COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOINT HEARING
OF THE
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
AND
CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMMITTEE

STATE CAPITOL HARRISBURG, PA

MAIN CAPITOL BUILDING
ROOM 140, MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM

TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2013 10:00 A.M.

PRESENTATION ON
REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE
ON CHILD PROTECTION
CREATED BY HR 522 AND SR 250 OF 2011

BEFORE:

HONORABLE RON MARSICO, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HONORABLE KATHARINE M. WATSON, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMMITTEE

HONORABLE BRYAN CUTLER

HONORABLE SHERYL M. DELOZIER

HONORABLE BRIAN L. ELLIS

HONORABLE KEITH J. GREINER

HONORABLE GLEN R. GRELL

HONORABLE JOSEPH T. HACKETT

HONORABLE FRED KELLER

HONORABLE MARK K. KELLER

HONORABLE TIMOTHY KRIEGER

HONORABLE JOHN A. LAWRENCE

HONORABLE DAVID M. MALONEY, SR.

* * * *

Pennsylvania House of Representatives Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

BEFORE (cont.'d):

HONORABLE DAN MOUL

HONORABLE DONNA OBERLANDER

HONORABLE BERNIE O'NEILL

HONORABLE MIKE REGAN

HONORABLE TODD ROCK

HONORABLE RICK SACCONE

HONORABLE TOMMY SANKEY

HONORABLE TODD STEPHENS

HONORABLE WILL TALLMAN

HONORABLE MARCY TOEPEL

HONORABLE TARAH TOOHIL

HONORABLE THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HONORABLE LOUISE WILLIAMS BISHOP,

DEMOCRATIC CHAIRWOMAN OF THE

CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMMITTEE

HONORABLE BRYAN BARBIN

HONORABLE MATTHEW D. BRADFORD

HONORABLE VANESSA LOWERY BROWN

HONORABLE MICHELLE F. BROWNLEE

HONORABLE H. SCOTT CONKLIN

HONORABLE DOM COSTA

HONORABLE ED GAINEY

HONORABLE KEVIN HAGGERTY

HONORABLE STEPHEN KINSEY

HONORABLE DEBERAH KULA

HONORABLE BRANDON P. NEUMAN

HONORABLE MARK ROZZI

HONORABLE JOHN P. SABATINA, JR.

HONORABLE JESSE WHITE

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

HONORABLE THOMAS P. MURT

HONORABLE SCOTT A. PETRI

COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:

THOMAS W. DYMEK

MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

JOHN E. SCARPATO

MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMMITTEE

KAREN L. DALTON

MAJORITY SENIOR LEGAL COUNSEL, JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

MEREDITH M. SCHULER

MAJORITY ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT, CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMMITTEE

E. LAUREN ORAZI

DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

ROSEANN R. CADAU

DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMMITTEE

V. KURT BELLMAN

DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH ANALYST,
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HEATHER J. WALSH

DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT, CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMMITTEE

I N D E X

TESTIFIERS

* * *

<u>PAGE</u>
DAVID W. HECKLER CHAIRMAN, TASK FORCE ON CHILD PROTECTION; DISTRICT ATTORNEY, BUCKS COUNTY
CINDY W. CHRISTIAN, MD DIRECTOR, SAFE PLACE: THE CENTER FOR CHILD PROTECTION AND HEALTH, CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF PHILADELPHIA; MEDICAL DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, PHILADELPHIA
JASON P. KUTULAKIS, ESQ. SENIOR PARTNER, ABOM & KUTULAKIS, LLP
JACKIE ATHERTON BERNARD, ESQ. CHIEF DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, BLAIR COUNTY
RACHEL P. BERGER, MD, MPH CHILD PROTECTION TEAM, CHILD ADVOCACY CENTER, CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH MEDICAL CENTER

PROCEEDINGS

2 * * *

2.1

2.2

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to the Joint Hearing of the House Judiciary and House Children and Youth Committees.

I and Chairperson Kathy Watson are very pleased to be able to convene our committee meeting today to receive testimony from the members of the Task Force on Child Protection. So we have a full house here, don't we?

MR. HECKLER: We do.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Good morning.

MR. HECKLER: Good morning.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: I want to announce that the meeting is being recorded -- you can just all see that -- and I'd ask that Members and guests silence all cell phones and electronic devices. So we've all done that? Okay; good.

One year ago, the Pennsylvania House and Senate worked closely with the Governor and created the task force for the express purpose of comprehensively studying the laws, policies, and practices of this Commonwealth to determine how best to reform Pennsylvania's laws to better address the terrible crime of child abuse. I sponsored, along with Chairman Caltagirone, the House resolution that

created this task force, because it was evident that no single piece of legislation can solve the problem of child abuse alone.

2.1

The task force brought together 10 members, each of whom is an expert in his or her particular field, representing a wide range of background and experiences in child abuse issues. Using this interdisciplinary approach, the task force has completed the Herculean task of conducting this review, and I applaud all of the task force members for their efforts.

The task force used an approach to deliberate and produce a thoughtful 427-page report detailing the task force's conclusions. It will take time to fully digest the many findings and recommendations of the task force. And while some aspects of the task force report may take time to enact, others can be moved forward without delay.

There is much work to be done. To that end, be assured I will devote the full energy and authority of the House Judiciary Committee to combating the issue of child abuse. I'm quite certain that Chairperson Watson feels the same way.

Now with the task force's guidance and expert suggestions, it now falls upon the rest of us -- the rest of us, those of us in the General Assembly, the Governor, and those who prosecute these crimes and those who work

selflessly to advocate for the children who are hurt by
these terrible crimes -- to assume the mantle of leadership
in reforming Pennsylvania law to protect our children.

2.1

2.2

The task force has made an enormous contribution to better protecting the children of Pennsylvania from the predators who, for too long, have preyed upon the defenseless. I look forward to working with all the Members of both Committees; the General Assembly, Republican and Democrat; the Governor; and those who advocate for the victims to combat this horrific problem in a responsible, comprehensive, and constitutional manner.

Before I turn things over to Chairperson Watson, let me just add this one housekeeping note. While I expect we will receive much useful testimony this morning, the Committee will also keep the record open in order to receive written comments from any other interested persons who wish to submit statements.

With that, I turn the hearing over to Chairperson Watson for her opening remarks.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: Thank you, Chairman Marsico.

Ladies and gentlemen, first of all, a huge thank you to you, task force members, who came out of busy lives to make such an important contribution for the children of Pennsylvania, for the families of Pennsylvania, and a

contribution certainly to the Children and Youth Committee and the Judiciary, because you've pointed the way, the way for us to go. And as I've said to many people, this is a long road to go down. It's a road that does have some twists and turns, and we need to be very careful that we don't get off into what I call the woods on either side for side issues but that we keep going down that road.

Will we get there, as you would hope, and I'll call it lickety-split, but really fast, at a fast gait and a clip? Probably not. There are lots of things to understand and digest and viewpoints to be heard. But I would like to assure you that Chairman Marsico and I, we've met before this all started, and we determined we're going down the road. And going with us is Representative Caltagirone and Representative Bishop, so at least -- and no, this is not the Wizard of Oz, ladies and gentlemen, and it's not a yellow-brick road, but we are going to go down that road.

We are holding this hearing with Judiciary as a start. You showed us the way. You talked about interdisciplinary work to make things better, and you are seeing here, I think, a very important start that we are working together, recognizing in a bipartisan way, in sometimes a younger and an older way for some of us, but very importantly, with committees and no propriety, we just

want to get the job done for the children of Pennsylvania 1 2 and for the families of Pennsylvania.

So we've gone through a lot of our housekeeping rules. I believe we still are required to take the roll. I guess I would like the Members of the two Committees, Children and Youth and Judiciary, to please introduce themselves for being here, and then I have the pleasure of doing a brief introduction of each of you on the task force who is going to testify. We're not going through all your credentials because that would take us until 11 o'clock, so we'll just say something nicely. And our Committee Members will simply identify themselves and the part of the State that they represent.

Let's begin.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

MINORITY CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Tom Caltagirone, Berks County.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Dom Costa, Allegheny County.

REPRESENTATIVE TALLMAN: Will Tallman, York and Adams Counties.

REPRESENTATIVE TOEPEL: Marcy Toepel, Montgomery 22 County.

REPRESENTATIVE SABATINA: John Sabatina, Philadelphia County.

25 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Deberah Kula, Fayette and

1 Westmoreland Counties. 2 REPRESENTATIVE ROZZI: Mark Rozzi, Berks County. 3 REPRESENTATIVE HAGGERTY: Kevin Haggerty, 4 Lackawanna County. 5 REPRESENTATIVE GAINEY: Ed Gainey, Allegheny 6 County. 7 REPRESENTATIVE MURT: Tom Murt, Philadelphia and 8 Montgomery Counties. 9 REPRESENTATIVE BROWNLEE: Michelle Brownlee, 10 Philadelphia. 11 REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Stephen Kinsey, 12 Philadelphia County. 13 REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Scott Conklin, 14 Representative of the little-known region of Penn State 15 University. 16 REPRESENTATIVE TOOHIL: Tarah Toohil, Luzerne 17 County. 18 REPRESENTATIVE BARBIN: Bryan Barbin, Cambria 19 County. 20 REPRESENTATIVE REGAN: Mike Regan, York and Cumberland Counties. 2.1 2.2 REPRESENTATIVE HACKETT: Joe Hackett, Delaware 23 County. 24 REPRESENTATIVE M. KELLER: Mark Keller, Perry and Franklin Counties. 25

```
1
                 REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: Donna Oberlander,
 2
       Clarion and Armstrong Counties.
                 REPRESENTATIVE SANKEY: Tommy Sankey, Clearfield
 3
 4
       County.
                 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Jesse White, Washington,
 5
 6
       Allegheny, and Beaver Counties.
 7
                 REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL: Bernie O'Neill, Bucks
       County.
 8
 9
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Sheryl Delozier,
10
       Cumberland County.
11
                 REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Brian Ellis, Butler
12
       County.
13
                 REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Glen Grell, Cumberland
14
       County.
15
                 REPRESENTATIVE ROCK: Todd Rock of Franklin
16
       County.
17
                 REPRESENTATIVE SACCONE: Rick Saccone, Allegheny
       and Washington Counties.
18
19
                 REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Dan Moul, Adams and
20
      Franklin.
2.1
                 MINORITY CHAIRWOMAN BISHOP: Louise Bishop,
2.2
       Philadelphia County, Chair of Children and Youth, minority
23
       side.
                 I just wanted to say in passing, and I'll be very
24
       quick, Madam Chairman, in meditating on the many, many
25
```

```
1
       challenges, vast challenges that are before us today, that
 2
       it is time -- and I'm delighted that all of us are here --
 3
       it is time for us to address the issue of child abuse and
 4
       child sexual abuse, issues that have been, and have existed
 5
       for years, that have been covered up, that have been
 6
       denied, and that have been placed on the back burner.
 7
                 I'm here and delighted that we have brought it
       out of the past and out of the hidden in families, in
 8
 9
       communities, in schools, and in homes. It's time for us to
10
      talk about them.
11
                 Thank you.
12
                 REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Todd Stephens,
13
      Montgomery County.
14
                 REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Scott Petri, Bucks County.
15
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: I think that's it, and
16
       I'm Kathy Watson, proudly from Bucks County.
17
                 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: We have one more.
18
                 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: One more?
19
                 REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: Dave Maloney, Berks
20
       County.
21
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: There we go. And you
22
       will note, ladies and gentlemen, sitting here, we're well
       represented for this Commonwealth. We probably hit almost
23
24
       all of the 67.
```

So we are ready to go, and if I might take a

moment to introduce those from the task force who are testifying today to give us something of an overview.

Each of you will have received through your Chairman, your Committee, this tome of information. This committee, the task force, was very busy. It's very interesting. You'll want to read, and you have your own copy to make notes, highlight, do whatever it is that you need to do so that you understand it. But we're going to help you today by doing an overview.

And who will be joining us? Well, if I would introduce the task force:

The Chairman of the task force, David Heckler, who is the District Attorney of Bucks County, former President Judge, and I suppose for this Capitol also a former State Representative and a State Senator from Bucks County. He's also a good friend of mine.

And with him, there are several task force members who I hope are becoming new friends, and that would be Jackie Atherton Bernard, Esq., Chief Deputy District Attorney for Blair County.

