 7 8 without asking you at least one question. 9 DR. EVANS-RHODES: Go right ahead. 10 REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: From what I 11 gather, there is no requirement at all for --12 for any agencies who receive underage child 13 and has had sexual relationship. You're 14 saying there's no law that requires them to do 15 anything? 16 DR. EVANS-RHODES: No, I didn't say 17 there's no law. I said that they're mandated 18 reporters. I said that they're not following the law. 19 20 REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: They're 21 not -- so there is a law that they're not 22 following. 23 DR. EVANS-RHODES: Correct. 24 REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: All right. 25 So what you want to do is see that there's

penalties for people who don't do it. I guess, if there's a law, there should be some penalties that come and consequences for not reporting. Right?

DR. EVANS-RHODES: I want to see to it that people who should be reporting follow the existing law.

REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: Follow the existing law.

Are there penalties in place right now for people who don't follow the existing law?

DR. EVANS-RHODES: You know, I cannot speak knowledgeably to that. What happens is that they're not reporting. The fact that they're not reporting, we don't have a trail, and so, we are not doing what we need to do to protect our young children.

REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: And I understand that. Because I'm surprised to hear that they are not doing it. I know for children who go to school that show signs of — some scars or something on their body, the teachers are required to call DHS to say this child may be getting physically abused, and

now you're saying that it's not across the board.

DR. EVANS-RHODES: As in so many areas of the law, there's what we say is required and then there's what's done.

REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: I thank you so much.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Another question?

Chairman Rohrer.

REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Thank you for testimony. You laid out some very interesting statistics today. And I know when we were working on this legislation last year, the thing that really drove our concern was the fact that — that there could possibly really be — when, I mean, because most of us here — a lot, anyway, were around when we passed the mandated reporter law. And I remember the debates on why that was so important, because we wanted to protect our innocent children from things that were occurring to them. And when it became aware, when I became aware that, in fact, it was likely that there were

children that were actually being multiple 1 2 times assaulted when they were twelve and under, of all things, which is statutory rape, 4 if there is a sexual assault, that just really 5 shocked me. And I found it very, very difficult to believe that whether that's done 6 intentionally or it's done because it's just 7 8 an easy thing to overlook, requires a little 9 bit more work, I don't know fully, but I know that there is -- there seemed to be an issue. 10 You're a psychologist. 11 12 DR. EVANS-RHODES: Yes. 13 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Speak to me a 14 little bit about the harm done to a young 15 child, and what -- and what this -- I mean --16 part of this is to get at the perpetrator. 17 DR. EVANS-RHODES: Correct. 18 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: But part of 19 it is also to save lives of young children who 20 can be damaged forever. 21 DR. EVANS-RHODES: Absolutely. 22 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Can you speak 23 to that a little bit, about what you have 24 found and what are we talking about here? 25 DR. EVANS-RHODES: The damage occurs

on so many levels. And unfortunately, you know, when we talk about damages, it's bad enough that we've got a child victim, but as that child grows and goes untreated, so now we have an adult bearing those scars. That has an impact on society.

Speaking of the damage to the victim, not the least of which is the damage to trust. So a trusted professional who was there in a position to protect her, failed to do so. The damage to trust is immeasurable. When we talk about how that child proceeds, of course there are physical repercussions of abuse in terms of, for example, potential for childbearing, in terms of risk of diseases, in terms of risk of pregnancy, again all of those carry damage or potential harm to the child.

The damage to the psyche, again, of being abused, and the abuse perpetrating, in terms of self-esteem, in terms of trust, in terms of ability to bond and build relationships, in terms of the ability to even later become a successful parent herself.

REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: There was an earlier question about -- because,

unfortunately, this happens where some of this abuse is afflicted by a parent, of all things.

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

DR. EVANS-RHODES: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: From your perspective, as a psychologist, in dealing with this, how -- what -- how do you deal with an issue of trying to protect a young child, when, perhaps, you have an adult in place --I'm not sure that the only choice is just -if there is an adult, either -- a parent involved, you just don't go there because that's embarrassing. So does that mean we don't do anything for the child but just let the child be victimized? Or is something -how do we deal with that? Because we know that that's a difficult issue. From your perspective, how -- should we not deal with it? Should we deal with it, knowing that it's a very difficult --

DR. EVANS-RHODES: I understand that it's a difficult issue. By simply turning our eyes and looking the other way, the abuse continues. We haven't, then, done our job.

So, once again, we're back to the place we are here. We have mandated

reporters. We're asking that they follow the law. They're not. We are now requiring that they obtain proof of age, because that's been the loophole they've used.

It -- are we going to eliminate

parents who are abusing their children? I

wish I could say we eliminate parents who are

abusing their children. This isn't going to

make that go away, but the fact is that we've

got to see to it that those mandated

reporters, who are supposed to be there to

protect the innocent, are doing so.

REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 $\label{eq:chairman} \mbox{CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:} \quad \mbox{Are there} \\ \mbox{any } -- \mbox{ Tim.}$

REPRESENTATIVE SEIP: Just very briefly. Thank you for being here, Dr. Rhodes.

I know myself -- and I don't want oversimplify this -- but I remember I was working as a caseworker with a child who was involved with children and youth, had an injury to his nose, was wintertime, I said, Gee, what happened to you? He says, I was

snowboarding and broke my nose. Now, sounds very reasonable to me, but I contacted the caseworker who was working with the family and said, You know, this is what was reported to me. You know, I don't know if there is abuse going on or not. I wanted to make sure that there wasn't.

And children and youth followed up on that and they substantiated that there was no abuse going on, no physical abuse. You know, and certainly, again, I didn't want any abuse taking place, but also along with that, I didn't want to lose my job. I didn't want to be — open myself up to different legal sanctions, which there are. And if you are a practitioner, if you're a school nurse with a license or if you're a licensed social worker, like myself, you would have the opportunity to lose your license if you don't report suspected child abuse.

And again, that's the key word. It's suspected. It's not that you're supposed to go out and collect any evidence or -- you're not the one who's supposed to determine whether, well, I think this is abuse or I

think it's not. It's up to you to report that either to ChildLine or to the county children and youth office so they can investigate that.

And believe me, I -- I really recognize the damage that some individuals can do, because I've, unfortunately, had an opportunity to meet some very impaired people with some very, very debilitating conditions, I guess, who have caused tremendous harm to children. And nobody -- I don't know anybody on this panel is pro child abuse. We want to make sure that we're doing all we can to thwart that.

But I do want the people here in the audience today and the people on television to know that mandated reporting laws are in place, and there are sanctions if you don't follow through on your commitment. And everybody's -- as I'm sure the psychologists have ongoing training requirements to maintain their license, social workers do. And hopefully we'll have a human services license in the very near future.

So if you want to comment on --

DR. EVANS-RHODES: Your comments take me two different directions. And the first is that, certainly, again, all we're asking that people follow through on what they're supposed to follow through on. It is not up to the mandated reporter to gather evidence. All they're doing is reporting suspected abuse.

I have young children myself, and I have had those situations at the ER where the kid is injured, and as a parent, you're saying, oh, gee, what are they going to think. But, again, all they're doing is, they have to report suspected abuse.

And so the second direction I go is, so here we are at the physician's office or at the ER or at CYS, and we've got a child twelve years old who's pregnant. We have evidence that sexual contact occurred. I know of no other way for pregnancy to occur in a twelve-year-old child other than sexual contact, the same with sexually transmitted diseases. So, again, mandated reporting, following through.

REPRESENTATIVE SEIP: Well, I guess we can both agree that that's a situation for ChildLine or children and youth.

```
1
                 DR. EVANS-RHODES: Absolutely.
2
                 REPRESENTATIVE SEIP: All right.
       Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 4
                 Thank you for your comments,
5
       Dr. Rhodes.
                 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative
 6
7
       True.
                 REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Thank you,
8
9
       Mr. Chairman.
                 Just -- I think some of us have
10
       tip-toed around this somewhat. I've been
11
12
       listening patiently, and I just want to lay
13
       out something. You were talking about
14
       mandated reporters as someone who's been very
15
       involved in the child abuse issues for many
16
       years. And if you don't have knowledge of
17
       this, please speak to that. I was kind of
18
       saving up for our district attorney, but I'd
        just like to enter it here.
19
                 The folks in abortion clinics that
20
21
       perform abortions on a twelve- or thirteen-
22
       years-old girl, they're a mandated reporter?
23
                 DR. EVANS-RHODES: You know, I can't
24
       speak to that knowledgeably.
25
                REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Okay. I think
```

there might be a question about that. One of my concerns, and trying very hard, you know, not to get into the whole emotional issue of abortion, in my book, if a parent or a guardian or whoever brings a girl -- a young girl into an abortion clinic and they don't ask her how old she is or whatever but performs an abortion on a twelve- or thirteen-year-old girl, that's absolutely child abuse in my book because she's pregnant in the first place.

And in my way of looking at it, why would they not report. She had some sort of relationship with somebody, obviously. And I think the heart of a lot of this legislation, I would hope, would be to get to just that. Because regardless of how you feel about the abortion issue, a twelve-year-old girl coming in pregnant and having an abortion performed on her, she has been abused. No question. Thirteen, fourteen, in my book. But I know we can get into details on age. Nevertheless, that's abuse.

DR. EVANS-RHODES: But, once again, we can even take abortion issue out of it.

```
1
       Simply the fact that a child of that age,
2
       pregnant, according to our laws in the state
       of Pennsylvania, that is abuse.
3
                 REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: And I
 4
5
       appreciate that. And I thank you.
                 And, just for the record, though, I
 6
       think the folks that work in that -- in the
7
8
       clinics need to acknowledge that. You know, I
9
       know it's a tough place to go, but
10
       nevertheless --
11
                 DR. EVANS-RHODES: I would not
12
       disagree.
13
                 REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: --
14
       reporting should be made.
15
                 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16
                 Thank you, ma'am.
17
                 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.
18
                 Any other questions?
19
                 Josh.
20
                 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Thank you,
21
       Mr. Chairman.
22
                 Just to Representative True's
23
       question, I just -- I believe I know the
24
       answer -- and perhaps counsel can check and
25
       get back to us on that to confirm -- the Title
```

X family planning institutions, like those that I believe you were referring to, are required to meet state reporting requirements. And my understanding further was, we have eighty-six of them here in Pennsylvania, and each was deemed to be in could compliance with state reporting requirements.

Now, that's the information that was shared with me, and I'd be happy to leave that open to counsel to come back and report to us on this. That's my understanding of the situation.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Okay.

Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes. Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Thank you.

Representative Shapiro, I guess part of the problem is, and we all have folks that come into our offices and so forth, but there is a concern that perhaps they might not be. How you get at that, I wish I had the solution to, you know. Just that that reporting is done, but there's a great deal of concern.

We have -- I hear a lot about a

1 facility in York, for instance, a neighboring 2 county. And I just -- but I appreciate the 3 information, and perhaps that's something --4 it still is abuse, I mean, because there has 5 been a male in that little girl's life that needs to have some serious harm done to him. 6 Excuse me. 7 8 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: 9 Mr. Chairman, just to follow up. 10 And, Representative True, I'm not 11 quibbling with your underlying assertion at 12 all. 13 And I think, Mr. Chairman, if we can 14 get to the bottom this, that's a fundamental question that I think Representative True and 15 16 I would agree needs to be answered. So if 17 there's a way that we can get to the heart of 18 that reporting, whether that's happening in 19 those eighty-six institutions, I think that 20 could help inform the committee quite a bit. 21 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes, I agree 22 with you. 23 Representative Lentz. 24 DR. EVANS-RHODES: May I comment?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Sure.

Go

25

ahead.

DR. EVANS-RHODES: I'm a numbers person. Numbers don't lie. Again, the numbers don't add up. Clearly, there are cases that are going unreported. Mandated reporters aren't reporting.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Just a quick follow-up on that point. Representative True raised an interesting issue as to whether or not personnel that work in abortion clinics are covered by the mandatory reporting law.

And as I understood the earlier testimony, yours and the earlier gentleman's testimony, the point of requiring proof of age was that somehow healthcare providers were avoiding the reporting requirement by sort of being willfully blind to the age of the patient; correct?

DR. EVANS-RHODES: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Understood from Mr. McMonagle that that is a practice in abortion clinics; right?

DR. EVANS-RHODES: Again, abortion clinics, not my area of expertise.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Okay. So is

it your testimony that there's a widespread 1 2 practice in hospitals and doctors' offices to not ascertain the age of the patient in order 4 to avoid reporting something? 5 DR. EVANS-RHODES: It is certainly a practice. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Can you tell me a single hospital in the commonwealth of 8 9 Pennsylvania where a young woman would be 10 admitted for treatment without her age, in fact, her date of birth being recorded as part 11 12 of the process? 13 DR. EVANS-RHODES: You know, I can't point my finger at a specific institution. 14 15 What we know is, again, the numbers don't 16 lie. We've got girls under age, pregnant. 17 We've got girls under age with sexually 18 transmitted diseases. Again, by definition, 19 sexual contact has occurred. 20 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Right. 21 DR. EVANS-RHODES: The number of 22 those that's occurring in the state does not 23 match the number of reports. 24 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: So that's a 25

math problem. But what we have here is a

statute that requires doctors and all
healthcare providers to obtain proof of age.

And I'm understanding that we're passing this
law -- we're being asked to pass this law
specifically because of the practice by
healthcare providers of not getting the age of
a patient.

And I want to know, where's that happening? Because I'm not familiar -- I don't think anybody in this room has ever taken a child to a hospital without one of the first things you do, you fill out a piece of paper and tell them what their age is. So I'd like to know where this is occurring that we have to pass a law to remedy it.

DR. EVANS-RHODES: Well, that's also you -- you spoke of you, yourself, taking a child into the hospital and doing that. We're not talking about a situation, for example, where a young girl shows up unaccompanied or where a young girl shows up with a friend that says, Yeah, my friend's such and such an age. All we're doing is asking that they document.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Again, unaccompanied or not, I don't -- I'm not aware

1 of any hospital that takes anybody and treats 2 them without ascertaining your basic biographical information, including your age. 3 4 It's usually one of the first things you're 5 asked, if your seeking treatment. DR. EVANS-RHODES: Very well, then. 6 We're asking that we make it a point that they 7 are required to document it, so we've got that 8 9 paper trail. 10 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, 11 Doctor. 12 DR. EVANS-RHODES: For real this 13 time? 14 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I think so. 15 Thank you. 16 Bruce. 17 Our next testifier will be Bruce 18 Castor, former district attorney in Montgomery 19 County, and gentleman I worked for for several 20 years as DA with this committee. 21 MR. CASTOR: Nice to see you, 22 Mr. Chairman. I was going to say good 23 morning, but good afternoon to you and the 24 committee.

As the chairman said, my name is

25

Bruce Castor, and I currently serve as a commissioner in Montgomery County. I am a lawyer by profession and have a been member of the bar of Pennsylvania for twenty-four years.

From 1985 until 2008, I served in the Montgomery County District Attorney's office, and was district attorney from 2000 to 2008.

I am a past president of the Pennsylvania

District Attorney's Association and served on the supreme court juvenile rules committee, which authored the rules of juvenile court. I currently serve on the senate select committee, studying so-called wrongful convictions.

In addition to my governmental rule,

I am a partner in the Blue Bell-based law firm

of Elliott, Greenleaf.

Today I speak to a particular aspect of House Bill 928. It's my view that the person elected by the people of the several counties to make criminal charging decision, the district attorneys, need to be given information pertaining to the crime of statutory rape when such evidence comes into

the hands of healthcare professionals.

Statistics I have seen compiled by various state agencies, including the Office of Attorney General, for example, list abortions performed on young women who are age thirteen or younger. This list is compiled by county, but a check with county officials to ascertain whether a corresponding prosecution for statutory rape was considered revealed no such connection.

In other words, abortion providers reported performing abortions on young girls, there is a probability that these young girls were victims of statutory rape, since girls under age thirteen are deemed incapable of consenting to sexual intercourse. But law enforcement officials were routinely not notified of these incidents.

Similarly, healthcare professional are sometimes called upon to treat young girls for sexually transmitted diseases. Where the girl is under thirteen years of age, she potentially has been the victim of a sexual offense, especially if the disease she has contracted could only have been as result of

sexual conduct. The child is treated, but, again, law enforcement is often not notified.

I am concerned that abortion providers and healthcare practitioners are not making a sufficient effort to learn the age of the patient in order to skirt existing reporting requirements. House Bill 928 would seek to remedy this situation by insisting that the providers of these services take active measures to learn the age of the patient. In turn, learning the age of the patient would lead to a definitive determination on the question on whether reporting is required.

I am sensitive to victims and their family's privacy. I am aware that often victims of sexual abuse, and especially those of tender age, would rather put the abuse behind them then relive the experience through the criminal justice system.

In Montgomery County, we have a well developed child advocacy program to assist with these issues. In addition, the prosecutors there decide on a case-by-case basis whether to push for prosecution, paying

close attention to the wishes of the victim and the victim's family.

The point here is that the district attorney, person elected to make charging decisions, is the one making the call on the criminal action, not the treating doctor, the victim, or the victim's family. The reason for this is obvious. The district attorney has to balance the needs of the victim against the danger that a perpetrator might attack another child if the perpetrator's not punished.

While the prosecutor is keenly aware of the feelings and sensibilities of the victim, he or she represents the Commonwealth as a whole and must be primarily concerned with protecting society at large.

I, therefore, support House Bill 928, especially those portions which provided for mandatory reporting of sexually transmitted diseases and abortions performed on girls thirteen years old or younger. By definition, in most instances, these girls are victims of crime, and thus evidence of their victimization needs to be brought to the

attention of law enforcement for appropriate action. Prosecutors must act with discretion to balance the need of the victim with the danger posed to society by having an offender go unpunished.

I support requiring those who treat these underaged girls for STDs or abortions having to take affirmative steps to learn the age of the child to trigger the reporting requirement or not.

Finally, I want to thank the committee for permitting me to testify and taking up this important public issue.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, sir.

Questions.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Good morning.

In the testimony that we are going to hear from an additional witness, they make reference to the fact that Pennsylvania already has a statute in place that requires the rape kit, the use of the rape kit. You're familiar with that, obviously, as a prosecutor.

MR. CASTOR: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Would you agree that in most rape cases, the rape kit is the source of -- the physical identifying evidence, in other words, capturing of sperm or DNA or whatever usually comes in the rape kit. Is that right? Is that a fair statement?

MR. CASTOR: When such evidence is available to be recovered, that's how you get it. The -- unfortunately, I would say the majority of the prosecutions that I'm familiar with and that I conducted myself, rape kit was of limited value. Sometimes there's something there and most times there's not.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: But when there is, it usually comes from the rape kit.

MR. CASTOR: Agreed.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: And this law requires doctors to gather DNA evidence from newborn children if they are born to a child, under this statute, or from fetuses, if there was an abortion performed. Are you familiar with that section of the statute?

MR. CASTOR: I read that section of

the statute. That's not the portion that I 1 2 was primarily testifying on, but I read that. REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Do you support 3 4 that section? 5 MR. CASTOR: I heard what the major said, and I am familiar with the difficulties 6 in the forensic laboratories and staffing and 7 8 personnel and expense. I wonder if there 9 could be a compromise struck between the needs 10 of the state police and their staffing issues and the needs to preserve evidence. 11 12 I mean, as I heard the major 13 testifying -- obviously I did not know what he 14 would say until I was here in the room -- I 15 was struck with the notion that perhaps it 16 might be a good idea if the evidence was 17 preserved but not necessarily tested until it 18 was needed. 19 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Have you ever 20 prosecuted a rape case using fetal DNA 21 evidence? 22 MR. CASTOR: Me, personally, no. believe that our office has done that when I 23

25 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: You would

was the district attorney.