And Dr. Cindy W. Christian, Director of Safe

Place: The Center for Child Protection and Health, and

that's part of Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. And

also, she's the Medical Director, Department of Human

Services of Philadelphia. She doesn't have enough to do.

1 And Jason Kutulakis. Jason is Senior Partner of 2 Abom & Kutulakis right here in Dauphin County. 3 And then we have by Skype, I hope, and I'm only mildly technically aware so I'm hoping this works, but it's 4 5 Dr. Rachel Berger. Dr. Berger is of the Child Protection 6 Team, Child Advocacy Center -- the other children's 7 hospital on the other side that works for the betterment of 8 children -- Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, the 9 University of Pittsburgh Medical Center. So we're covered 10 on both areas of the Commonwealth. And hopefully 11 Dr. Berger can hear, and then you will hear her testimony. 12 She needed to stay in Pittsburgh. Mr. Heckler, I never know if I'm doing "Judge," 13 14 "DA Heckler" -- whatever. 15 MR. HECKLER: Just "Dave." 16 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: David, are you ready 17 to go? 18 MR. HECKLER: I am; I am. 19 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: Okay. Yes, sir? 20 MR. HECKLER: Thank you. 21 And let me mention, although we were not able 22 to get in contact in time for me to submit to the 23 Committee another member who served on the task force, 24 Delilah Rumburg, who, of course, is known to you folks, I'm

sure, as the head of PCARE -- there you go -- Delilah is

25

also with us this morning.

2.2

I'm delighted to be here. Actually, I never got much of a look at this room during my tenure in the House of Representatives. We were always in the minority, and they didn't much let us in here. So I'm delighted to sit here this morning in the majority caucus room.

A couple of preliminary things. Let me please recognize the staff of the Joint State Government

Commission. I know that in the tough budget times that the Commonwealth has been through, maybe even their very existence was in doubt. The report you have before you just would not exist, and certainly in its excellent form, without their extraordinary efforts, and we taxed them to the max. I've known those folks for many years now, and I have it on good authority that we were the most miserable to deal with, the toughest group that they ever dealt with.

I'm an optimist. I thought we'd be done with this report in September. We were down to the last deadline in November. This has been an enormously hands-on, extraordinarily qualified group that I've been privileged to be associated with that just did an extraordinary job.

Also here today are some of the folks who helped out, and you will see, I suspect at least five times before we're done, that I'll be looking back at Mary Taylor, who

of course many of us first met when she was I guess minority counsel to the Judiciary Committee in this House, to remember what the heck it is we did and why.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We were blessed with a great deal of support.

Jim Anderson is here from the Juvenile Court Judges'

Commission. There were other extraordinary task force

members who made enormous contributions.

If we hadn't written a report at all, if the only thing we did is have hearings and collect the testimony of an extraordinary group of witnesses and then gone home, I think we would have done something very important for this Commonwealth. And I commend to your attention as you go through these things -- and you may find that you have questions about some of our recommendations. I'm already hearing a little, well, you know, maybe they went off a little bit on a tangent here. Read the testimony. And I'm just going to highlight -- I think Joint State has it, certainly we have the written testimony that was submitted, and I believe there are transcripts of virtually all of the testimony that's available: Anne Marie Ambrose, who is the Commissioner of the Philadelphia Department of Human Services; Dr. Maria McColgan, who is from St. Christopher's in Philadelphia -- and I don't mean to ignore or diminish the testimony of other people, but just in terms of highlights -- Dean Gelles from the School of Social Policy

and Practice at Penn; Leslie Gomez and Gina Maisto Smith, who were both former prosecutors in Philadelphia and have seen and prosecuted horrors that none of us want to think about; Bob Schwartz, who I can remember before I was even elected to the House as somebody who has been a tireless children's advocate in Philadelphia for many years; Sean McCormack, a prosecutor here in Dauphin County; Dr. Turkewitz, a member of the staff at York Hospital and plainly a committed pediatrician and somebody who has wrestled with these issues for many years.

On the issue of child advocacy centers, particularly in the smaller counties of this State:

Jeff Burkett, who took the initiative in a very small county to start a CAC with the help of his local hospital, gave moving and persuasive testimony about just how dramatically effective that particular institution can be in a community. And then, of course, Craig Stedman, the District Attorney, and actually all the people who came with him from Lancaster County, which is, you know, a larger, more sophisticated approach to the same thing -- many others.

Before -- let's put it this way -- before you bypass any significant part of this report, I would urge you to read that testimony for yourself. It wouldn't take all that long. I just came away from every one of our

hearings in some cases moved certainly in awe of the efforts that people are putting in throughout our Commonwealth to better the condition of children and to address it from the prosecutorial standpoint, and I've always sort of taken the negative view of life to punish those who do terrible things to our children.

Another point I'd like to make, and I'm going to leave it to your questions and to my very able colleagues to deal with more of the specifics of this report, but one of my, and it may look sort of goofy as we have proposed it, I sort of took the lead on proposing three different entities that would interact with the Legislature. You may well want to streamline that, although like the task force, we propose that all of them would serve without compensation. So I'm thinking that, you know, it doesn't necessarily have to cost the taxpayers very much, but I would strongly stress, there needs to be an ongoing dialogue in this area.

We've waited many years, and I'll confess, I was Chairman for a while when I was in the Senate of the Aging and Youth Committee. I didn't really understand the CPSL all that well as an overall structure. We did some amendments, and some amendments that I still think were useful, particularly in helping to terminate parental rights where that needed to happen for the child's

well-being. But I never got a command of it; I didn't practice in this area, and it wasn't until my service here that I really kind of came to see how it works or, in the case of our present law, in a lot of cases doesn't work, and hopefully we've given you a better version.

But there are entities out there -- one of the outstanding ones, of course, is the Field Center at Penn -- that are thinking, are devoting substantial academic efforts to figuring out where we should be going, where our society should be going, and certainly where Pennsylvania and its laws should be going. There needs to be an ongoing, gradual discussion with the Legislature. We don't want to do this once every 10 or 15 years when a Sandusky case blows up and we suddenly discover that there are problems in the world.

And I guess that would be my final observation to you. What the Sandusky case has succeeded, and also the Archdiocese of Philadelphia cases succeed in bringing home to Pennsylvanians is, this stuff really happens, and it happens a lot. I did not fully appreciate until I became a Judge, just in a county like Bucks County, 600-and-some thousand people, how regularly children are victimized -- sexually, which we kind of like not to talk about and kind of want to push away, and physically.

My Chief of Prosecution is sitting at his desk

right now doing the final prep on a case in which an infant child was killed by the paramour of the mother. The child had been seen at one of our local hospitals for a broken limb within several months before the death. Children and Youth were involved in that, but the nature of the injury was not identified as being abuse related. The child went back into the same setting and was left for the weekend by the natural mother with the paramour, who killed the child, including the child ended up with a significant human bite mark. That child died a terrible death. This stuff happens. It happens in our cities. It happens in our small towns. It happens in our affluent suburbs. It happens, and it happens regularly.

And so the final piece, I can't tell you how many times as a Judge -- in fact, it was one of the things that actually made it a little bit easier to leave the bench and plunge back into my first love -- the number of times I went home and said to my wife, you know, if I never spend another day listening to a child, 8, 10 years old, relate their abuse or their sexual experiences to me and 12 strangers sitting in a jury box, that will be great; you know, that will be just fine with me. And certainly as a Judge, you know, as punitive as I'm perfectly comfortable with being, nothing you do to a convicted offender helps that child in a significant way.

Preventing, identifying this conduct, identifying pedophiles who don't get fixed, who will do it over and over again unless they are caged, getting them caged quickly, identifying what's going on quickly and sparing other children, is a priority which we can address. And so the final piece of information or the final thought I would have for you, as all of you and your colleagues, because I hope you will become advocates for what you take from our efforts and draft in legislation to the rest of the Legislature, the Members of the House and the Senate, who sometimes need to be led along by the House in my experience, look at this from the child's point of view. It became so plain to me when I actually was part of digging into the CPSL, trying to figure out, where did we get this, why would somebody enact this particular provision, that everybody is thinking about adults. are various entities. You can kind of figure out where this would come from or where that would come from. But if you're the child, if you are the recipient of this treatment and looking for somebody to just give you simple justice or just protect you in some basic way, it just makes no sense whatsoever. And the more you can stop, when you get to a

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

particular issue and you're weighing it -- well, there's this consideration; these people want you to do this -- or,

you know, people are advocating for particular angles to say, wait a minute, if I'm a kid and this is happening to me or there's the possibility that it's going to happen to me and somebody is trying to prevent that, what makes sense? What do you do? I think you will find that it gives you a perspective that you might not have otherwise. We deal with these issues, and we certainly deal with them when there is a public consciousness. We've all got a responsibility to deal with the well-being of children in our communities, in our Commonwealth, on a daily basis. This is a great opportunity to do that.

I still stand in awe of the knowledge and abilities of the people I was privileged to serve with on this task force, and, you know, you have our summaries of what we've done. I hope you will be asking us questions so that we can focus in on the things you're most concerned about.

I'm particularly hopeful that you'll be asking
Dr. Christian questions. My staff, many of the young
people on my staff are just envious that I have gotten to
hang out with Dr. Christian so much, and of course she has
appeared in trials that have been tried before me and
others in Bucks County, and of course many places. But
it's just fun to see people who, every once in a while a
foolish defense attorney endeavors to cross-examine

Dr. Christian, and then it just gets better than it was on direct. So we hope that you'll be asking her questions.

But at any rate, thanks for having us here today. I'm sure I speak for everybody on the task force. We will be delighted to be of any help we can -- formally, informally -- to get this done in a way that will help the children of Pennsylvania.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: I thought that, and with your permission, Chairman -- Chairman and Chairman -- that we would let the task force members in the order you choose go ahead and testify. And then, Members, if you're jotting down all your questions or you've read your 400 pages, we can go and ask questions, if that suits everyone. All right? So we all know how this is going to go.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Before we do that, I see that other Members have joined us: Representative Krieger, I believe, is here from Westmoreland County, and Representative Cutler is here from Lancaster County.

Any other Members that came in? Stand up and introduce yourself.

REPRESENTATIVE NEUMAN: Representative Neuman from Washington County, the $48^{\rm th}$ District. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Representative Vanessa Lowery Brown from Philadelphia.

1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: We'll turn it over to 2 you.

MR. HECKLER: Thank you. Then I will yield the floor to Dr. Christian. A good bit of legislation, the way we do it these days, is contained in the definitions, and that has been one of the areas where she and Dr. Berger put considerable effort.

Doctor.

2.1

DR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Boss.

Mr. and Ms. Chairs and all of the

Representatives, first let me say that it is really an
honor for me to be here. This is not what a pediatrician
gets to do every day. So, you know, yesterday I was making
rounds in the hospital, taking care of sick children, and
today I found someone to cover for me so I can be here with
all of you to kind of help explain and maybe defend and
help you all with the very, very really extraordinary,
challenging, and I think very good work that this task
force did. It was really a great honor for me to be chosen
to be on this task force, and I really enjoyed greatly any
contributions that I've made.

So I, for some reason, have kind of adopted talking about our definitions and the changes or our recommended changes in the definition of "child abuse," and let me start by saying that we made some minor changes to

the definition of "child sexual abuse" because, for the most part, the definitions were okay. But we did broaden "sexual abuse" to include, and I'm going to read a little bit just so I get it correct, "engaging in sexually explicit conversations and looking at the intimate parts of a child or encouraging a child to look at the intimate parts of another person for the purposes of sexual gratification of any party." But the problems that we have with child sexual abuse were not really contained in the definitions of "sexual abuse." For the most part, they were pretty good.

But I will say as a practicing pediatrician and a child-abuse pediatrician, our State definitions of "child physical abuse" have been incredibly problematic for years. Our State definition of "child physical abuse" is probably the most narrow in the country, and we did not hear testimony from anybody who praised our definitions of "child physical abuse," who said they were adequate or in any way exemplary.