24

agree --

2 MR. CASTOR: Exceedingly rare.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Exceedingly rare. So for an exceedingly rare prosecution, we're going to gather DNA evidence in every case where a child is either born or aborted to a young victim of rape. That's you — that's what this statute would do.

MR. CASTOR: Yeah, but that isn't so burdensome, Mr. Lentz. The rape kit --

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: What's not burdensome to you or I, it may be burdensome to the medical providers or the infant child that's having its DNA gathered. Might be burdensome to them.

MR. CASTOR: If it's tested. I mean, you talk about rape-kit analysis. I mean, they do combings, they do swabs, they do blood tests. They do all of these things. It goes into a preserved bag and then into another bag, and then it is held in case it is needed. This would be one more step in that process.

Where it becomes burdensome is you go in and test all of it.

1 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Right. 2 you agree, again, it's exceedingly rare. Now, the child protective law that 3 4 has been referenced already, Pennsylvania's 5 child protective services law requires healthcare professionals to immediately 6 contact the state's ChildLine when they have a 7 8 reasonable cause to suspect that a child has 9 been raped, and that report is thereafter 10 immediately referred by ChildLine to the 11 appropriate county children and youth agency. 12 Do you agree that's the law today in 13 Pennsylvania? 14 MR. CASTOR: Absolutely. 15 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: And would you 16 also agree that the majority of the cases that are prosecuted in this state are -- of child 17 18 sexual abuse are cases that are referred 19 through that system? 20 MR. CASTOR: No, absolutely not. 21

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Would you say that it's common in child sexual abuse cases for the individual child to walk into the police station and report having been raped?

22

23

24

25

MR. CASTOR: No. The most common way

1 is a child tells a parent who then reports it 2 to the police. 3 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: So they tell a 4 parent. But the idea of a child going to the 5 police and saying, I'm the victim of sexual abuse, that's almost unheard of; is that 6 7 right? 8 MR. CASTOR: Yes. I mean, most 9 people, most children wouldn't know how to 10 find the police station. I mean, they'll tell 11 their teacher. They'll tell their parents. 12 They'll tell an adult that they trust. 13 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Well, there's 14 been a lot of reference to Philadelphia 15 today. Isn't there a police officer in just 16 about every school in Philadelphia on duty? 17 MR. CASTOR: I think I can honestly 18 say I have never been in a school in 19 Philadelphia 20 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: If you're 21 going to support this legislation, you might 22 want to visit. 23 MR. CASTOR: I'm not the DA anymore, 24 either. 25 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: So if, in this case, we're now essentially making the doctor
the equivalent of the police so you know that
word gets out among the youthful population
and they will know shortly after this becomes
law that if you tell a doctor that you have a
sexually transmitted disease the doctor has to
call the police; right?

MR. CASTOR: I think that that's the way the law is now.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Well, the law doesn't require them to call the police. The law requires them to call child protective services. There's a difference between child protective services and the police; you would agree?

MR. CASTOR: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: So it will quickly become apparent that if you go to the doctor and you have a sexually transmitted disease or your pregnant, the next thing you're going to see is a guy with a clipboard and a uniform or a badge; right?

MR. CASTOR: I don't know that I can draw that conclusion. I think the conclusion that I would draw is that the law requires

1 reporting of the treatment of a sexually 2 transmitted disease to a government agency, 3 and that a government agency then is likely to 4 report it to law enforcement. So the same 5 risk that your question suggests regarding against is already present. 6 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: You would 7 8 agree that if a child has a serious disease, 9 in which all of these diseases are serious, 10 some more serious and some are threatening to 11 the health of the child and others, but the 12 first priority is treatment; correct? MR. CASTOR: The first priority for 13 14 the ill person? REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: 15 16 MR. CASTOR: Sure. 17 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: So treatment 18 would be above the prosecution and the order 19 of things we want to get done for that child; 20 right? 21 MR. CASTOR: Yes. 22 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: And to the 23 extent the perception that going to the doctor

22 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: And to the
23 extent the perception that going to the doctor
24 would lead immediately to contact with law
25 enforcement would discourage a child from

getting treatment, that would be a bad thing.
We could agree on that; right?

MR. CASTOR: If, in fact, the premise is true. I mean, we have a law that requires doctors to report gunshot wound victim, and people still walk into hospitals with gunshot in them.

avoid bleeding to death, usually the result of a gunshot. But you agree that it's a rare occurrence for a child to go directly to law enforcement; right? So if the child thinks going to the doctor is the equivalent of going to law enforcement, that may discourage them from seeking medical care, and that would be a bad thing; right?

MR. CASTOR: I think it is bad thing if a child would not seek medical care. I would not necessarily connect the two. I think that when a child presents at a doctor or a hospital with a severe medical condition, the child is brought there by a parent or a caregiver, and the first priority is to treat the illness.

I suppose it is possible that some

parent would prefer their child to continue to go downhill and potentially die from a disease rather than take the risk that it might be reported to the police, but that's seems so fanciful as to be unlikely to be worthy of your consideration.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Well, if the parent was the rapist, that may make sense, but also I'm talking about the child's decision, not -- without their parents, which in many of these cases the child's decision whether or not they want to get treated for an illness that they may not know has long-term impacts on them, such as leading to infertility, et cetera.

MR. CASTOR: Well, I --

 $\label{eq:representative lentz:} \mbox{I just have}$ one last question.

MR. CASTOR: Mr. Lentz, I have to stop you there. Probably, when I was in the DA's office, conservatively two hundred thousand cases went through there when I was there, and perhaps a hundred fifty of them —thousand of them while I was in the supervisory condition. I cannot recollect a

single case where a child elected not to receive medical care from a serious disease or illness.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Okay. Well that -- this law wasn't in effect during that time period, right, so we don't know that that impact would be felt.

But just one last question. In the penalty section of the bill -- and you're now a lawyer in civil practice, so you probably have clients that this would impact, so I'm interested in getting your opinion on it.

In the civil remedy section, it says that a doctor or the person that they work for, so let's use Children's Hospital as an example. If a doctor were to fail to comply with this statute, and then the child victim were raped again by the same predator, so say we have a situation where a young woman is being raped by a stepfather, and for some reason the doctor or the nurse at Children's Hospital fails to comply with this statute, she returns home and is raped again by her stepfather. Children's Hospital would be civilly liable for both compensatory and

79 1 punitive damages for the fact that she had been rape a second time. Do you support that 2 provision of that statute? 3 4 MR. CASTOR: Yes. 5 REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Okay. Thank 6 you. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Josh. 7 8 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Thank you, 9 Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Commissioner, for your 10 11 testimony today. 12 I want to pick up on some of the 13 areas of questioning that Representative Lentz 14 issued and also some of the questions that I 15 had earlier for Mr. McMonagle. I want to sort 16 of come back to where I began. Page three, 17 line twenty-one of the underlying legislation 18 -- and I'll read it to you if you don't have 19 it in front of you -- talks about how this 20 will greatly strengthen the Commonwealth's 21 ability to protect children under thirteen 22 years of age against child rapists and other 23 sexual predators. And that's in line, seemingly 24

consistent with your testimony that says, I'm

25

concerned that abortion providers and
healthcare practitioners not making sufficient
efforts to learn the age the patient in order
to skirt the existing reporting requirements.
Suggesting in your testimony and in the
underlying bill that somehow the current
system is not working; that is, physicians are

not reporting.

And so I really want to come back to where I ended my question before, and ask you, What is broken? Again, I can recall your press conferences. I can recall your statements back home talking about the great cooperation between our healthcare providers in Montgomery County, our law enforcement, our physicians, our medical providers. In fact, that was one of the foundations for the establishment of Mission Kids, of the -- of the various programs we have back in Montgomery County.

So it seems to me that, as district attorney, you were almost bragging about how well the system was working. And now, today, you're sitting before us suggesting that it is broken, not working, and this legislation is

the answer to that.

So I was wondering if you could just help me understand that sort of seeming dichotomy between the two statements that you've made over time.

MR. CASTOR: When I would announce a prosecution, I would certainly have stated that particular agencies cooperated well with each other in that particular case. I cannot recall ever saying that that always was the case.

The way this issue came to my attention was when I was given statistics by county of abortions performed on girls, I believe it was under twelve, but I'm not sure about that. And it would have a list of the county on the one side and then it would have a list on the other side of the number performed. The agency that performed the abortion was apparently required to send statistics to some state agency by age of the person that was having the abortion. They were some years out of date, so I would get them maybe three, four years after the fact.

And even in a county as large as

Montgomery, it is still a relatively rare thing to have a twelve-year-old girl pregnant and a prosecution as a result of it. As a matter of fact, I would venture to say that there would be none that occurred in the years that I was either first assistant or district attorney, that I would not know of individually. Because it is relatively -- relatively rare, and it is a serious offense and a matter of great public interest.

So when I see, in the column for Montgomery, four, five, six, whatever it was, and I know that there's only been one or two prosecutions, and I know that the district attorney's office would individually review possible cases for prosecution, and I know that we didn't review that many, I know that something's not adding up.

So the question you asked earlier about what aspect of it is broken, those two things should -- there should be a -- a connection. Because of my position with the district attorney's association, I then picked up a telephone and called my counterparts in other counties where they had a few of these.

Did you do any prosecutions as a result of this? The answer was invariably, Not that many.

So that lead me to think that there's some -- there's no correlation between the number of, in this case, abortions performed and the number of cases that were submitted to law enforcement for consideration of prosecution. And I think that the legislation is designed to try to assist in matching those two things up.

Obviously, there are plenty of times when the prosecutor would elect not to go forward with a case for a host of reasons:

The perpetrator is -- difficult to ascertain who the perpetrator is, the child is of such tender years that he or she can't testify, it would be too traumatic and burdensome for the family to relive it. All of these things are components of whether the prosecutor would exercise discretion to go forward or not.

What I'm saying is, I think the prosecutor ought to be put in a position where he or she can decide whether to go forward or not.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Right. I totally understand that. And I want to make sure that our prosecutors have the tools available to go after these rapists.

I think I have the chart that you're referring to here, which is entitled Induced Abortions Performed in Pennsylvania Females

Twelve and Under. It lists the counties. And 2005 is the last year listed, which correlate with your testimony that it was a few years old.

It says there were six in all counties in Pennsylvania, five in Philadelphia and one in Franklin County. Doesn't show that there were any in Montgomery County. So, I guess this is what you're sort of hanging your testimony on?

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ CASTOR:}\ Probably\ the\ one\ before$ that.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: 2004 there were also six. Don't see --

MR. CASTOR: I'm trying to remember how long ago it was this came to my attention, but I would say that it was four or five years ago, anyway.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Okay. Well, there's no evidence, at least on this chart, of that ever occurring in Montgomery County.

So, even if you go based on this, you're sort of hanging your support on this legislation based on six incidents here in '05, one in Franklin, five in Philly, pick any area you want, where we do or don't know whether or not

prosecutors even got involved in these cases.

I guess that's what I'm sort of getting at here. We're -- I think we should be very careful when we try and legislate the behavior of physicians when there is no evidence to suggest that the physicians aren't acting in a way that is helping the prosecutors already go after those who perpetuate an obvious heinous crime.

And putting your former hat back on as the district attorney I'm just asking, When did that happen? No one here today has testified in a way to show me any evidence to suggest that this is a problem that this legislation will address. That's what I'm getting at.

I think many of us can agree on the

underlying -- parts of the underlying premise here. But no one, including yourself, seems to be providing any evidence to suggest that the physicians, healthcare providers aren't doing this already. Indeed, we are going to hear testimony in a few moments from a doctor, Dr. Pletcher, and we have a letter from CHOP, talking about the hippocratic oath that physicians have to take, talking about their ethical and legal duty to contact child protective services or legal law enforcement. I'm just asking you, when is this not happening?

MR. CASTOR: I'm telling you, that based -- other than what I told you concerning charts that I've seen, I don't know. And it may be that you're putting your finger on something that needs to be investigated further.

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Good.} \ \ \text{And I}$ hope that we will.

Now, you focused your testimony, and

I appreciate this, on learning the age. That

was -- I think you agree that was for the crux

of your testimony. There is a key part of

this on page eight. I direct your attention
to that. Page eight of the underlying
legislation, line twenty-one, talking about
delivery of a baby.

I will read it, in case you don't
have it in front of you: A physician who
delivers or supervises the delivery of a bab

have it in front of you: A physician who delivers or supervises the delivery of a baby conceived by a child shall collect or provide for the collection of a sample of DNA suitable for testing from the baby in accordance with the instructions of the state police.

How does that help ascertain the age of those involved in this possible rape?

MR. CASTOR: I think that this portion is designed to try to preserve physical evidence that would be of value in a prosecution and not connected with the age of the victim.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Not connected.

MR. CASTOR: I think it is not.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: I think it's not as well, but I just wanted to see if your read was different than mine.

MR. CASTOR: I think that that -- I

think that the evidence collection portion of the bill was designed to enhance the prosecution, if there is one.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Would you agree that mandatory evidence collection like this is somewhat controversial?

MR. CASTOR: You talking about a career prosecutor. I think we should be collecting as much evidence as possible to win cases.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: You don't think this violates the Fourth Amendment?

MR. CASTOR: I don't think so, no. I don't think it violates the Fourth Amendment because I don't think it is state action.

number of state mandatory collection laws have already been challenged in the courts, suggesting they violate the Fourth Amendment. And one of the things that we found, and perhaps you're not aware of this -- I'll be happy to inform you, and then maybe you can offer your opinion on it -- is that those mandatory collections have been found in violation of the Fourth Amendment, unless,

unless the individual that they were collecting it from was convicted of a crime or a person accused or arrested of a crime.

I'm assuming you would agree that the baby here is not a criminal. The baby here was not accused of a crime; is that correct?

MR. CASTOR: I agree that the baby is not accused of a crime. The portion that you read is for the preservation of evidence for future testing. The -- the -- the baby will still exist, if it is a viable baby, and the evidence will still be there. So it really -- it can't be any Fourth Amendment violation because you can always go and get it later.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: I'm not sure the courts would agree with you on the potential violation there of the Fourth Amendment.

But I would just come back to your original purpose for being here today and supporting this legislation on the grounds that it will help us get at the age. When you've also acknowledged that the collection of DNA is preserving potential evidence has nothing to do with the age. And I would

argue, and I think the courts would, in many cases, uphold this, it's also a violation of Fourth Amendment.

MR. CASTOR: It absolutely is not a violation of the Fourth Amendment. The -- if you're talking about a viable baby, another human being, you do not have a Fourth Amendment interest in someone else's DNA. So the answer is, it can never be a violation of the Fourth Amendment, unless, of course, it's the baby that's being prosecuted.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Again,
mandatory DNA collection bills like this have
been challenged successfully in other states
where the individual they are collecting it
from is not a criminal or arrested in a
crime. They have not been shown to be
constitutional. So --

MR. CASTOR: Well, you and I can argue about that, but I'm telling you, in the courts of Pennsylvania, you cannot have a Fourth Amendment standing in someone else's DNA. I have tried DNA cases, many of them, including the first one in Montgomery County. A famous case, Caleb Fairley. You're probably

familiar with it.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Was that a mandatory DNA collection case?

MR. CASTOR: It was before we even knew what DNA was. It was one of the first times we ever used it.

The point is, forcing someone to give their DNA that then can be used to incriminate them, they have standing to challenge the constitutionality of how the DNA was collected. You never have standing to challenge how DNA's collected from someone else.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: And I hear your argument, I just don't think that pertains when you're talking about a mandatory collection law like the one that is being proposed. Nevertheless, I hear your testimony.

So, I mean, in sum, Mr. Chairman, you know, I have yet to hear from any of those testifying, to -- including the commissioner here, any evidence to demonstrate to us how this system isn't working, any evidence to suggest it's broken, any evidence in terms of

how it would be strengthened.

Indeed, the underlying legislation here, the commissioner just testified, includes provisions that really don't get at the heart of what prosecutors need, and that is tools to go after these criminals.

I think -- well, I'll reserve my two cents for the conclusion of the witnesses today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative Vereb and then Counsel Andring.

REPRESENTATIVE VEREB: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, commissioner.

Been suspiciously quiet this whole hearing. And now hearing you testify reminds me of a phone call to you when you're chief of the criminal division on, I believe, a Saturday afternoon in a rape case that the victim took over a month to report. A family dispute arose. Our patrol guys were called out. I was called in, and in panic, called you. And we dealt with a lot of circumstantial evidence because of the girl's

lack to report when there were no mandatories on anyone back then.

And you remember how painstaking the case was, both criminally and lack of evidence and all the procedures that are involved of dragging this girl of this age in question through -- through that process.

So, pardon me, Mr. Chairman, if I'll use that statement in that particular case as one that says, you know, is it a pro-life, is it an abortion issue, is it a clinic issue? I agree that Mr. McMonagle should not come here and slight a particular county without statistical facts, nor should any witness come in in front of us unless they know that from their professional experience.

But I also refute and disagree with some of the bobbing heads of the audience and even some members of my colleagues here that say that rape victims by via this legislation will fail to go get medical help of some type. And a condition that is consistent with rape or whether they think they've consented to it or not consented to it, by law, by statute, at this age, they can't consent to

it.

I don't just don't see how this

prevents any further from what already

happened, rape victims or victims of abuse,

how this prevents them from going to get

treatment. We assume, and some will assume

that this stops people from that treatment or

from going to get that treatment. But, you

know, it's almost the same argument. It's a

reverse argument of mandatory reporting a lost

or stolen guns. We're getting the same

argument used for the opposite position of

we're mandating a report.

I agree with Representative Shapiro, he and I know and the hospitals that we are very familiar with, I can't even fathom a medical doctor looking at a victim and not reporting it. But there is the possibility, I guess, that it does happen.

I look at the failures in our medical system. I also look at the failures in our legal system. And, you know, we get into this debate, and just a moment ago, Commissioner, is what is the difference between this and me being interrogated by a doctor when I was in

full uniform with my daughter in Pottstown

Hospital with a broken nose, and she fell off

the bed, and I was brought through the third

degree back in the mid-'90s.

What is the difference between child abuse and the mandatories that doctors currently have to report it versus this?

MR. CASTOR: Well, my immediate thought, Mr. Vereb, is that the doctor must have known you personally.

REPRESENTATIVE VEREB: First one in about ten years, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CASTOR: You know, it's interesting you point that situation out. I remember when your daughter was injured. A family friend of ours had a infant that had a broken femur, which is a very difficult bone to break, and it was a spiral fracture, which, as you know from your experience in law enforcement, oftentimes is from twisting the bone. A highly irregular type of injury.

And I got a panicked call from that child's mother, saying they got the third-degree, too, in the hospital about it. And so -- my anecdotal experience is, as is yours,

that you get a lot of -- you get a lot of interest from people at hospitals when children present with those sorts of injuries.

I think that the import of the legislation is not to deal with the hospitals that you and I and Representative Shapiro are familiar with, but perhaps those medical providers that are of less ethical standings than we would hope they would have.

REPRESENTATIVE VEREB: Well, we obviously heard the issue of the abortion clinics, which -- you know, never had a position to be in one and don't know what criteria there are, and I guess there's some more credible, medically standing, than others.

Would you -- I mean, do you agree, I think you can enter this opinion, you certainly have had the experience, would you agree that a mandate on doctors or medical professionals or nurses, whoever the appropriate titles are, would you agree that's going to deter more children from reporting a rape, based on your experience?

MR. CASTOR: I wouldn't think so. I think that a child who is the victim of a crime such as a sexual offense who screws up the courage to go tell somebody about it is going to do it regardless of what the reporting requirements are.