So presently our definition of "child abuse" is "Any recent act or failure to act by a perpetrator which causes nonaccidental serious physical injury to a child under 18 years of age." Under this definition, children are not adequately protected. There were concerns that were repeatedly raised about the meaning of "nonaccidental"

and the definition of "serious physical injury" which requires severe pain or impairment of physical function as part of our child-abuse definitions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So some of the testimony that we heard from front-line pediatricians was that we could have children before us who have multiple bruises, injuries in abnormal places, children who have been clearly victimized by an adult who is supposed to be protecting them and taking care of them, but because the child before us is not in severe pain -- and we can talk about how people experience pain -and because the child's skin has all been injured but the child is moving fine and using their limbs and maybe even running around the hospital room playing, that this would not be defined as "child abuse." And I don't need to show examples, but if you'd like to see, I brought plenty of examples with me of children who have multiple injuries who, by our laws in Pennsylvania and by actual investigations, had unfounded child abuse reports because their injuries didn't seem to meet our definitions.

So we recommend changing the definition of "child abuse" to include "recent intentional or reckless acts."

So we've replaced "nonaccidental" with "intentional or reckless acts, attempts to act, and failures to act that cause or create a reasonable likelihood of bodily injury or serious bodily injury." And these definitions also better

parallel the definitions of "assault" and "aggravated assault" in the Crimes Code. Am I correct, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HECKLER: It sounds good so far.

DR. CHRISTIAN: You know, I'm just the doctor. Okay.

So in addition, though, we made some other recommendations. There are some States that define "child abuse" by a very specific list of things: if a child has this; if a child does that; if you see this, that, that, or the other, this is what constitutes "child abuse." And we really didn't want to give basically like a recipe or, you know, just a list of injuries that would constitute "child abuse," but we really did believe that there were certain situations that in and of themselves should be considered child abuse, and we included kicking, burning, biting, stabbing a child, cutting, throwing a child, unreasonably confining or restraining a child. We see children who are locked up in closets for hours or days or weeks or months at a time, and if there are no obvious injuries to that child, they might not have met our definitions.

Forcibly -- and we use the word "forcibly" -- shaking or slapping an infant, because we see infants who have injuries where there's no impairment but they have marks on their bodies, and to us, to a pediatrician, that's just a marker for worse things to come, and if we can't use

our system to protect that infant, we're asking for that baby to come back with sometimes fatal and sometimes life-threatening and permanent injury.

"Intentionally interfering with a child's breathing." We have parents who try to suffocate children and then the child is fine when the child is seen by the doctor, but intentionally trying to interfere with the breathing of a child should be child abuse.

Or causing a child to be present where illegal drugs are manufactured, such as a methamphetamine lab, and include driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs with a child in the car.

And then finally in our definitions, we have all seen, those of us who work kind of front line, have seen many cases where it is very clear that a child has been a victim of child abuse. They may be battered. They may have multiple injuries, life-threatening injuries. But after an investigation, Children and Youth, the police, nobody knows the exact identity of the perpetrator. It may be one of a number of members of a family. We just don't know who did it. Presently, that case would be a nonindicated report. They would not indicate that as "child abuse" in the State of Pennsylvania, even though it was clear that the child was a victim of child abuse, because they could not identify the perpetrator. But in

order to protect that child, in order to know that that child was a victim of child abuse, we recommend that those cases are indicated as "child abuse" regardless of whether or not you can identify the perpetrator.

And that's all I have to say for now, and I'll turn it over to Jason, I suppose, for his comments. Thank you very much.

MR. KUTULAKIS: Good morning.

2.1

I was introduced as an attorney in a local law firm, but I've dedicated a great deal of my professional career towards advocating for children's rights.

Organizing the Pennsylvania Children and Youth Solicitors

Association is very much akin to the District Attorneys

Association, and now I'm involved in a training program for what I call first responders to child abuse, and that is called ChildFirst Pennsylvania.

So while on its face you say I'm an attorney, really my passion is about ensuring that Pennsylvania's most important resource, and that's not natural gas, although we talk a lot about it today, it's the children of this Commonwealth. They're the most important constituent that this body has, and they're the most unspoken for or least spoken for resource that we have. So when you're approached by others that say "We have a stake in this," remember the voices that don't have the opportunity to

speak to you and don't have the power and resources to come before you to speak on this topic that transgresses all socioeconomic situations in the Commonwealth. This is a very serious pandemic that we have.

But I thank the leadership for giving me the opportunity and us the opportunity to spend a great deal of time putting this report together. It's extremely comprehensive, and I'm very hopeful that it will move forward, while not at lightning speed, with due diligence. I, too, remain available to be a resource formally or informally to anybody in this body to discuss this subject matter in the future.

The report really focuses on the Child Protective Services Law primarily, although we do touch on the Crimes Code and some family-law matters in the custody section.

But it really focuses on what we call the Child Protective Services Law -- Mr. Chairman referred to it as the "CPSL" -- and that is the body of law that directs and drives the child abuse system. It's a civil-related system, not a criminal-based system, and that's hard to get your brain around, and that's why the definitions that Dr. Christian talked about in modifying and changing them are so important.

While there may be a situation -- and I give this example when I talk about this -- where if I were to walk

out of the Capitol today and walk across the street and punch a 5-year-old as hard as I can in the face and break the orbital socket, no doubt that's the crime of aggravated assault. However, under our current definition, that's not child abuse, because I don't have any kind of relationship with that child. So it's important as you go forward to digest -- and I reinforce what Dr. Christian talked about -- the issue of physical abuse and how that really is going really unattended in the Commonwealth versus other States.

2.2

Our mandate, especially for some of the newer Members, our mandate came down that asked us to address the issue of mandated reporters and also to, equally importantly, reinstill, come up with information to help reinstill confidence in this system, and this report really does a good job of that.

While the authority probably was precipitated by the Sandusky case and the Archdiocese case, I think that's where the mandated-reporter section came from. So to that end, I'll address two different things today: Who is the perpetrator of child abuse currently and what do we recommend, and what is a mandated reporter today and what do we recommend?

Currently the definition of "perpetrator" involves, yet again, somebody who has a special relationship with that child: a parent, a person

responsible for the welfare of a child -- and that's further defined -- or a resident of the home where the child resides who is over the age of 14. We've expanded that definition or recommended expanding that definition so that we bring in and we start counting other children, to protect other children, as Dr. Christian indicated. That's the most important thing we need to come out of here doing, and we need to hold those perpetrators accountable.

The recommendations include expanding to add employees or volunteers who are in a position of trust, someone with whom you leave your child when you go to work. So ensure that they can be defined as a "perpetrator."

It would also include specifically individuals who work or volunteer at camps, athletic programs, enrichment programs, schools, teachers, all of their employees.

Any person who commits abusive acts on a child within that child's home. You don't need to have a special relationship. If you commit an act on a child in their safe haven, they should be held accountable.

Any relative within the fifth degree of consanguinity, and there's a little chart; you can figure that out.

A paramour or former paramour.

Those people all come into regular contact with

children, and they should be held accountable if they commit these heinous acts on a young child.

We have seen in the high-profile cases in the last year and a half a system break down, clearly break down, and not catch bad situations early on. The task force has recommended expanding the definition of those who are required to report suspected child abuse. And it's very important to understand that as this body goes forward, to get the message out that anybody can report child abuse -- anybody can report child abuse. Frankly, I think they should report child abuse. However, there are those that are required to report, and there are consequences for failing to report if you're one of those enumerated persons.

We've expanded that definition to include:

- Colleges, employees of colleges or universities.
- Coaches, those that are entrusted to work with children in athletic systems.
- Attorneys, and there is a caveat to that: unless you are receiving privileged information.
- Librarians. We heard testimony about children coming into a library, and there are people there, they are in trusting situations and

1 learn of situations of child abuse, but they 2 are not required to report currently. Persons working or volunteering in programs. 3 The commercial film industry. Computer-repair individuals. 5 6 7 These last two areas are for obvious reasons, because it deals with child pornography, and we must change 8 9 the tide and make those people accountable. If they come 10 into contact with that subject matter, they should be 11 required to report it, and there should be serious 12 consequences for failing to comply with the law. 13 I'm going to reserve more time so that hopefully 14 we'll get a dialogue with all of you. Again, it has been a

I'm going to reserve more time so that hopefully we'll get a dialogue with all of you. Again, it has been a great privilege, but I hope that you rely on us. We volunteered our time this year and we continue to pledge that time to make sure that Pennsylvania becomes a leader in the fight against child abuse. This is a great step towards that.

MR. HECKLER: And last but far from least, Prosecutor Bernard.

MS. BERNARD: Thank you.

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

Good morning. I also would like to echo that of my colleagues on the task force. It was a completely humbling experience to work with these folks in their

various areas of expertise.

2.1

I am a former child abuse prosecutor myself and have since moved on from that position in the District Attorney's Office, but I think it is clear that Pennsylvania has a long history of wanting to protect kids, and we have several good statutes which we have tried, I think, over the years to patchwork that protection in. But it became clear through our testimony that we heard that there are just some serious issues that exist with even being able to account for the number of children that come before us that are abused.

So we know that there's a definite need for a revision of, how do we account for children that are abused? And one of my roles in the task force was to remind people that we have a civil definition of "child abuse" which is handled by the Children, Youth and Family Services, and then we have a criminal definition of "child abuse" which is dictated by the Crimes Code.

So the example that Jason pointed out -- I noticed everyone kind of sat up and thought about that for a minute -- is really how "child abuse" is defined by the civil definition. And one of our objectives through the task force was to try to mirror those two so that we had more interdisciplinary ability to work together.

Pennsylvania back in the nineties said, we want

to have multidisciplinary teams. We want people who are child abuse caseworkers and Children, Youth and Families and police officers, if they're traveling along this parallel path, we want them to try to work together and for the best interests of the children, which comes back to the child advocacy center, which I'm sure our Chair will address in a little bit.

But we did implement some statutes to make that happen, but what kept happening in reality in the field was that the child abuse investigators for CPS kept butting up heads with the criminal investigators, and a lot of that had to do with the statutory implements that were obstacles to them and to their ability to work together. And so a lot of what you'll see in our report is an attempt to really marry the two and, as consistent as we can be across the board, make those definitions the same so that we don't have an example, as Jason pointed out, where a child is assaulted in broad daylight by a complete stranger and Children and Youth cannot be involved, and therefore, that child, on a national database, is not counted as an abused child, okay?

Pennsylvania looks great in the numbers. When I was first appointed to the task force, I looked at the numbers for Pennsylvania and we looked wonderful. I was like, wow, we're really low in our numbers. And then it

became evident that one of the reasons why we're so low in those numbers is those numbers only account for the work that is done by Children, Youth and Family Services, not by law enforcement. And those numbers only account for those cases where the children were specifically indicated on an abuse for a named perpetrator.

So all of the cases where Children, Youth and Families was working in general protection, trying to make sure that children had a clean home, went to school, had adequate clothing, adequate food, none of those children were considered abused and none of those children's numbers were showing up on the national database. So one of the things that I think our report also recommends, if you can get through the technical stuff, one of the things that it also recommends is the need to be consistent.

So really my purpose today is to simply address a couple of the Crimes Code changes that we're proposing, and they're quite simple. The legislation starts in your report on page 241, and it deals first with the physical assaults of children.

We heard testimony from two former Philadelphia prosecutors, a very talented woman as well as a current Philadelphia prosecutor and another colleague of mine, Sean McCormack, who works in the District Attorney's Office here in Dauphin County, as to the obstacles when it comes

to prosecuting cases where children are victims.

2.2

And I know all of you with your experience in the Legislature are well aware of the current legislation or the recently passed legislation that allows children to testify by closed-circuit television, all for good reason. But as a trial prosecutor you can imagine that when I'm asking 12 people to convict someone and call that person a child molester or a child abuser, they want a lot of proof, and they want to be able to judge that child — they want to see that child; they want to judge that child's credibility in person. So even though that's an effective step towards us being able to prosecute these cases, jurors' expectations are not always realistic with what we expect of children.

I like to tell a story to put that in perspective. Years ago when I was a new prosecutor in the District Attorney's Office, I was sent to a training, and it was for sexual abuse and how to prosecute those cases. I was very pregnant at the time with my first child, and one of the tactics that the law enforcement instructor used was to pick out someone in the room and ask them to describe their first sexual experience, and the point that she was trying to make was to get all of us to realize how difficult it is for any one of us as an adult to talk about that in public in a room full of strangers.

Well, I was the lucky one that got chosen, and being very pregnant, I just kind of panicked. I was like deer in the headlights, and I said it never happened, you know? And she started to laugh and so did everybody else in the room because clearly it had happened, but she pointed it out as an example of, children in that same situation, often when they're interviewed for the first time in dealing with it, don't want to admit that it happened. So a lot of times the first response they get is, "That didn't happen. I don't know what you're talking about," and I know exactly how that feels.

So one of the things we heard about, going back to the Crimes Code, is the difficulty in prosecuting cases against children when they're physically assaulted. And Cindy had mentioned that Pennsylvania, really under the definition that existed in the CPS Law, did not adequately protect children, and I felt and I believe that I convinced some others on the task force to agree with me that the Crimes Code also did not do an adequate job in protecting children.

We have a history in Pennsylvania of protecting certain classes of people. If you look at the aggravated assault statute as it exists right now on the books, we recognize that certain people, just because of who they are or the type of employment they have, are entitled to a

heightened sense of protection and, therefore, heightened penalties if they are assaulted in that capacity, so why wouldn't we offer children that same protection? So what we're proposing under the aggravated assault statute is simply by age, and determined by the type of injury that they suffer, they're a protected class. So if they're under 4 and they have bodily injury, it's one crime; if they're under 12 and they have serious bodily injury, it's another crime, and the grading also increases based upon their age and the type of injury they suffer. We think it's very reasonable and it is consistent with what we have done historically in Pennsylvania.

As well as the simple assault statute. There was one glitch that we found in that, and that is, under the current simple assault statute, you had to be 21 in order to be guilty under that section that protects kids. So we're simply making that, if you're an adult, if you're 18 or over and you assault a child 12 or under, you're subject to a heightened degree of penalty as a misdemeanor of the first degree.

One of the interesting things that we heard about

-- and very sad -- in the testimony was that we had

children that had been involved in the system through

Children, Youth and Family Services and then were being

removed from school, which, as you can imagine, school was

probably the place where they got away from the abuse if the abuse was occurring in the home or at the hand of a paramour of the parents, and so then you're also removing that child from all the neutral eyes that are on that child throughout the day. And we had information from various witnesses that children then were dying, because there was no one to really keep track of them, number one; and number two, they had already been involved in a system, and sometimes when the caseworkers went there or law enforcement went to the home, there was nobody who would really tell them where the child was. There were excuses about, well, the child's with so-and-so or the child went shopping, all the while the child was being systematically, physically abused to the point of death, and we had a couple of those cases that were talked about to us.

so we'd like to propose an amendment to the endangering the welfare of children statute to provide that people who reside in the home have a responsibility to report -- if they reside in the home or if they're the paramour of a parent and they know that a child is being abused, they have a responsibility to report that abuse under ChildLine, you know, which is simply a phone call. That's all it is. They can even remain anonymous. But if they want to absolve themselves of liability under "endangering the welfare," they're obviously going to have

to prove that they made the call, okay? It gives the authorities the ability to make sure that that child is safe.

The other changes that we're proposing under the "endangering the welfare" section is that people should have a responsibility when the authorities come there to make sure that they're not trying to protect the abuser, and so there's a separate section that really says it will be a crime if you do not -- if you prohibit the authorities, law enforcement, or Children and Youth from detecting the abuser at the home.

A couple other things I just wanted to touch on briefly, and then I also would be happy to answer any questions relative to our work on the task force, is that I have been handling most recently a lot of child pornography cases, and these are very troubling cases for us in Pennsylvania. Many times, we cannot connect the people who possess this material with actual assaults on children, but we have also had people who possess this material and then we've had information from children that they have been abused by these same people. This is an epidemic as far as I'm concerned in Pennsylvania right now, and our sentencing guidelines are woefully inadequate to address the type of behavior that is being demonstrated in these movies, these videos, these images.

Unfortunately, we can't show them to you, and I don't think you would ever want to see them. When I prepare for trial on these and I see these images, there are things that I can't forget about for weeks. They stick with you forever. And I often feel bad even having to show them to a jury when we get to that point in a trial. But the Federal system, and I know that there's a lot of talk here in Harrisburg about the removal of mandatory sentences, but I would ask that in this particular case you recognize that, first of all, mandatories are done at the prosecutor's discretion, so the prosecutors have the ability to determine whether or not someone is truly a first-time offender and a low-level offender and their risk of recidivism based upon the information that we have before we even ask for it.

And additionally, we with a mandatory would be protecting the most vulnerable segment of our society — these kids. I don't know of any research, and I would be happy to review any that anybody could suggest, that would show me that people who have this predilection to this type of material are really rehabilitatable. Clearly, the sentencing guidelines right now, if you are a first-time offender and have possession of child pornography, it's probation to 9 months. So even if we were to go through a trial, many times these folks get probation.

And I have to tell you, many of the defendants that we prosecute have jobs and have families, and so I think the courts are often persuaded by the fact that they otherwise seem to be productive members of society. But this is a very dark crime. I'm positive that it leads to the exploitation of children on many levels, which we may never be able to truly gather the data on in terms of human trafficking, kidnapping, abuse by people that these kids know, abuse by complete strangers, and then the people who have it and view it, the crimes that they are committing on children.

So the Federal system actually takes into account the number of images that a person has, what the children are required to do in the images, including bestiality, bondage, those types of things, and they assign a sentence based upon the content, which is, I think, where we need to go in Pennsylvania, and I would seriously ask you to consider doing something along those lines.

My friends at the State Police tell me that when they prosecute or try to investigate these cases, they have so much difficulty gathering the information, because most of the companies, computer companies, are located out of the State. So what we've proposed and supported and I believe was considered by the General Assembly previously was administrative subpoena power for police to get limited

information to initiate an investigation so that they can start the process moving. And it also has certain timeframes on it that are reasonable, so that if nothing develops out of it, we are protecting people's privacy and returning the information or destroying the information.

So I would ask your support of that.

And finally, we heard from doctors. You know, we all like to think as prosecutors or police officers or CYS solicitors or former Judges that we're on the forefront of protecting kids, but we heard from pediatricians who as well are foot soldiers when it comes to protecting our children. And sometimes they're the first line of defense when a call needs to be made against a parent, and they have to actually see that parent in the examination room and still report it.

We heard from them that they are often intimidated and retaliated against for making those reports, so we've proposed -- and this is really the genesis for it, but I think we made it broader than just pediatricians -- we proposed a crime for retaliation or intimidation against a witness in a child abuse matter so that we can protect the integrity of the investigation and we can protect the integrity of the prosecution and we have witnesses who are willing to not only come forward but stay committed to protecting Pennsylvania's children throughout

- the process. And so I think that you will find that also,
 after page 241, in the proposed amendments to the Crimes
 Code.
 - I think that's all I have, and I probably took

 more time than I should, so I apologize. But thank you all

 so much for your attention and your hard work.
 - MR. HECKLER: I wonder if we might -- I,
 Chairman Watson, share your uncertainty about the
 technology. If Dr. Berger is hearing us and has been
 hearing us and can join us. I'm not sure whether she would
 wish to make any comments at this time, but I'd like to see
 if we can afford her that opportunity. She certainly was a
 key contributor to our efforts and deliberations.

I see your picture.

DR. BERGER: I can hear you.

MR. HECKLER: Great.

DR. BERGER: I'm not sure that you can hear me.

MR. HECKLER: We can.

DR. BERGER: Okay.

So I was just going to make one comment and say thank you for having us speak here. This is Rachel Berger from Pittsburgh. I think Cindy reflected my views very, very clearly here.

I said I've been in this field for more than 10 years, and I would say I'm the front lines insofar as I

have taken care of hundreds and hundreds of children with physical abuse, some with sexual abuse, as well as other kinds of problems, like failure to thrive, severe neglect, lack of supervision, multiple other problems, and I can't state strongly enough some of the issues which Cindy raised about how the definition of "physical abuse" has really, the current definition has really made it difficult to protect children on the front lines before they have injuries which are fatal or near fatal.

I've also practiced as a PCP for 6 years before I started in child abuse, and I was struck by how the issues in primary care today are still the issues that we're faced with, where children who are involved with CYF are involved with actively getting services and the primary-care providers have no idea that CYF is involved in the lives of their families.

We had one of the physicians testify,

Dr. Amy Nevin, who said that about 40 percent of her

caseload or the children she sees -- she's in a very

high-risk area of Pittsburgh -- are involved with CYF, but

she has no idea what 40 percent that is because the cases

are opened and closed without her ever knowing. And CYF

can get information from her and ask her for it, but if she

asks them, they cannot provide her with information. And

so the idea that you can even practice primary care without

knowing things such as CYF is involved in the children's lives and providing services for huge risk factors really interferes with our ability to care for children.

2.2

And I always say the primary-care providers are our safety net for children, and we need to do everything we can to allow them to practice in the best way possible so that they can protect children, because that's really where the primary and even the secondary prevention starts. Once as a system, if I see the children and CYF is seeing the children, honestly, we're almost too late.

So I wanted to thank also Mr. Heckler for doing a fantastic job to lead this task force and also to say this was an unbelievable experience for me to hear all the different people testifying and also the expertise of the other people on this task force. So I can hear everything that's going on, so thank you.

MR. HECKLER: Thank you very much, Doctor.

And if I may just piggyback on those comments for a moment, Dr. Christian has down "break down the silos";

Dr. Berger covered a part of it. Let me branch that out into the criminal justice end of it and the broad range of Children and Youth Services.

Purely in the interests of adults, we have in the existing laws a number of different silos, a number of different, oh, this information is confidential; the

alleged abusers have rights not to have this shared. We don't keep records at all for a variety of reasons on what we call child protective -- I'm sorry.

MR. KUTULAKIS: ChildLine.

DR. CHRISTIAN: GPS.

MR. HECKLER: GPS; thank you. General protective services, and they tend to be -- and I know the doctors will back me up -- general protective services are thought to be more dealing with neglect than overt abuse. Kids, if we're talking about actual kids dying, they are probably statistically more likely to get neglected to death than they are beaten to death or strangled to death. There's no record of the GPS services. If you aren't treating a child within normal ranges, there are all kinds of possibilities. We need to have, we need to maintain records of those, and at least for law enforcement purposes, those records need to be available.

We've already established and I think the language here proposes the treatment that doctors need to know, and in some cases I think maybe there's even more restriction now than the law requires. But the doctors who are providing treatment need to know, there needs to be records maintained when kids receive services, and at least when there's a reasonable reason to investigate, those need to be available.

And we certainly see in some cases either parents moving from place to place, from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, so even the Child Protective Services may not know what happened. You know, they're in Bucks County one month; they move up to the Poconos. Those folks don't have a clue until they have to discover in some way that there's a child in need. And then law enforcement isn't going to know at all, when finally you reach a threshold where maybe there are reports and a criminal investigation, they're not going to have access to this.

2.1

So we really try to require those records be maintained, not destroyed at any point, for those limited confidential purposes. Not something that, you know, generally follows you around, but if there's a reason to focus on that child's well-being, we can go back, because very little of this stuff just suddenly pops up.

Again, I don't want to belabor. For instance, CACs, we really haven't covered those in depth. I'd like to. But we all want to maximize the opportunity -- there are quite a number of you here -- to entertain your questions.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Well, thank you very much.

I'm going to turn it over to the Members for questions and get some dialogue going here, but first I

have a question.

You emphasize a lot and you just mentioned the CACs in Pennsylvania. Could you explain, for those who are not aware, what the function is of a CAC, and what is your vision? The task force did put a lot of emphasis on CACs. Would any of you want to talk about that?

MR. HECKLER: I'd be delighted to. And Jason probably has more expertise; I'll let him sort of follow up. But let me just stress, if there's one tagline that I've taken from this, if there had been a CAC -- first of all, CACs are the logical extension of the multidisciplinary team, which are required in every county. The DA is supposed to be in charge of sort of setting up the protocols -- don't necessarily exist. And in some of the smaller counties where the resources are limited, that's understandable but not acceptable.

A multidisciplinary team, at a minimum, involves the Children and Youth worker, who should be present in every county; law enforcement, you know, State Police, local police, whoever is looking at a particular alleged criminal, a crime committed against a child; and somebody from the prosecutor's office. That's at a minimum. You then bring in other people, depending on what the resources in that county are.