I mean, we have -- we have various statutes in place where age is a critical issue. I mean, you have to be twenty-one to drink; we require proof that you're 21. You have to be eighteen to vote, and we require proof that your eighteen. You have to be sixteen to drive; we require proof that you're sixteen to drive.

So if this body, in its wisdom, is going to impose restrictions on age, it would seem to me that be prudent to require those on whom the restriction is place ascertain what the age is.

REPRESENTATIVE VEREB: That's all my questions for this witness, Mr. Chairman.

Just to follow up on a comment on
that -- you know, illegal aliens walk into ERs
that we're very familiar with in our area
every day and they have no fear of our federal

law or our immigration laws, residency laws,
to go in and receive free medical treatment.

And I just -- I hope as we proceed with
however this legislation works out, that if we
are going to proceed numerically, I think

these numbers should be found.

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

If the accusation in Philadelphia --I have the greatest respect -- I think a lot of us do -- for former district attorney of Philadelphia, and I don't know much about the current, but your inciting a lot of people not doing their job by that statement, and I think as we proceed, we should deal with the facts on all of these -- these agreements, but I think the former district attorney, you know, has the greatest experience in our region as any other prosecutor down there. And I think that that's something that I'd like to see off the table. It's a question of credible medical people doing their job versus the ones that this legislation, I think, fairly targets.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

Counsel Andring.

MR. ANDRING: Yeah, just briefly. An awful lot of our conversation today seems to revolve around matters that strike me as being well settled law currently. If a twelve-year-old girl walked into a physician's office and she's pregnant or she has a sexually transmitted disease, I don't think there is any question that, under current law, there is a reasonable suspicion that child abuse has occurred to initiate the entire reporting system, I think that requirement is clear under current law and would be kicked in.

Would then be required to report that
suspected abuse to the county agency or the
state agency, which would re-refer it back.
And this comes back to your specific comment
that the district attorney has to be the one
making charging decision, which again is the
way our system is set up right now and the way
it's supposed to work.

So my question goes as to whether you have any experience or comment on the extent to that step of the process where abuse -- the suspected abuse is reported to the

administrative agencies, but then if you're going to become involved, they have to take the step of bringing you into the process.

Do you think that is the potential breakdown in what we're looking at here? And what is your experience with the efficacy of that function?

MR. CASTOR: If your question is, is that a potential breakdown? The answer has to be yes. Whether it's, in fact, a breakdown, I cannot say.

I can say that I've seen plenty of cases that came to us because of a child reporting to a parent or a teacher or school nurse or somebody like that, and then we find out previously that the child had sought treatment from a physician. Now, that doesn't mean that the physician didn't report it to the right place. It maybe hasn't reached around the law enforcement yet. We don't wait for it, we just go ahead.

So is there a potential breakdown between reporting to the social service agency and then the social service agency to law enforcement? Yes, but I don't know how we

would prove that.

MR. ANDRING: I specifically asked that, because I think it was about three or four years ago the Philadelphia District
Attorney's office actually proposed a law. We had a hearing on it, and maybe that would have set up an entirely separate and distinct mandatory reporting system where providers would be required to report both to the existing system and to local law enforcement officials, be it police or the district attorney.

And they indicated back at that time that there was -- again this was the Philadelphia DA's office, not the DA's association -- but they indicated that they felt there was a problem in that process of getting the information from the administrative agency taking the abuse complaint, doing the initial investigation. I know of past various statutory provisions trying to address that issue, and, you know, make sure that that occurs. And in a lot of counties, we have these committees set up that review these types of things.

And I was just wondering if you had 1 2 any more feelings about that part of the 3 process. 4 MR. CASTOR: I guess the answer is, I don't have any more feelings about it. I can 5 see where there -- that issue could exist. 6 7 And I can see why Philadelphia would think 8 that that's an area that needs to be 9 addressed. But from my experience, I don't 10 know that to be the case. 11 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are there any 12 other questions? 13 Thank you, Bruce. 14 MR. CASTOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 15 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We'll next 16 hear from Dr. Jonathan P. Pletcher, Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, and Lourdes M. Rosado, 17 18 associate director, Juvenile Law Center. 19 DR. PLETCHER: Good afternoon, 20 Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. 21 Thank you for hearing my testimony 22 today regarding House Bill 928. My name is 23 Jonathan Pletcher, and I'm a pediatrician 24 who's devoted his career to understanding and

addressing the healthcare needs of

25

adolescents.

I truly applaud the congressmen's efforts to protect vulnerable preteen children from sexual victimization. In my testimony today, I hope to demonstrate that as healthcare providers, we are willing and able to work with this legislative body and law enforcement to protect children and teenager from adults who wish to prey on the young for their own sexual gratification.

However, I also hope to explain how this bill, as proposed, would not serve this purpose. Both the effectiveness and the effect of forcing healthcare providers to prioritize the report of any and all cases of sexually transmitted disease or pregnancy in children under the age of thirteen, I believe, would lead us away from the challenge of protecting our children.

Please allow me to explain my
background and perspective. I grew up in what
was then a semi rural suburb of Pittsburgh. I
was raised by a school teacher and principal.
So I learned early that protecting children is
the collective responsibility of parents and

professionals. My home away from home has always been with both sets of grandparents, who are life-long residents of Indian Head in Fayette County and Greensboro, Greene County.

I graduated from University of
Pittsburgh's School of Medicine and I received
medical training in general pediatrics and
adolescent medicine at the Children's Hospital
of Philadelphia, starting in 1994. I worked
there as an attending physician until 2006,
and helped to build a comprehensive adolescent
health center that primarily served youth in
West Philadelphia and surrounding suburbs.

An opportunity to create a new adolescent health center led me to work at Lehigh Valley Hospital in Allentown. Once that was established, family needs and professional opportunities led me to my current position and the ability to return home, to the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh of UPMC.

Having lived and worked throughout
the commonwealth, I'm intimately acquainted
with its diversity, and I have a profound
respect for the values held and the challenges

faced by families who raise children in urban, suburban and rural communities.

I am primarily a clinician, but I've also conducted research in the areas of teen pregnancy, sexually transmitted disease, and health risk behaviors.

Having lived and worked in these regions of the state while providing care exclusive to older children and teens from all walks of life, I believe that I can offer some unique insight into what happens when a child under the age thirteen is diagnosed with sexually transmitted disease or pregnancy. You can trust that I have copious clinical experience helping children and families heal both physically and emotionally from these very traumatic experiences.

My experience tells me that involving law enforcement can be very important, even crucial, element of protecting the safety of the child. To this end, I am fully supportive.

But this bill, as written, raises many concerns. As was mentioned, I've take the hippocratic oath to, first, do no harm,

and second, to provide aid and care. My first duty's for the protection and safety of the child. This requires and rests on a sound doctor-patient relationship, which in these circumstances is often a doctor-family relationship.

When we address the healthcare needs of vulnerable youth, establishing a trusting relationship with the patient is essential to having open and honest discussions that aid in effective treatment. We are called legally and ethically to contact child protective services or local law enforcement if we suspect that our patients have be subjected to or are at risk for abuse, neglect or maltreatment.

When making these reports, we take into account many factors about the child and their environment, as Pennsylvania's mandated reporting laws allow for some application of our clinical knowledge and experience.

Because of this small degree of flexibility, reporting can be accomplished in partnership with families and child protective agencies.

This preserves and often strengthens the

doctor-family relationship, as maintaining continuity of regular healthcare is an essential component of healing.

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 mandate that our first duty is to contact the Attorney General's office, the Child Predator Unit, based on single piece of information would have an absolute chilling effect on our ability to work with families and community child protective agencies. Adolescents and their families generally expect that they can confide intimate personal details to their healthcare provider in order to improve their health. Even a perceived threat to this doctor-patient relationship could return the risk that families would not seek help or withhold information that is crucial to the care and protection of that child. This effect would not be limited to children under thirteen.

While this bill may be viewed as a way to aid the valiant efforts of the Child Predator Unit, it would significantly impede our ability to provide optimal healthcare to individuals and families.

These are my conclusion as a

healthcare provider, but I hope to provide some medical evidence and opinion that will help you, the Judiciary Committee -- members of the Judiciary Committee, draw your own. I hope you understand if I use some frank terminology, and I assure you that what I say is in the mainstream of medical discourse.

First, a single act of penetrative intercourse is not a guarantee that a child will become pregnant or acquire a sexually transmitted disease. In fact, most children -- most female children age twelve or younger are either premenstrual or anovulatory, meaning that their reproductive organs are too immature to conceive a pregnancy.

Second, the term "sexually transmitted disease" is a broad categorization of viral, bacterial, and parasitic pathogens that can be spread through sexual contact but may not exclusively be transmitted in this manner. For example, genital herpes and warts are diseases that are typically spread through skin-to-skin contact and not through penetrative intercourse. As such, a child

with a benign flat ward on their hand may, in fact, transmit the virus to their genital area.

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

Bacterial pathogens, these were discussed previously, such as gonorrhea and chlamydia, are -- typically are spread through penetrative intercourse. When these bacteria infect the reproductive organs of younger teens, they require treatment that must begin immediately and can last for weeks. A delay in initiating treatment or a curtailing of that treatment can result in complications that are not uncommon, such as infertility, chronic pain, damage to vital organs and even death. Of course, this is not to mention the impact of pregnancy or STD on the psyche of a young child, requiring long-term care to prevent severe behavioral health consequences.

From a public health perspective,
many of these pathogens are more likely to
affect certain segments of our population,
such as African-Americans who reside in large
cities and in individuals of limited
socioeconomic means.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want to deviate a little bit from my prepared testimony to answer the question about numbers, if I may. Some numbers were presented earlier today and numbers were lumped together. When you're looking at public health statistics and they give the number under the age of fourteen or under the age of fifteen, you have to look at it year by vear. You can look at any public health department statistics, you can look at organizations such as the Kaiser Family Foundation in the example of teen pregnancy, and you will see there's a precipitous dropoff in the number of teen pregnancies as you move down the ladder of age. In fact, if my memory serves me correct, there are one-ninth the number of pregnancies that occur in thirteen-year-olds as do occur in fourteenyear-olds.