One of the resources, and it's funny, these CACs

have sprung up differently in different communities. Bucks County happens to have the only one that actually originated with a victims' service agency -- with NOVA, in our case. Many of them spring up in hospitals, because the hospital has a convenient place. The kids, in many cases, require some sort of treatment, either, you know, a rape test or just physical treatment. But one way or another, the thing that the CAC adds to this multidisciplinary team who already is getting together, looking at the background, helping each other with the investigation, not "Oh, I'm law enforcement; I don't talk to Children and Youth, " "Oh, I'm Children and Youth; I can't talk to law enforcement," and "I'm the prosecutor; I've got to eventually pull this all together and prosecute," but everybody gets together, lets their hair down, and actually cooperates.

You then, to get to the CAC, you have a person who's key to this, a qualified forensic examiner, somebody who really doesn't have a dog in the fight, isn't looking to get this child to say "I was abused," either sexually or physically, but is simply skilled at talking to kids as kids, talking to them at their particular level, whatever that may be, and is particularly trained in asking nonleading questions.

One of the problems I dealt with, at least one case that still troubles me as a Judge, is where a young

woman who was sort of a little wishy-washy just in her general character, and maybe because of things that had happened to her at the hands of her father, was questioned by her mother, a priest, and about three different police officers in the course of a day, and ultimately her testimony wasn't tainted, but a whole lot of defense material was generated simply because none of those people just let the child tell her story.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so the CAC, a lot of people put emphasis on bricks and mortar, the idea that you have a nice, safe place with maybe some pictures of balloons on the wall where the child -- and again, some of these children are quite young -- can feel comfortable and can feel safe, and then be questioned, we find right from the get-go on videotape, in an environment where it's just them and this trained, friendly, comfortable "interrogator," if you will, although it's hardly an interrogation, with them in a remote location behind a one-way mirror or whatever, the police, prosecutors -- I mean, at least all of our CAC interviews happen with one of my prosecutors on the other side of the window -- and after the question takes place, then there's an opportunity for some dialogue so that, you know, the criminal justice needs of the interview are met. But the child is hopefully only put through it once, ideally.

And I will tell you that I think some of the testimony, for instance, from Mr. Stedman is maybe the most striking, although I think even up in -- well, I'm forgetting the county.

MR. KUTULAKIS: Jefferson County.

MR. HECKLER: Jefferson County. Once they had the CAC in place, they have had practically no trials of these cases. In some cases, even where the guy steadfastly "Oh, no, this didn't happen, couldn't happen," finally they sit him down and say, "Hey, watch this video," and at the end of that they fault. So an enormously effective technique to save kids from having to go through the experience of a trial.

Jason, what did I miss?

MR. KUTULAKIS: Mr. Chair, if I may, you really have two pieces of the puzzle going on here. One is the multidisciplinary investigative team. That's those people that the Chairman described.

The CAC is the home where they all get together. We have counties such as Adams County, I think one of the best in the State. They developed it with some funding from the community. This is not something that takes a lot of money to put together. It is a very, very necessary component to improving the system in Pennsylvania.

We need to make sure that we have protocols for

the MDIT, the multidisciplinary investigative team, in every single county, that they are functional, operational, with checks and balances. And I think in our report we suggest that that information is checked by the committee that the Chair suggested at the onset to here today. Make sure that those protocols are in place, because statutorily it should be today, and I've got to tell you, it's not.

The CACs, we've suggested, should be within a reasonable distance for the child so the child doesn't have to travel and be further traumatized by traveling long distances, and furthermore, having our professionals having to travel long distances to convene as a team. It's all about getting those people to have the expertise to bring the child in for, it's a one-stop-shop process. You have the forensic interviewer, not an interrogator -- I'll take issue with that terminology in the system -- but a forensic interviewer. That's somebody who has highly credentialed training on how to speak in a developmentally appropriate way with the child.

For instance, when I started doing the trainings, one of the things you do is to build a rapport with the child. You draw an oval on a piece of paper and say, "Johnny, we're going to draw your face. Is that okay?" "Sure." "What's on your face?" "Eyes, nose, mouth." Being the genius that I think I am, I want more

information: "What else is on your face?" and a kid looks at me and studies my face, can't figure out what I'm getting at. I say, "Well, what do you hear with?" "Ears." "Where do they go on your face?" Silence; crickets. And I draw them on my little drawing: "Is this where they go on your face?" He says no. "Well, it seems to be this is where they go on your face." At the end of the day, the point is, ears don't belong on your face to a young child. They're very concrete thinkers. They belong on your head. So if you don't have a trained forensic interviewer that's asking developmentally appropriate questions of that child, you're never going to learn how that child was sexually assaulted by mom's boyfriend.

We need to have CACs. It's the most important thing we come out of this with: CACs, highly sophisticated and trained, a well-oiled machine, the MDITs, and that's really what ChildFirst does. We're training the members of the MDIT. If I can impress upon you, those two things have got to come out of this body.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Do the CACs receive any State funding at all?

MR. HECKLER: At this point, except for maybe a few might have gotten grants, I think generally---

MR. KUTULAKIS: I can tell you, Cindy Horshaw is here from DPW. Right now there are some Federal bring-down

dollars from the Child Justice Act, and they're using some of that information to study these things, to give them a little seed money. So I know there's a little bit of money coming down from the Feds on this, but I don't know about any State direct funding source.

2.2

MR. HECKLER: Counsel, as I told you, Counsel Taylor, who has the real dope here, PCCD has given some grants to a few of these. One of the important sources is the needs-based budgeting through DPW to Children and Youth Services. And I will tell you, for instance, Bucks County, there's a charitable component both through NOVA, in this case the sponsoring organization; a lot of the hospitals kick in money. Montgomery County, Risa Ferman, has done a spectacular job at fundraising through, I think it's a kids' place.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Mission Kids.

MR. HECKLER: Mission Kids; thank you. So it depends on the community.

What we are suggesting that you folks do, that the State do, is come up with sort of an endowment, some money. You shouldn't be funding these things entirely. This needs to be a collaborative effort, but certainly money should be available through the needs-based budgeting. A good bit of what our CAC runs on is money and other resources that have been allocated through the

Children and Youth budget, which ultimately comes from the Commonwealth.

MR. KUTULAKIS: Can I just add to that?

We already have a lot of the players in the system that are being compensated -- the caseworker, the county detective, the prosecutor. They are already in place, so it's a matter of getting them together. A lot of this is already there. It doesn't take a great deal more money. We need to have the structure from you to make sure it happens.

There will be some money that's required, but it's not as much. When you talk about adding MDITs, they're already doing the work. We need to get them together as a piece of the machine.

MR. HECKLER: The big thing that probably goes beyond the multidisciplinary investigative team are these interviewers -- and I stand corrected; not intervogators, interviewers -- but they need to be specially trained and somebody needs to pay them. But in some cases, they might even be able to ride the circuit.

Although I will tell you, in Bucks County, I think we had 600 interviews last year. And they also clear cases. You know, in some cases it will be "No, nothing did happen here," and obviously, particularly in custody disputes, there are either confabulated claims or one way

or another. You know, it cuts both ways. But the ability to have, as I say, an endowment, some funding for which PCCD might be an appropriate sort of vehicle, so you could have a grants approach.

Many places, it is hospitals. I'm not sure to what extent, in our new health-care environment to what extent the State will be involved, but that may be another vehicle in which some State money would be forthcoming.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Okay.

Chairperson Watson, a question?

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

First, rather than a question, because I have

Members who are absolutely chomping at the bit, and the

truth is, I've got all your phone numbers. So if I don't

ask you questions, I'm just the one going to be at the

other end going "Can you talk to me now?" or "Can you call

me on my cell phone?" So plan on it; yes, it's me when you

get that phone call.

But very seriously, I first want to thank you. I think the expertise in this, really what seems like a long time, I'm sure, if somebody's filming it but is a brief vignette, I think, and, well, I'll use this one because mine's annotated, but this document, a wealth of information and certainly a very good roadmap of where we

1 want to go.

2.1

2.2

I'd like to turn it over to questioning, and I know that Representative Bishop may have a question, and then I'll allow my time to go to Representative Moul over there, my Vice Chair, who had a whole list of questions even before he walked in the room.

MINORITY CHAIRWOMAN BISHOP: I'll try to be brief. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you so very much for all of your time and all of your patience, and it's an awesome job that is ahead of all of us.

I would really like to direct a question to Dr. Christina?

DR. CHRISTIAN: Christian.

MINORITY CHAIRWOMAN BISHOP: Christian.

Dr. Christian, I spend a lot of time as an ordained Baptist minister doing sessions and sort of almost like consulting, though I'm not a doctor, but always trying to help those in church, especially the youth. We do a lot of times in the evenings, a lot of times on Saturdays and Sundays, talking about problems that many of our children encounter, especially those that are mentally ill.

It has been the theory of some of the ministers that I've talked with recently and some of the parents that many of the outstanding, well-known mass murders that are

treated and possibly might still be being treated and the combination of not getting all the care they need or going off medication that they need. And they feel that many of them have been violated in some way at a very early age, may not have talked about it and may have grown up with a lot of anger and a lot of hatred, and when they get certain medications and don't take that medication and don't get the care and the counseling they need, then they go off and they're so mad that they just shoot anybody, and they feel that these mass murders, many of them, could be caused by that.

So in your study and you being a doctor and seeing them every day, is there any possible validity that a child who doesn't have all of the care they need, doesn't have the kind of concern, may be home and nobody is paying attention to them, do they have those kinds of tendencies, and is there a combination of the medication and their condition that could cause that?

DR. CHRISTIAN: Okay. So I think that there are a lot of questions kind of embedded in that question. So my first answer is that there is very strong evidence that children who are victims of child maltreatment, whether it's physical neglect, sexual abuse, have high rates of mental health disease, not only as children but as adults.

But there's also incredibly strong evidence that children who are maltreated as children also have higher rates of all of the common physical problems in adulthood that lead to morbidity and early mortality, including higher rates of heart disease, obesity, even cancer; higher rates of depression; higher rates of sexually transmitted infections; higher rates of almost every disease that you can think of.

2.1

So even from a financial point of view, if you wanted to save this country billions and billions and maybe trillions of dollars, if you could do something about child maltreatment, you could affect the health and the well-being of the adult population and save enormous amounts of money on health care, okay? Because it's not only your genetics that predict your diseases as adults, it's the epigenetics. It's the influence of stress hormones on a young body and how it influences our decisionmaking and our immunological response to stress. And trust me, this is emerging scientific data that will really help inform how we think about adult physical disease as well.

I also believe -- so the answer to the first part is yes, children who are abused are going to have terrible mental health problems. We also have a problem in this Commonwealth and in this country that children who are

involved in child welfare have high rates of use of psychotropic medications, and we don't use psychotropic medications accurately or well in this Commonwealth and in this country. There are some children who are undertreated and there are some children who are overtreated, and we don't have enough mental health clinicians, psychiatrists, child psychiatrists, to ensure that what we're doing for children and the drugs we're putting them on sometimes are appropriate, are adequate, and are well monitored.

2.1

2.2

And there are movements in this Commonwealth and throughout the country to really look at these issues, but I will tell you that sometimes our laws, those silo laws, those HIPAA laws and other laws of protection, do not allow for communication back and forth between our behavioral health systems and our child welfare systems. And, you know, part of what we need to do is break down kind of these silos.

I know that in the Federal Government they just passed a law, like last week, that started to break down the educational silos, so that now children who are in foster care, there must be information shared about their education back and forth between the schools and child welfare, right? So breaking down FERPA a little bit to allow educational data to go back and forth between child welfare and schools so that we can ensure that kids in

foster care are in school, are getting the appropriate education, somebody knows that they are in trouble. We need those same barriers broken down between child welfare and our HIPAA laws.

And I believe and I did tell the Chairman on the way here that this is an area where Pennsylvania could be a leader in the nation to say that when we have children who are placed in foster care, we want to break down the barriers between their primary-care doctors, the doctors who are supposed to be protecting and ensuring the health and well-being of children, and child welfare. We want them in communication. We don't want doctors hiding behind HIPAA saying "I can't share that information" or our child welfare laws saying "Well, you can give me information, but I can't tell you anything about this child." We need to break down barriers, wrap our arms around children.

And I don't know, finally, the data on mass murderers, because I don't know that there have been enough studies really. But I think any of us would believe that young adults, adolescents or young adults who do these horrendous things to children have very serious mental health problems that absolutely need to be addressed in more appropriate ways.

MINORITY CHAIRWOMAN BISHOP: Thank you, Doctor.

1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: Representative Moul.

2 But I do have to, may I check with Chairman Caltagirone

3 | that he -- no? We're good?

2.2

Then, Representative Moul, the time is now.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Thank you, Madam Chairs and

Chairmen. I appreciate it very much.

I'm Representative Dan Moul from Adams County, and thank you for the plug.

MR. KUTULAKIS: It was sincere.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: And believe me, it was a great segue into one of the things I was going to mention, the importance of our CACs. And I'll very gloatingly say I have the best one in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, right down the street from my district office, and I encourage everyone who would like to see one in action and how they are designed to work to not only help our court systems but to help the children, which is the main basis of what it's geared toward. Please come down and take a look at that.

And I would also encourage our committees to respectively bring some of these professionals in from the CACs and let's jump into their brains, because they have issues of their own that they need to convey to us as lawmakers to help them out. This is probably the most serious issue that we will face in this building, as far as

I'm concerned.

2.1

One of the things that I want to throw out there as far as CACs is, should we be setting or should we look at setting standards of operations for CACs so that they're all operating across the State rather than having 67 different sets of rules and regulations and how we go about operating it? One of the things, and I'm not looking for an answer there necessarily, but, you know, we should think about this.

And I know we're running late on time. Just two more quick things.

I heard, you know, that we should have recommended penalties for those who do not report child abuse. What would be a reasonable amount of time, and is this something that we must address legislatively?

MR. HECKLER: If I may, presently it's a misdemeanor of the third degree for those fairly limited people who are identified as mandated reporters and who fail to report. So that's within the existing structure. We recommend both raising that, if I recall correctly, to a misdemeanor of the second degree, which gives you more range in terms of sentence, at least discretion with the court and the prosecutors, and very substantially expanding the universe of people who are required to report.

And one of the things that is fascinating, and we

see it in the Sandusky case, there are a bunch of people who don't know whether they're required or not and for whom it comes as a surprise that they may be mandated. One of the approaches that we've recommended, and we recommend that everybody who gets a license to do anything from the State, you know, be a beautician, lawyer, doctor, or Indian chief, be a required reporter. You may well get some pushback on that, and that's an area that, you know, you folks as the elected Representatives, you can figure out who should be.

educated, and it's not that tricky these days. I'm on a Boy Scout board, and I managed to find my way, as computer illiterate as I am, through the training and get approved. But we suggest, for everybody we can administer it, have them sign an oath; have them sign something that says, which will certainly help prosecutors when we find out that they have not been reporting, but it will bring home to these folks, hey, you know, I'm signing this; I'm going to be subject to criminal penalties; and if it's a licensure issue, I may lose my license to do whatever it is, practice my profession, and we recommend that as another penalty.

So absolutely we think that's something you folks need to attend to and have made our recommendations.

DR. CHRISTIAN: But -- oh; I'm sorry.

MR. KUTULAKIS: If I could, currently the requirement is an immediate report. We're not suggesting that should change. In fact, that's the way it should be; a mandated reporter, a person required to report, shall immediately make an oral report. Think about the school setting. A kid comes to school and says "I'm being abused." You don't want Johnny to go home to the abusive setting; you want that report to happen immediately. It has to be followed up within 48 hours with a written report from that mandated reporter giving more details about what they're reporting.

2.2

So that's the current status. We're not suggesting that should change. In fact, I think we would say it should not change.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Okay. Thank you.

One very last quick thing. I must admit I'm a little derelict in my duties. I didn't get all the way through this book yet, and I'm working on it. Where does Münchausen by proxy fit into this?

DR. CHRISTIAN: You know, Münchausen by proxy, it's not a very common problem. It represents parents who kind of feint or fabricate illness in their children and repeatedly bring them in for kind of medical care that is unnecessary, and it's a really very terrible way to harm a child.

1 You know what? If you think about the example I 2 gave of interfering with the breathing of a child? Like 3 sometimes parents suffocate children but, you know, they let go just in time and then they save them. It would be 4 5 included in there. And I don't know if it's spelled out 6 specifically, but it would probably be---7 MR. HECKLER: If we can get back to you on that. I know that arose in various testimony and discussions, and 8 9 I think specifically it is addressed, but not by name---10 MR. KUTULAKIS: Right. 11 DR. CHRISTIAN: Right, but not by name. 12 MR. KUTULAKIS: Not by name. 13 MR. HECKLER: --- and we'll have to hunt it up for 14 you. 15 REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Okay. That mental illness, 16 in my opinion, needs to be defined---17 DR. CHRISTIAN: It's in there, I think. We'll find it. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: ---as opposed to grouped 20 with everyone else. But thank you very much. I really, 2.1 truly appreciate what you people are doing for us. 2.2 MS. BERNARD: Could I just make a point as well? 23 REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Sure. 24 MS. BERNARD: With regard to your previous 25 question about how long someone has to report? So they're

answering you, under the Child Protective Services Law, as it relates to a mandatory reporter and the expansion of that definition. But under the proposed recommendations to the Crimes Code changes, there would be additional requirements for people who live in the home where the boyfriend or girlfriend of the parent know that the abuse is occurring, and a failure to do so more than one time can lead to a course of conduct, which would be a felony, versus under the old law where it was a misdemeanor for simply failing to report, if that helps explain it a little bit better, too.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: It does. I just didn't know if we needed to address that here.

MR. HECKLER: Well, I assume what you're concerned with is essentially a defense that we don't want to be prosecuting the mother, for instance, who obsessively, because of her mental health issues, is making these reports.

There is a false-reports section, and actually one of the things that pops up that you wouldn't think about right away is some of the savvy teenagers who end up in institutions of one sort or another, because the courts have placed them there, and then figure out ways to get over on the system by reporting that, oh, this counselor or that counselor abused me, and that needs to be dealt with.

We've got language in there that does that.

2.1

But just from a prosecutor's standpoint, I've got plenty of people to prosecute. If I've got a crazy woman who everybody is satisfied is off the deep end, I'm not interested in prosecuting her. There have been very few prosecutions of people who fail to report in any event. One of the things, however, it does -- and we'll have to find you that section -- we were concerned with dealing with it from the child abuse standpoint as actually addressing that can be, as I recall, a child abuse just so that Children and Youth can be involved in helping to protect that child, who may suffer some very real consequences as a result of that constantly being dragged back to the doctor when there's nothing wrong.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: We have four other Members that have questions, but I just want to give a plug for the Lehigh County CAC. I actually had made a visit there last year, Representative Harhart and I. They have an excellent CAC as well.

MR. HECKLER: There are a ton of them out there that are doing great, and the real issue is, and I know Prosecutor Bernard has mentioned, you've got to truck kids several hours---

MS. BERNARD: We come to Dauphin County or we go to Pittsburgh. So if you can imagine, even though we tried to say a reasonable amount of distance where the child lives, putting a child in the car and traveling 2 ½ hours to get here with a team of people, having that child undergo an intensive interview, and then sending that child back to their home, it's a whole day for that child. So I'm not so sure that 2 ½ hours is a reasonable distance.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Yeah.

MS. BERNARD: If we could make it, you know,
45 minutes or less, you're going to also be more
efficiently using the personnel involved in the case, which
goes back to the whole cost.

You know, if we're talking about the economics of a CAC, as Jason mentioned, many of the individuals involved in a CAC are already being paid to do their job, but now we're going to do it more efficiently and we're going to save money that way, because we're going to be doing it one time versus three different times.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Okav.

Representative Stephens for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Well, I guess, I mean,
I would be chastised at home if I didn't recognize

Abbie Newman from Mission Kids, the Montgomery County Child

Advocacy Center, which I was a founding board member of, by

the way, and I think does an excellent job in addition to
Lehigh and Adams and all the other wonderful institutions.

I can see we're going to go down the road here with every
one of them.

Thank you all so much for sharing your knowledge with us, and fortunately I'm familiar with many of you from my work in the DA's Office back in MontCo. But I wanted to focus specifically on the issue of mandated reporters, and I know we were just talking about it briefly.

I introduced a bill last session that would have made everybody a mandated reporter, and I know, DA Heckler, you just made a comment that sort of just about everybody and their uncle seems to be included in the list. I mean, it's very comprehensive, the number of folks.

MR. HECKLER: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Do you envision, is the standard a subjective or objective one when it comes to that mandated reporter? In other words, is, you know, the kindergarten teacher who might be a reading specialist with enhanced training held to the same standard as the HVAC guy who happens to stop in a school to fix the heating and cooling system, or are they different standards that would apply?

MR. KUTULAKIS: It's very subjective. But keep in mind, it's reasonable basis to believe that the child

has been a victim of abuse. There's no need to conduct an investigation. In fact, you shouldn't do one. We should let the MDITs do that. The idea is to open the door to have a communication with the professionals. Let them do their job and screen out cases where the child has not been abused.

2.2

But it is subjective, and the reason -- and I'm familiar with your bill. The reason this task force, we debated about this, is it's important to train those people, the mandated reporters. And it's not just making the report. A mandated reporter doesn't simply make the report. They can make an oral report, but then the next step is a sophisticated written report.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: But I guess the question is, when you have every independent contractor who could come into contact with children and every employee of a mandated reporter and every independent contractor of a mandated reporter, I don't, just from a practical standpoint, see how you could possibly train every plumber, every electrician, every -- I mean, I'm going through the building trades right now, but do you know what I mean? I mean, it's an exhaustive list.

So I can certainly appreciate -- and like I said, I'm on your side. I mean, I think, you know, if you see a child being abused or you suspect that a child has been

abused, you should pick up the phone and report it. I just wondered, getting back to something that DA Heckler said, how do we effectively make sure people understand who is obligated to report it?

When it becomes so complicated in terms of, well, am I an independent contractor of a mandated reporter, I don't know if you get that far down the road for those people to really understand that they have that obligation, and then aren't we defeating the purpose by making it too complicated?

MR. HECKLER: Well, I don't know that we so much envision the building trades who might wander into a building, although that may be a reasonable reading of the broad language. That's for you folks to craft. We certainly wanted to capture, and again, reflecting on Sandusky, the people who would provide educational or supervisory services who might well not be directly employed in the school.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Okav.

MR. HECKLER: For instance, one of the reasons the colleges were pulled in, and in fairness, why there may have been some ambiguity on the part of the folks at Penn State, they're not normally dealing with kids under 18, except sometimes they are, both some younger kids going to school but also all these enrichment programs, all kinds

of other settings in which it turns out, lo and behold, we do have younger kids in the university.

So I think, number one, you're right in terms of maybe it needs to be focused more in terms of who needs to educate and what education is appropriate, but the standard, as Jason articulated it, of having a reasonable basis to believe, you know, the HVAC guy isn't going to have a reasonable basis to believe pretty much unless he walks around the corner and, you know, à la the shower scene out of Sandusky.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Sure.

MR. HECKLER: He just doesn't have that kind of interaction. It's going to sort of naturally focus down to the adults who we'll be speaking with who will have a much more intimate kind of interaction with the child to ever be in that situation.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Okay. And that's sort of what I was getting at with my question: Did the task force intend to really make that relevant to those independent contractors that would routinely come in contact with children, you know, more so than the HVAC system or the plumbing system? I mean, it seems like that was really the intent, to focus on those that are routinely in contact? Is that——

MR. HECKLER: Sure.

```
1
                 DR. CHRISTIAN: Yeah. And who are responsible in
 2
       their -- like who come in contact with children in their
 3
      professional lives, whatever your professional life is.
 4
                 REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS:
                 I did just have sort of a technical question, and
 5
 6
       I guess you guys all have the report there.
 7
                 On page 77---
                 DR. CHRISTIAN: I've memorized it.
 8
 9
                 REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: All right.
                                                       I don't
10
       doubt it, knowing you.
11
                 MR. HECKLER: I wouldn't call her on it.
12
                 REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: On page 77, in the very
13
       first full paragraph there, Roman numeral (i), the small
14
       letter "i" there, "In the case of an employee or
15
       independent contractor of a mandated reporter, notify the
16
      person directly responsible for supervising the employee or
17
       independent contractor on behalf of the mandated reporter."
       Should that also include notifying the mandated reporter?
18
19
                 MR. HECKLER: Well, you understand that's an
20
       "and." So the first thing that they've got to do,
2.1
       everybody has a direct obligation to report to ChildLine.
2.2
                 REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS:
                                          Right.
23
                 MR. HECKLER: And then, let's see---
24
                 REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: I mean, I think I get
25
       the intent.
                    I think the intent was to bring the -- if the
```

mandated reporter themselves doesn't suspect it but one of their employees or independent contractors does, then you obviously want this to still go up the chain of command, even though that link is sort of missing. I just wondered if there was a deliberate reason or if I'm missing it or if it was just an oversight or something like that. But it just seemed to me like the mandated reporter -- I didn't know why the task force didn't say "notify the mandated reporter" who would then send it up the chain as opposed to going around the mandated reporter.