Additionally, when you're looking at numbers related to STD reports, of course they don't add up. Somebody can re-acquire the same infection. The same infection can be reported more than one time. So each individual report does not represent an

individual who has been infected.

Let me just say that in my role as physician, it is of paramount importance that I maintain a non-judgmental, respectful, and continuous relationship with patients and families who are affected by these unfortunate occurrences. Impediments to the maintenance of this relationship caused by mistrust or fear put the health of some of our most vulnerable children at risk.

minds about my sincerity or my motives for speaking out against this bill, please know this. I'm the father of three children, ages five, nine, and eleven. Like hopefully all parents, there's not an hour that goes by that I'm not with them that I don't worry about their safety. I firmly understand and applaud law enforcement, the Attorney General's Child Predator Unit, and others efforts and progress at protecting all of our children from predators.

In fact, I am currently working with the office of the Attorney General towards this goal, and I welcome future opportunities

for continued collaboration.

I cannot emphasize enough that by forcing me to be a blunt instrument of law enforcement, it would greatly diminish by capacity to work with families towards fulfilling my first duty, which is to provide for the care of my patient. I worry that the ripple effect of this law would lead many individuals and families away from seeking help from healthcare professionals. Not only would this jeopardize the health and well-being of injured children, it could move all of us further from the goal of eliminating the threat of child predators.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

Before we have questions, if you would like to testify next, Ms. Rosado.

MS. ROSADO: Of course.

Thank you to the chairpersons and to the entire Judiciary Committee for the opportunity to speak to you today about House Bill 928.

My name is Lourdes Rosado, and I'm testifying on behalf of my organization, the

Juvenile Law Center, to express our concerns about the bill. As I will explain in more detail in a moment, the Juvenile Law Center's primary objection to House Bill 928 is that it adds a redundant abuse reporting requirement that does not enhance children's safety but at the same time does raise unnecessary barriers to teenagers who seek healthcare. For that reason, Juvenile Law Center respectfully urges members of the committee not to support the bill.

Juvenile Law Center was founded in 1975, and we're the oldest multi-issue public interest law firm for children in the United States. Our mission is to advance the rights and well-being of children in jeopardy. While Juvenile Law Center has been in the news as of late for -- primarily for our work on juvenile justice issues in Luzerne County, we also have a long history of working on behalf of children in the child welfare system. For example, we have represented children in abuse and neglect system -- abuse and neglect proceedings in Philadelphia family court for the last thirty-five years.

We routinely conduct training for child-serving professionals, a whole range of professionals -- healthcare practitioners, social workers, family planning providers, juvenile justice staff, and school-based professional -- on the legal reporting requirements for child abuse and neglect in Pennsylvania.

And our publication Child Abuse and the Law, which now is in its seventh edition, is the leading comprehensive manual in Pennsylvania abuse reporting requirements.

It's been circulated to tens of thousands of child-serving professional, attorneys, and judges since it was first published in 1977.

Juvenile Law Center has been, is, and will always be committed to protecting children from all forms of abuse in the commonwealth.

HB 928 purports to create further protections for children under the age of thirteen by mandating that physicians forgo confidentiality and report instances of rape to state authorities, but we already have a law that does that.

Under our penal code, a person

commits rape when he or she sexual intercourse with a child under the age of thirteen, no matter what the person's age or relationship to that child. Pennsylvania's Child Protective Services Law requires healthcare professionals to immediately contact our state's ChildLine when they have reasonable cause to suspect that child has been raped, and that report is thereafter immediately referred by ChildLine to appropriate child -county children and youth agency. And the children and youth agency must then notify law enforcement of a report that a child's been These laws are in place. HB 928's requirement that reporters call law enforcement directly with the same report does 17 not augment child safety.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And here, for a moment, if I may, Representative Waters, I believe, asked a question earlier about what -- what sanctions were in place if a mandated reporter does not, in fact, fulfill their duty, and there are criminal sanctions in place, under current law, for failure to report.

REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: Thank you.

MS. ROSADO: What House Bill 928 does do is impose additional and what I think is unnecessary constraint on healthcare professionals that will deter teenagers from seeking healthcare. As parents, law makers and advocates, we all have an overarching interest in encouraging children to seek healthcare for high-risk medical conditions and diseases. The last thing we want is to discourage youth from getting treated, for example, for STDs because they're worried about whom such information will be shared with.

Before states across the country provided these confidentiality protections, teens avoided seeing their doctors and diseases spread, children's illness were exacerbated.

Thus, our general assembly, like other general assemblies, wisely chose to allow minors to consent to various types of healthcare, ranging from testing and treatment of STDs, to treatment for substance abuse problems, from prenatal care to outpatient mental health therapy. And that's based on a

recognition that -- how crucial healthcare access is to ensuring their well-being.

The bill, however, will force doctors to collect documentation from teenagers before they can provide them with the healthcare to which they can legally consent to under our laws. Knowing that they have to produce papers when they go to an appointment will keep many youth from seeking healthcare.

And what happens when a teenager presents at a healthcare facility without papers and wants to get an HIV test or prenatal care? Do we really want that healthcare facility to have to turn that minor away?

The bill incorrectly claims that there's evidence that healthcare professionals routinely circumvent their mandated reporter duty, but, again, the data shows otherwise.

According to the DPW's report, their annual report, in 2008, over four thousand reports of suspected child and student abuse were substantiated, and sexual abuse consisted of -- was involved in about 52 percent of all of those substantiated.

Healthcare professionals were the source of 22 percent of all substantiated reports of abuse received that year. They were the second largest reporting body in the commonwealth, behind only social service agencies, which contributed to 27 percent of those substantiated reports.

The general assembly commendably amended the CPSL in 2007 to close certain loopholes in the law, most notably by mandating the report of abuse committed by all persons and not just those that fit into a definition of who a perpetrator is.

Juvenile Law Center supports efforts to close existing gaps in our abuse reporting laws and to streamline them. For example, we understand that Senator Fontana is planning to introduce legislation that would establish the same threshold for triggering a duty to report abuse by a school employee that currently applies to everyone else. Currently, there is no requirement to report in that instance, unless the abuse rises to serious bodily injury, which is a much higher threshold to trigger a report. And while we haven't seen

Senator Fontana's bill and can't specifically comment on it, we encourage attempts to create a unified and coherent system of abuse reporting and investigation.

We also support more training on the Child Protective Services Law, as in bills such as Senate Bill 1137, which was introduced by Senator Vance, which specifically calls for more training of school personnel. Our research, writing, and training in this area tells us that it's challenging for mandated reporters to learn and understand Pennsylvania's comprehensive set -- yet complex set of laws on abuse reporting. Healthcare professionals, in particular, often face the difficult task of figuring out when their duty to provide confidential healthcare ends and their duty to report begins.

What we really need is to better
educate child-serving professionals on their
obligation. We should avoid adding redundant
law provisions that will only make a complex
set of laws more confusing while also
deterring youth from seeking healthcare.

In conclusion, keeping our children

out of -- children out of harm's way is an 1 2 awesome and complicated responsibility. And we need many, many different tools or 3 4 techniques to accomplish this. There is no 5 question that one such powerful tool is mandatory child abuse reporting. But another 6 critical tool is allowing youth the 7 8 opportunity to build relationships of trust 9 with healthcare practitioners so they will 10 seek their assistance when they're unsafe. 11 Our job, and it's not an easy one, is 12 to determine the right balance. Juvenile Law 13 Center remains committed to assisting the 14 general assembly in this task. 15 Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. For the record, I want to mention 17 18 that Pennsylvania Medical Society, 19 Pennsylvania Children and Youth 20 Administrators, the American Civil Liberties 21 Union, and the Children's Hospital of 22 Philadelphia have submitted testimony for the 23 record, which will be part of the official

Questions from members?

24

25

record.

Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for answering the question that I was seeking an answer to.

MS. ROSADO: Thank you. You're welcome.

me, what this -- a matter of basic common sense that there was some mandatory requirements and consequences for not doing so already in place and as I hear my colleagues argue about why do we need to have this bill, and, of course, on the flip side of that, we, as legislators, are always looking for ways to enhance and better protect the citizens of this commonwealth. And, of course, we don't want to be redundant in doing so.

The -- the very fact that certain parts of the commonwealth appears to have larger numbers as opposed to the others -- Philadelphia, I see, has always been like the highest number of cases, according to the chart that I saw in terms of induced abortions. And I don't know what the numbers

might be when it comes down to sexually transmitted diseases, too.

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 could Philadelphia do a better job, in your opinion, to make sure that those numbers go down? I believe it was eight — the latest report, as many, as high as eight abortions. I don't know what the numbers was in terms of sexually transmitted diseases. But how can Philadelphia do a better job in bringing those numbers down?

MS. ROSADO: I think that's a great question. I think one of the keys is training. The law that we have, even though that we did have substantial revisions a few years ago and I think are working on streamlining the laws, they're still fairly complex to understand. And I think we shouldn't assume that anyone knows them just because they are in a certain profession, as like a social service provider. I think we need to -- I think legislation would be aimed at mandating more training of certain professionals would probably be very useful, so that they can get up to date on the current requirements of the law.