MR. KUTULAKIS: Because they are the mandated reporter. This describes the person's actions. So this is the reporting process. The report, the person's required report, a.k.a. the mandated reporter, that person has to make the call to ChildLine first and also the mandated reporter must report up the chain of command.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Right.

MR. KUTULAKIS: That way we avoid the Penn State debacle.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Right.

MR. KUTULAKIS: That's what that is describing.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Well, no; this talks about someone reporting on behalf of the mandated reporter. That's what it says, the last sentence there.

I mean, I can talk to you guys about it

```
1
       afterwards; I don't want to tie up the meeting, but it
 2
       just, the language about reporting "on behalf of the
      mandated reporter" is what confused me and some of the
 3
       staff members here as we reviewed it, and we're trying to,
 4
 5
       you know, kind of sharpen the pencils on it.
 6
                 MR. HECKLER: And right now it's stumping me.
 7
                 REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Okay. Well, I'll
       follow up with you guys.
 8
 9
                                 This may have come out of the
                 MR. KUTULAKIS:
10
       institutional, the hospital setting, where somebody is
11
       incredibly busy, like Dr. Christian.
12
                 MR. HECKLER: Yeah.
13
                 MR. KUTULAKIS: Gets hands on the kid, says "I
14
      have a reasonable basis to believe child abuse occurs," and
15
       they have a point person, and I don't know who that is.
16
                                 Social worker.
                 DR. CHRISTIAN:
17
                 MR. KUTULAKIS: The social worker.
                 REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: So she's directing
18
19
       someone to report it on her behalf.
20
                 DR. CHRISTIAN:
                                 Right.
2.1
                 REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Okay.
22
                MR. HECKLER: Yeah. That's doctors in
23
      particular.
24
                 And in fact another one of those little things,
25
       one of the most useful things we may do in all of this,
```

right now, ChildLine has very specific requirements that require things to be either done live over the phone or in writing, and ultimately in writing. We authorize e-mail. You know, here it is, the 21st century; you can use e-mail.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Right.

MR. HECKLER: Because doctors are hanging, doctors who should be treating people are hanging on the phone, and in fact in some places, even though it may not meet the requirements of the law, they are already delegating a unit clerk or somebody like that to hang on the phone because ChildLine backs up their delays, and a doctor could be burning a heck of a lot of time just waiting on the phone. So that's a yes.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: That's very helpful. I really appreciate it. That sheds a lot of light on it.

I have one last, what I think is a quick question, and I'll certainly touch base with the rape crisis centers on this issue, but it surrounds the privilege concerning rape crisis centers with statutory sexual assault. And I just wondered, and DA Heckler, I know you made reference to this, or maybe it was

Ms. Bernard, I'm not sure, but one of you made reference to the fact that oftentimes a child, when first asked about a sexual encounter, isn't entirely forthcoming, and I just had concerns about a rape crisis counselor making a

determination as to whether or not something was statutory sexual assault, which, as we know, is consensual, versus either a sexual assault, which is without consent, or even a forcible rape. You know, to me, it was something that I wondered whether you thought that requires some additional investigation that maybe we don't want rape crisis counselors to have to perform in order to assess whether we are dealing with statutory sexual assault, a sexual assault, or a rape. Can you comment on that and why that carveout was there and whether or not you think it's best to leave that unreported?

MR. HECKLER: This may be getting at, and again, let's make this a pro tem answer and maybe we need to look more closely at this. In fact, I've been dealing with my local people on this issue.

There is a legitimate concern on the part of rape crisis centers that they will not have, particularly teenage girls who are sexually active, whether we'd optimally like them to be or not, 15, 16, 17, 18 years of age, and who have some kind of sexual relation with a boyfriend, with somebody who's a juvenile. If they know that the rape crisis center worker is going to have to report that, they may not speak with them about it, they'll just keep mum, as opposed to getting some psychological counseling, maybe some physical, you know, STD counseling

and being checked. So we weighed sort of a carveout, do we want to give these people some leeway not to have to report the relationship which may technically, depending on how you define it, be a lower-level crime. But, you know, you're weighing that they're not going to get any counseling at all.

So I want to look at the language, but that is certainly, let's put it this way, that's an issue that's going to be before you one way or another. What we did may be the right way to handle that. Certainly there's a legitimate balancing in terms of whether there ought to be some limited exception to the reporting requirement where you're talking about not an adult victimizing this child but some kind of more or less consensual conduct taking place amongst peers.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: May I just interject one thing and ask a quick question and we'll move to our other people.

Pulling it back from mandated reporters and so forth, I am correct -- am I not? -- that any one of us can report child abuse.

DR. CHRISTIAN: Yes.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: Can you give a

1 2-minute, because there are people in the room who may not 2 realize and there are people who will watch this on PCN or 3 wherever. And I guess it's a commercial I'm trying to do, 4 but I want people to understand, while we prefer, and our 5 mandated reporters are trained, indeed the protection of 6 children is a responsibility for all responsible adults 7 anywhere in the Commonwealth. So could you do that little 8 commercial, one of you, about how indeed we do that? 9 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: You just did it. 10 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: Well, no; they have to 11 give the number. 12 MR. KUTULAKIS: I think you did a great job. 13 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Doctor. 14 DR. CHRISTIAN: Although there are some 15 individuals in Pennsylvania whose professional 16 responsibilities are to ensure the health and the 17 well-being and the safety of children and they are mandated reporters, every citizen of the Commonwealth of 18 19 Pennsylvania can report any suspicion or concern they have 20 about child abuse simply by calling ChildLine at 2.1 1-800-932-0313. 22 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: And that number again 23 was? 24 DR. CHRISTIAN: 1-800-932-0313. 25 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: I've watched cable; I

1 know they do this, and it doesn't cost \$19.95. So you can 2 do it for free. But it's very serious. Sir, thank you. 3 4 MS. BERNARD: Mrs. Chairman, can I just say one thing to you? If an individual believes that a child is 5 6 being abused, until we can get some implemented changes to 7 have consistency between the Child Protective Services Law and our Crimes Code, I would ask that they also reach out 8 9 and contact their local police department to report those 10 concerns, because many times cases that are referred to 11 Children and Youth under the current law would not go to 12 the police for further investigation. They would simply be 13 handled as a civil investigation. 14 So we need to make sure that our children are 15 being protected by law enforcement to the extent that we 16 can as well as Children, Youth and Family Services. 17 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: Thank you. 18 MS. BERNARD: Thank you. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: 19 Thank you, 20 Mr. Chairman. 2.1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: That was a very good 2.2 idea. 23 Representative Brown, I believe you're next. 24 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: You know, as we all take 25 this very seriously, unfortunately I've had issues come

into my district office, and we have parents that come in and they report that incidences are happening with their children. Either it has been a boyfriend returning back from incarceration; it has been a parent. And I often have not really been confident that we've handled it as correctly as we probably should have, and it leaves me to wonder with the mandated reporting how other people in society are confident in reporting.

You know, it's good that we just did that commercial, and I want to thank our Chairwoman, you know, moving on to your new career in journalism, for having us do that, because education is a big piece to this. And with the report being here, you know, and we're making these recommendations, if we don't add a broad media education to this, I don't know how effective we really are, because we know this in this closed room, we all have been educated well, but this is widespread throughout our Commonwealth more than we even want to admit.

You know, the numbers that you talked about, you thought our numbers were kind of low and then you realized we weren't really reporting well. I believe the number is even higher than that, because people have come into my office that probably didn't even make that channel, you know? Because when you have a mother that, you know, they want to walk me into almost a closet and whisper to me that

this is happening in their home, and then when you tell them, well, you need to do this, this, and this, you know that they walked out and they haven't done it, because it's a hard thing to do, to report your mate. And sometimes they have come back two and three times when, you know, there should be a proper way to address this so they don't have to come back and we can help to remove that burden of shame that is associated with protecting children. So I just wanted to put that out there, that really if we're serious about it, we have to put money to it and we have to do an education campaign on this.

My other concern was about the oath. I saw that there is a recommendation that teachers and other mandatory reporters sign an oath, and I was just wondering, would there be a clearance house where that oath would be stored? You know, how is that administered, and what would be the penalties if somebody did not have all of their staff do the oath?

MR. HECKLER: I'd have to look at the penalties. It certainly wouldn't be above a misdemeanor of the second degree.

The oath, at least as we've proposed it, would be
-- and I'm going to scrub the bureaucracy -- but the

Department of State licensing folks, that would actually
have to come back -- in order to get your license to be a

teacher, well, now, the teacher is the Department of Education, but whoever the licensing agency is actually has to have that oath.

Let me just throw in a plug. As I mentioned,

Delilah Rumburg, another member of our task force, is here.

One of the notes she continued to sound throughout is

prevention. Certainly education goes hand in hand with

prevention. There are a number of outstanding programs.

I'm going to again screw up the exact title, but I believe

up in York, Operation Front Porch or something similar -
Front Porch Light -- in communities, that's another

component of this. It's much harder to quantify, but

certainly educating people to the needs that this happens

is enormously important.

Let me emphasis the role of Children and Youth Services within each county. That's another place this can be reported. They are the people who, of course, will report to law enforcement if the matter rises to a crime but are involved within the communities. And I think some of the proposals we've made -- for instance, getting the solicitors involved -- we've attempted to parallel what we see in criminal justice, which is the police -- law and order -- the police and the prosecutors work as a team to get to the end of the day, and the Children and Youth workers, many of whom need training, need experience. It's

a tough job and it doesn't pay very well. There's a big turnover. Having them guided by and assisted by legal counsel to make appropriate choices and administer the law effectively is another one of the recommendations we make.

DR. CHRISTIAN: But we have also talked about we really need a culture change -- right? -- where the culture in the State, the culture in this country, is to protect children. And so part of that is education and part of it is building our laws that protect children and being serious about our laws to ensure that they really do protect children. So I think we're in support of kind of all of that education and public awareness.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

DR. CHRISTIAN: Can I -- oh; I'm sorry.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Go ahead.

DR. CHRISTIAN: You know, I want to emphasis one thing that was, I think, very important in our report that I don't think has had due diligence, and I just want to make sure everybody understands because I think this is an opportunity, and I'll only take 3 minutes to do it.

Right now, we have two laws. We have a CPS law and we have a general protective services law. In the CPSL, cases get reported to ChildLine or a county; they get numbered; they get investigated. And then after they're investigated, if they are indicated or founded by a Judge,

then they go on a registry somewhere. If they are not indicated, then they get expunged and they go away forever. So that 6 months down -- or no, no, 2 years down the line, if another report comes in, nobody knows that there was a CPS investigation in the past.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On the GPS side, in the GPS law, those cases get reported often to the county, sometimes through ChildLine, but they don't get numbered. There's no statistical recognition of them in our child abuse reports, in our State reports. And the county knows about them, but no other county knows about them. The State doesn't know about them. And some of the fatalities we see, and I've reviewed plenty where there has been a CPS report, a CPS report, 12 GPS reports, another CPS report, a GPS, 4 more GPS reports, and then a death, but nobody is looking at everything. And one of our recommendations is that we do away with a system where we throw out the cases that there is just not enough information to indicate it, maybe that we know it's child abuse but we don't know the perpetrator so it gets thrown away forever, or all of the GPS cases that never get counted by the State and nobody knows existed, and those are the families that go from Montgomery County to Berks County to Lehigh, all over the place, where nobody knows that they existed, and really, just for very specific purposes, maintain a record that child welfare has

1 been to this household, not once, not twice, but seven

2 | times in the last 10 years, so that you really know what's

3 going on in a family so you can make meaningful

4 interventions earlier into that family, and I just wanted

5 to stress that.