1 REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: Not only 2 that, but I want to know how -- what 3 legislation did you say that could be, maybe, 4 helpful as a deterrent to this behavior? 5 Because obviously the mandatory reporting laws that we have haven't really done as good as it 6 has in other sixty-eight -- or other sixty-six 7 8 counties. We still have a higher number. And 9 I'm just trying to figure out how we can do 10 something to make that number go down. Not, I -- I'm more like pro, when it comes down to 11 12 prevention rather than reaction. That's what 13 I'm trying to see. 14 MS. ROSADO: I'm going to turn it 15 over to Dr. Pletcher on that one. 16 DR. PLETCHER: Representative Waters, 17 I agree that it is about access to 18 confidential care, removing barriers to 19 preventive care. Legislatively, if your 20

I agree that it is about access to confidential care, removing barriers to preventive care. Legislatively, if your question's specifically about legislatively, is there something that can be done to improve opportunities for young children to get in the proper education early, when they need it, and also presented in a way that shows them they have choices. That they don't have to follow

21

22

23

24

25

the same path that maybe somebody else did or 1 2 somebody else tells them. REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: Yes. 3 4 DR. PLETCHER: It involves exposure 5 to role models. It involves improvements to the education system, the social service 6 system. So absolutely there's things that can 7 8 be done that I believe we can all work 9 together to do to improve that number. 10 REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: So something could be done, perhaps, in the basic 11 12 educational process that we have now that 13 would be helpful? 14 DR. PLETCHER: Absolutely. 15 REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: Would 16 children know how to better protect themselves 17 from becoming victims in the first place? 18 DR. PLETCHER: Absolutely. 19 REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: And if they 20 feel, I don't know what you call it, 21 endangered or suspect, because I don't 22 particularly know of any cases firsthand, but 23 I've seen enough or heard enough about cases 24 of problems that -- with leading up to a

25

problems.

And, of course, I didn't see the movie, but we all heard of the Precious, which, I believe, got a lot of attention of people. Unfortunately, hasn't gotten my attention enough for me to go see it yet, but we hear about these problems. We hear about, you know, these cases. And I know that you are opposed to the mandatory reporting that this bill requires, because you believe it would interfere with the trust that physicians and patients are trying to improve or establish.

And I'm not exactly sure if -- if a parent that feels as if their -- their child has some issue that needs medical attention and they're suspect of something, and -- because when you spoke earlier about there are other ways to contract diseases, like herpes, you mentioned, and -- and just touches, doesn't necessarily mean that an actual sex act took place, it could be other ways. I guess those are definitely rare. But nonetheless, if a parents feels as though this needs to be investigated, I don't think that a responsible parent would hesitate at all to go

and seek medical attention to -- just to substantiate their suspicions.

So, I just -- I just find that that part of your argument, to -- to me, to -- we get into like the -- the HIPAA law and stuff like that, I just don't see how that -- this part of the legislation actually interferes or would deter a parent from seeking to get to an answer. That's -- I'm just throwing that out there to you.

I'm trying to play both sides here, because at the end of the day, we all just to want to make sure that we provide enough legislation or what we do legislatively is to remedy what has become a growing problem. And I believe that's what the -- the gentleman who introduced this legislation was really trying to attempt to do.

DR. PLETCHER: May I makes a comment on that?

REPRESENTATIVE WATERS: Yes.

DR. PLETCHER: I appreciate that. I also appreciate the comment of the congressman -- I don't know his name -- who was in the back. I wish he was here. But I

have been involved in many situations where care was delayed either by the child or by the parent because of fear and mistrust. If I could be assured HIPAA immunity, I'd be happy to discuss them. Situations where, as you mentioned, a stepfather is the abuser and the mother just doesn't want to believe it. Denial, as we all know, can be a very, very powerful psychological force. Situations -involving situations where teenagers were afraid that they would become persecuted.

Girls are not the only children who are abused; boys are as well. And there are high-profile cases of teenage boys who are identified as sex predators. So a young man with a sexually transmitted disease will not come to seek help for fear he will be identified as a sexual abusers.

These are just some specific examples of how it can happen, because I think folks are struggling with that. How does it happen?

When we first moved to Pittsburgh -- well, I grew up there, but when I moved back to Pittsburgh with my family last year, we

were there for about a month or so; we didn't know too many people. And my youngest son bumped his head, needed to get staples in his -- for a little laceration. Of course it came up in the conversation with my wife -- we're both healthcare providers -- we knew we could probably treat this at home. We also knew it wasn't our decision to make. Take him to healthcare. Because we had the resources, because we knew they were going to ask the questions, we were prepared. We didn't hesitate to take him to the ER.

As a healthcare provider, I often put myself in the shoes of my patients and other people. They don't have the same resources. They don't have the same knowledge. They don't have the same experience of me -- as me, going for help and receiving help, first and foremost. So I understand when they come to me and they say, This is why I didn't come to seek help. Because I'm only interested in providing them with treatment. That's my priority, my job.

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE WATERS:} \mbox{ Thank you,} \\ \mbox{Mr. Chairman.}$

Thank you for your answers.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Any other questions?

Sam, sure.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Thank you.

I appreciate the testimony. someone who has physicians in their family as well, I understand what you're talking about. I -- we've had a lot of discussion today. I just wanted to kind of reiterate, again, the focus of this is -- is the fact that we're dealing with young children. We are not talking about fifteen-, sixteen-, seventeenyear-olds. These are twelve and down. And these are not individuals who -- you know, in this case, education for older children will work, but these are kids who are involved against their will. They're in circumstances where they don't have choices that they're able to make. They are truly victims.

And the result of that is that the focus, guess what, was we need to get help for them. That's correct. The focus here, more than anything, is on the ability to locate and identify the perpetrator. We know, from

facts, that the younger the child, the older the parent, the person involved with them. So we're not talking fourteen-, fifteen-year-olds -- fourteen-, fifteen-year-olds, we're talking, you know, those who are in their twenties and above, in most cases. And these are folks who repeat the actions.

And the concern here is that -- is that there are, because of one reason or another, the system is allowing individuals to slip through this system. And there are a couple of cases that we know of where, in fact, there were individuals who had had multiple, multiple pregnancies, multiple -- and it was never, ever caught, even though that person had been in the presence of someone who would have been subject to mandatory reporting requirements, never did it.

There was some indication that I had seen that there seemed to be an aspect about it that there was just, the child looked younger -- or looked older than they were, and they just didn't want to go down that road and didn't ask the age. That's the reason for the

age requirements, and that's been testified, I think, by the commissioner. We do -- we do require proof of age in a lot of different things, so it's not just here.

But, you know, I wonder what more of an important category should we be requiring age. We're talking about the lives of young children. I agree with you, they're not just girls; they're boys too. And so that's the intent of this.

I suppose that there are aspects that can be modified, the intent was to build in as many of the things into the bill up front so as to address the issue as best as possible.

And I'm not saying that there couldn't be more area for some improvement; I'm sure there is.

But I just want to make sure we walk out of here with the concept that we're not trying to defend a system that's allowing our young children to be victimized because of either willful and/or laziness, and/or whatever else that could be involved in the system to just not go that extra step.

So that's -- you know, and I think you would agree with me on that. I understand

what you're saying from my perspective is
working on the bill. And -- but, at the same
time, not to be protecting something that is
out that, in fact, is allowing -- you know, I
mean, the numbers I'm looking at from -- from
the rape abuse and incest national network,
those figures indicate that 15 percent of
sexual abuse occurs in children twelve and
under. So that is that's no small number.

And I think, from my perspective, as a father of six children, I am concerned about what I see. And I am concerned whether there's not intact families and that sort of thing, there's less help for those young people than those where there are. So that's my concern, that we work together and fix this glaring omission that appears to be in the system.

I mean, I'm sure you would probably agree with me on what I'm saying in that regard, but just wanted to make that statement as we conclude here, Mr. Chairman.

DR. PLETCHER: I do agree with the intent, with the intention. I do support the intent to create mechanism, improve a system

so that child predators are identified and removed. What I question is the methodology. It's the who we're reporting to, it's the how it's being reported.

I also question some of the core assumptions that this methodology is based on. Several times people have said, most of the time when somebody of the age of thirteen becomes pregnant or gets an STD it's because of an adult in their twenties or thirties. Personally, in my experience, I don't know that to be true.

I pride myself in maintaining longitudinal relationships with families. When I'm involved with these situations, I work hard to stay involved. Even when the family doesn't agree with my decision to call child protective services, when I explain to them why and I worked with them through it, they've always maintained, fought to maintain that relationship. I just don't know that assumption to be true.

And then there's something else, I think, that I've seen occur many times. I hope -- I hope that nobody in this room has

1	been the victim of abuse, but victims that I
2	have known who are very young often feel they
3	develop very close connections to their
4	abuser, and they try to protect them. And
5	I've seen that over and over again. And it's
6	only through connecting with caring
7	professional that they're able to talk about
8	what actually happened.
9	The methods of this bill will just
10	cut that right out. I firmly believe that.
11	Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you all
13	for testifying.
14	MS. ROSADO: Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: The hearing is
16	now adjourned.
17	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
18	1:12 p.m.)
19	
20	* * * *
21	
22	WRITTEN TESTIMONY SUBMITTED
23	
24	(The following letter has been
25	submitted by the Pennsylvania Medical

Society.)

Dear Chairman Caltagirone:

I am writing on behalf of the Pennsylvania Medical Society to express our concerns with House Bill 928, dealing with child rapists and predators.

First, let me state categorically
that the Pennsylvania Medical Society strongly
supports efforts to detect and prosecute child
rapists and predators, and we stand ready to
work with you and your committee to enhance
those efforts. We agree with the
legislation's premise that the state has a
compelling interest in bringing these felons
to justice.

However, sometimes well-meaning actions can have unintended consequences, and we believe that is the case with House Bill 928. The bill places the burden of proof of compliance on the treating health care provider, and then in section 6321.5(a)(4) deprives the provider of the right to prove his or her innocence if a written record was not prepared. It is not difficult to imagine any number of circumstances where a written

record might not be needed because the 1 2 provider has independent knowledge of the patient's age. For example, the provider 3 4 might also coach the patient's youth soccer 5 team, where birth certificates are required to prove age eligibility. House Bill 928 would 6 deprive the health care provider of the right 7 8 to prove his or her innocence in such a case. 9 Other similar examples are easy to envision. 10 As I stated at the beginning of this 11 letter, we would be happy to work with you to 12 address this important issue. However, we 13 must object to legislation that prevents 14 health care providers from demonstrating that 15 they have solid outside information regarding 16 a patient's age. Thank you for your consideration. 17 18 Sincerely, James A. Goodyear, MD 19 FACS, President 20 (This concludes the letter submitted 21 by Pennsylvania Medical Society. The content 22 was not altered to correct any errors in 23 spelling, grammar, or punctuation.) 24

(The following letter has been

25

submitted by the Pennsylvania Children and 1 2 Youth Administrators, Inc.) Testimony to House Judiciary Committee 4 regarding HB 928 pn. 1052 5 February 22, 2010 Good morning Chairman Caltagirone, 6 Chairman Marsico and ladies and gentlemen of 7 the House Judiciary Committee. My name is 8 9 Charles Songer. I am the Executive Director 10 of the Pennsylvania Children and Youth Administrators Association (PCYA), an 11 12 Affiliate of the County Commissioners 13 Association of Pennsylvania (CCAP), and 14 represent all 67 County Children and Youth 15 Services Agency administrators in the 16 Commonwealth. Personally, I have served in the public child welfare system in 17 18 Pennsylvania as a county caseworker, 19 supervisor and agency administrator from 1972 20 to 1997, and as Executive Director of PCYA 21 since 1997. I appreciate the opportunity to 22 speak to you today regarding House Bill 23 928, p.m. 1052. The mission of PCYA is to enhance the 24 25 quality of service delivery for children,

youth and their families by providing for its members:

- (1) A forum for the exchange of
 information;
- (2) Assistance in educating the general public and its constituencies; and
- (3) An environment of support for the $\label{eq:Association} \text{Association membership.}$

In light of this mission, the issue before us today, better detection of child rapists and predators, is important because of the often irreparable damage inflicted on children and youth by these individuals. We endorse the enhanced efforts to identify and apprehend these individuals.

We do have two concerns with the Bill as written however.

First, we are not convinced that the mere presence of a sexually transmitted disease constitutes evidence of either a felony or of child abuse as stated in sec.
6321.4(a) and we suggests that further information be sought from health care experts to clarify whether certain sexually transmitted diseases can be transmitted

accidentally.

1

24

25

2 Secondly, in sec. 6321.5(c), the chief administrative officer of the county 3 4 agency is required to establish procedures and 5 track referrals to the child predator unit. We certainly have no issue with this for cases 6 that meet our current definitions and 7 8 responsibilities under the Child Protective 9 Services Law. The definitions of "child" in sec. 6321.3 and "child abuse" in sec. 10 11 6321.4(c) do not correspond to our operating 12 definitions under either the Juvenile Court 13 Act (42 Pa. C.S. sec. 6301) or the Child 14 Protective Services Law (23 Pa. C.S. sec. 6301) and we ask that our responsibilities not 15 16 be expanded until the workload and financial 17 impact are weighed and addressed. 18 Thank you for the opportunity to 19 present this testimony. If further 20 information or clarification is needed, please 21 contact me at (717) 232-7554 or 22 csonger@pacounties.org. 23 Charles Songer, Executive Director

(This concludes the letter submitted by Pennsylvania Children and Youth

Administrators, Inc. The content was not altered to correct any errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

* * * * *

(The following letter has been submitted by the American Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania.)

Dear Chairman Caltagirone,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony on House Bill 928 for the House Judiciary Committee's hearing on February 22. This bill would implement new reporting requirements for pre-teenage girls who are pregnant or who have a sexually transmitted disease. It also would place unnecessary barriers to care for all teens under the age of 18 attempting to get treatment for a pregnancy or for an STD. 928 places the ability of teens to access critical healthcare at great risk. American Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania opposes HB 928. On behalf of the approximately 16,000 members of the ACLU of Pennsylvania, I urge you to oppose it, as well.

1 HB 928 puts teenagers at risk. The 2 bill requires all teens under the age of 18 to provide "credible written evidence," such as 3 4 a school record, healthcare record, or health 5 insurance record, before the teen is able to receive care for pregnancy or sexually 6 transmitted diseases (STDs). If the teen 7 cannot provide this information, the health 8 9 care practitioner will be unable to provide 10 treatment without risking prosecution. Therefore, this identification requirement 11 12 will serve as a barrier to care and drive 13 teens away from health care providers. 14 could cause teenagers - already a high risk 15 population - to forego medical appointments 16 and miss or dangerously postpone screening and 17 treatment for STDs, routine gynecological 18 exams, and other vital health care services. 19

health policy. Under Pennsylvania law, a minor can consent to treatment for pregnancy or an STD. These laws protect the privacy of teens who are being abused by a parent or parents or who have some other reason why they must keep their condition private. But to

20

21

22

23

24

25

provide "credible written evidence" of their age, a teenager would likely require the help of an adult. This requirement undermines a teen's right to private medical care, and will drive teens away from the services they need.

The bill endangers children in another way. HB 928 requires a medical practitioner to inform a child's parent of the child's condition. But there is nothing in the bill to exempt this requirement when the parent is abusing the child. Doctors will be informing abusive parents that they are aware of their children's conditions, potentially placing the child in more danger.

Another major concern is that the bill lacks any protections of a victim's medical information. For a preteen who has been the victim of child abuse, the reporting requirements of this bill could be devastating. By our count, in addition to the mandated reporting of child abuse to Childline, there would be an additional six entities that would be informed about the alleged abuse: the child predator unit in the Attorney General's office, the chief of the

administrative office of her county, the 1 2 county district attorney, the local chief of police, the Pennsylvania State Police, and her 3 4 parent or quardian. There are no requirements 5 in the bill for protecting her privacy. Once her medical information leaves the hands of 6 medical providers, it is unlikely that strict 7 HIPAA type protections would be afforded to 8 9 the victim. 10 HB 928 is loaded with privacy 11 problems for young people in need of medical 12 treatment. It will also effectively drive them away from seeking the very care they 13 14 need. The ACLU of Pennsylvania urges you and 15 committee members to oppose this bill. 16 Sincerely, Andy Hoover, Legislative 17 Director. 18 (This concludes the letter submitted 19 by American Civil Liberties Union of 20 Pennsylvania. The content was not altered to 21 correct any errors in spelling, grammar, or

punctuation.)

(The following letter has been submitted by The Children's Hospital of

22

23

24

25

Philadelphia.)

Dear Mr. Caltagirone:

We thank the Committee and you for holding a hearing on House Bill 928, "The Child Rapist and Predator Detection Act," to be held on Monday, February 22, 2010. In the absence of personal testimony on this matter due to prior commitments, we respectfully request that you include this letter in the record.

As adolescent medicine caregivers, much of our practice is focused on protecting children. Accordingly, we treat children that are victims of sexual predators and therefore, as you would expect, concur with the sponsors of this legislation that persons committing the most heinous crimes against children ought to be identified and punished.

We serve all health needs of adolescents. This care includes offering sexual health treatment and prevention. We strongly encourage our patients to postpone sexual initiation, but for those that are sexually active, we assure them they are protected both physically and emotionally.

This means that we routinely check in on the health of relationships and consistently screen for abuse, exploitative relationships.

We have carefully gained the trust of thousands of teenagers by following a medical model that encourages these children to develop their own strengths; to be competent and resilient. Because we often treat underserved youth at risk for bad outcomes, we work hard to engage them and gain their confidence in order to provide the most effective and highest quality care.

Some of the provisions in this
legislation, although clearly intended to
protect youth, may actually cause fundamental
harm to the relationships we build and could
result in the following: 1)adolescents will
forgo preventative care, and even treatment,
as the word spreads among adolescent
communities that not only is their privacy not
honored, but law enforcement will become
involved; and, 2)children who have been abused
will not be surrounded by a nurturing,
trustworthy environment both to disclose and
begin the healing process.

It is vital that we both initiate the child welfare system when appropriate and avoid the secondary trauma that may occur through interaction with the criminal justice system.

We would be pleased to work with the Committee to improve the bill without causing negative impacts on the relationships required to navigate challenging environments and situations. In fact, we have conducted longstanding research on this very issue and have developed best practices focusing on trust and confidentiality.

Some highlights we would like to discuss include the following:

The adolescents we treat are made aware of the limitations of privacy on matters involving abuse;

If youth seek treatment for a sexually transmitted infection (STI) and law enforcement is contacted, they will stop seeking treatment. This may result in increased transmission and prevalence of diseases in the community. With delayed or no treatment, additional medical complications

can occur;

2.3

because they are worried about the potential ramifications of disclosure, there is likely to be a rise in unplanned pregnancies.

Unplanned pregnancies often result in delayed prenatal care. The risk for poor health outcomes for mother and child are already high for adolescents; any further barriers to the receipt of early prenatal care for them could be devastating and result in worse outcomes and increased healthcare costs;

Sanctions against medical providers, punitive in nature, may have an adverse impact on clinicians that could choose to no longer treat adolescents for fear of failing to comply. Such sanctions could have large implications on access to care for a severely vulnerable population.

We would be honored to provide the Committee and you with further explanation of these matters and outcomes from the research we have conducted. While it is not our intention to support or oppose this legislation, it is our duty to share how it

1	may impact the practice of pediatric and
2	adolescent medicine in the Commonwealth of
3	Pennsylvania and the health and well being of
4	the children we care for.
5	Sincerely, Andrea Bailer, MSN, CRNP;
6	Carrie Calabrese, MSN, CRNP; Nadia Dowshen,
7	MD; Karyn Feit, MSW; Christine Forke, MSN,
8	CRNP; Kenneth R. Ginsburg, MD, MS Ed; Sara
9	Kinsman, MD, PhD, Nadja Peter, MD; Oana
10	Tomescu, MD, Ph D; Michele Zucker, MD.
11	(This concludes the letter submitted
12	by The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.
13	The content was not altered to correct any
14	errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation.)
15	
16	* * * *
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE I HEREBY CERTIFY that I was present upon the hearing of the above-entitled matter and there reported stenographically the proceedings had and the testimony produced; and I further certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my said stenographic notes. BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR Court Reporter Notary Public