MR. KUTULAKIS: To support that from a pragmatic approach, financially it allows you to put performance

8 measures in place.

MS. BERNARD: That's right.

MR. KUTULAKIS: So we spend lots of money through our needs-based budget, millions if not billions of dollars annually, and we're not measuring the GPS, the vast majority of cases, that come into child welfare. So by numbering every single incident where the family comes into contact with the county, you then can start building performance measures so that down the road we can say, this is a good place to spend money on this program; this one, maybe not such a good place.

DR. CHRISTIAN: Right. We don't know what's going on.

MR. HECKLER: I wonder if I could take and seize the opportunity that Representative Brown gave us to get back to another point that I think you folks are going to encounter in the course of your deliberations, and that is the dilemma that, and it typically tends to be women,

mothers of children who may be subjects of abuse by paramours, husbands, whatever.

2.2

As prosecutors, we encounter women who are abused, who decide by the time of trial certainly that now they weren't abused, either because they would prefer some more abuse to being, crassly, without the income; they've decided he'll never do it again and I accept that. We treat them like murderers and, wherever we can, just go ahead and prosecute, and in fact we just won a case not long ago where the woman testified for the defense "never happened" and we proved it did.

That is one thing where it's simply a woman who's being abused. It becomes gravely more serious, in my view, where the woman is saying -- and it falls to women primarily, although it could be the reverse -- you know, "My child was abused"; "Well, no, my paramour didn't do it" or "I won't report it," "I can't report it." Now, to some degree, that may be a matter of fear of abuse herself.

These are tough issues. These are tough issues that the victims' advocacy community faces, and it's one of the reasons why many of the victim advocacy groups haven't embraced CACs.

I take the view that the child's welfare comes first. I think women are making a sad choice to ever tolerate this in their own lives, but I don't believe

they've got a choice about whether their children are subject to it, both from a mandatory reporting standpoint and, you know, would I prosecute a woman who -- and clearly parents are mandated reporters -- would I, not necessarily with glee, but would I prosecute a woman who failed to report the abuse of her child? You betcha. And I'm not going to tell you that any of those choices are easy or that the situation advocacy groups find themselves in if Mom says, hey, this is happening; I need help; I need to be protected but we dare not tell on the father or I don't want to tell on the father. Where a child is involved, I don't think that choice exists anymore.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Representative Barbin.

REPRESENTATIVE BARBIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for your testimony today.

I was struck by your discussion, Dr. Christian, about the fact that our current system doesn't allow us to look at two related but not exactly identical problems for children in our Commonwealth, and I was wondering, I was reading your task force on where we're going to go with this computer technology. Does any State in the country allow for a person who has been abused or even a report that has been founded, does any State's computer system allow us to document not only what happened -- we need to

do what you're suggesting, the same number for this child regardless of which computer system they're in. We need to do that. But is there any current system that allows a person that might be in New Jersey who has neglect, in either system, and then comes to Pennsylvania, for those facts to be known by whoever is going to be reviewing the information, whether it's on the civil side or the local policeman that gets the same report in Pennsylvania? Is there any way for that person to know, the local policeman to know what happened in New Jersey or Florida or anywhere else?

DR. CHRISTIAN: There's no Federal system that I know of. Right? There's no Federal system.

MR. KUTULAKIS: Unless there's a criminal conviction, of course. But if we're talking just the civil piece, I've been working for years with the Feds trying to figure out the general definition that the nation could use on what is child abuse and how do we track it. There is none.

REPRESENTATIVE BARBIN: All right. So the question is, if we're going to spend money to set up CACs or these multidisciplinary investigative teams, shouldn't we be coming up with a standard first? Because we did this same thing twice before. In Pennsylvania, we established an emergency-responder program, but nobody bothered to get

the same mechanisms of radio waves as to how we were going to pass information back and forth between first responders, and now we're surprised we've spent a couple billion dollars at Homeland Security but our firemen can't talk to each other. So shouldn't we be doing the definition first before we start spending money on the CAC or the MDITs or the computer system?

MR. HECKLER: Well, I think you're posing two things that aren't in opposition. This thing goes on all kinds of -- you know, it's like the marshalling yard with all kinds of tracks. I think the people you should hear from on that rather than anybody who's here is probably the Department of Welfare would be the most knowledgeable, as well, perhaps to some extent, the State Police, and, well, Welfare is familiar with what the local municipalities do or local counties do but especially in a large county like Philadelphia or Allegheny, because that kind of recordkeeping is largely within the civil system.

At this point, we're asking that, A, it be expanded and that it be maintained so that law enforcement can reach into it in appropriate circumstances rather than that it all be seamless. You've got a great analogy and certainly we're pulling out our hair, you know, down home with those issues, but I don't know that it's exactly the same. Because as a prosecutor, I don't want to just be

able to punch up everybody whose family has had some kind of GPS services. If I've got something short of probable cause but a reason to believe, typically a police report, that a child may be endangered, then I want to be able to go to them and say, hey, I need any information you have about this child, about if there's a named perpetrator, so it's not quite the seamless communication situation.

MR. KUTULAKIS: And if I could further that.

If the question is, should you wait to begin the regimented development of CACs and ensuring MDITs are sophisticated with well-trained professionals, there cannot be any other answer than absolutely not. This needs to happen. Children are being victimized.

The CACs, there's a national accreditation process for CACs. They have to be a nonprofit, and there's a lot of structure that's available for them and they're proven to work. Dauphin County, their CRC, which it's a type of CAC but it's the Children's Resource Center here, has been in effect for 20 years servicing thousands upon thousands of children effectively so they don't have to —they get to tell their story. If there's a child abuse case there, we figure out who did it and there's swift prosecution in appropriate ways.

Equally important, they figure out if the child abuse did not occur. We don't put people into the system

that should not be in the system. This is a proven, effective tool, and to wait and not streamline money for this process would be the worst thing that could come out of this report.

2.1

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE BARBIN: If I was suggesting that,
I apologize for that suggestion. What I was really asking
was, don't you really need to have a standard that's the
same at every CAC and a standard that's the same in every
District Attorney's Office on these things first in order
so that there aren't differences as we go down the road?

MR. KUTULAKIS: And I think that's an important
point; I think it's a good point.

Right now, the task force that's handling the Criminal Justice Act? the Child Justice Act? The Children's Justice Act moneys, they have a task force that they are developing uniform protocols for the MDITs and the CACs. The CACs generally operate under the national nonprofit structure, but I can tell you, I've looked at the protocols. Unfortunately, our authority, we ran out of time. We had a proposal we were going to try to incorporate into this report. We just simply ran out of time for that.

But I agree with you. The answer to that is yes.

MS. BERNARD: And, Representative Barbin, if I could just say, too, that my understanding of the various

CACs that are operating across the Commonwealth is that they are very specific to what the needs are in the community. So even though we can have accreditation procedures put in place, the CAC has to directly address the needs of a particular community. So they all kind of look a little bit different maybe, but there are certainly already protocols in place for what each one has to have in order to be considered an accredited CAC.

And the MDIT should be spearheaded by the District Attorney's Office. And they as well, some counties are going to have county detectives who are going to lead every child abuse investigation; some counties, the expert for those investigations is going to lie within the local police departments. So I think the District Attorneys are in the best position to understand where their strengths lie and which personnel are going to be best capable of handling those in conjunction with the child abuse investigators for CYS.

MR. KUTULAKIS: And Ms. Taylor has just reminded us that all but two of our CACs in Pennsylvania are nationally accredited. So in order to receive that accreditation, they have to have this uniform process and protocol in place. The other two are in the pipeline, so they're going through the process. So that's one issue.

And then you have the issue of, should the

protocols for the MDITs from each county be uniform? I think the answer is probably yes.

DR. CHRISTIAN: One other thing. If you have an accredited CAC, you already have law enforcement, the prosecutors, Children and Youth, often with a health, like a medical component, working together. All right?

We also want to be clear that we never believed

-- and I think I speak for everybody -- that we really need

67 CACs, okay? Because in some rural areas, you won't have
as many cases. You don't need that one county to have a

full CAC, but you may want to have regional CACs for some

of the rural areas, but then when you have, you know,

high-population counties, you'll need a CAC in each of

those counties.

So again, not 67, but more than we have now to make it better for both the children and for the investigators.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Okay. Thank you very much.

Finished? I think Members are finished asking questions.

I do want to say the Judiciary Committee is having a meeting on February 4 and also February 11 to consider many of the recommendations -- not all, but some of the recommendations -- that have been submitted to us by

the task force. Our staff went right to work right after we got the report, and I want to give thanks and also acknowledge Tom Dymek, our General Counsel and Executive Director of the Committee, and the other legal staff that are here.

And I just want to say thank you to your staff,
Mary Taylor and Jim Anderson, for your expertise and your
help with this task force.

You know, the Members of the Committee and the General Assembly and the Governor and all the people of Pennsylvania, we can't thank you enough for what you have done -- the time that you have spent, the energy, and your passion. It's obvious the passion you have for the children of Pennsylvania, so we thank you very much.

There is lots to get done, much to get done, as we said earlier, so let's get to work. Thank you.

MR. KUTULAKIS: Thank you.

DR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Do you want to say something?

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: Just briefly, first of all, I would like to echo Representative Marsico. I'm new to being Chairman of Children and Youth. I rely on the gentleman over here, Mr. Scarpato, who also attended all of your task force meetings. So I'm very fortunate to have

1 that, to have him by my side.

I may be new to the Committee; I'm not new to some of the issues and have been a person who has advocated for children, perhaps from my background as an adopted child who is the parent of an adopted child, and both of us, luckily, have never suffered abuse. But the stories that I have heard, I consider myself very lucky from the bad start that I had and the family that I ended up with, so that gives me something of a passion.

I will work with my Chairman, Representative

Bishop, in a bipartisan way. We have already started.

We've parceled out ideas and bills and been meeting. I've only been on the job -- 2 weeks, John, I've made your life miserable? But whatever.

DR. CHRISTIAN: We made his life miserable, too.

MR. HECKLER: Yes. We broke him in for you.

He's a good man. You're going to be well served.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN WATSON: All right.

I will announce then, and I've already said "John, we need a timeline," so we have a Children and Youth Committee, an informational meeting, on February 12, 9:30, and that's in room G-50 in the Irvis Building. We'll discuss the child welfare system in Pennsylvania.

We have many new Members on our Committee, so I want to help us all have a good basis for understanding so

we can come to a better understanding in creating and crafting legislation. We're going to have a special focus on the response with the child welfare system to child abuse. It will give us the foundation we need.

And we're scheduling meetings during what is referred to as the "Appropriations break." While Appropriations hearings are going on in this room, we will be having some Children and Youth meetings for our Committee in any other location we can find in the Capitol.

So we will be busy. We will get to work. We very much look forward to working with the Judiciary Committee. And we have heard you, we have read what you've had to say, and we are planning to act.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Thank you,
Chairperson Watson, and we look forward to working with
your Committee as well.

You know, we talk about staff, and we have a great staff. Staff just pointed out to me -- Counsel Dalton -- that I gave the wrong Committee dates, meeting dates. February 6 and February 12 are the Judiciary Committee meetings.

Chairman Caltagirone for a final comment.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you,

24 Mr. Chairman.

2.1

2.2

And my dear friend, Dave, it's good to be back

with you. You all did a great job.

Just to let you know, my new Chief Counsel,

Lauren Orazi, worked very closely with Tom Dymek, and the

package of bills, answering a lot of the questions that you

raised here today, will be ready. And it's a shared

package, both Democrats and Republicans, that was parceled

out.

And Ron and I work very, very close together, and you can rest assured that we're not going to duck these issues. We're going to face them; we're going to try to get this rolling for you. Thank you all.

MR. HECKLER: Well, we're certainly confident of that. And I think you get a sense from all of us, if there's anything we can do to help in this process and to just engage in it in a dialogue. My brain dumps, so I have to go back and remember what we did, but these folks know better. We're happy to be of any help we can.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Thank you very much.

(The hearing concluded at 12:20 p.m.)

1	I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings
2	are a true and accurate transcription produced from audio
3	on the said proceedings and that this is a correct
4	transcript of the same.
5	
6	
7	Debra B. Miller
8	Committee Hearing Coordinator/
9	Legislative Reporter
10	Notary Public