04-03-022

ORIGINAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARING

IN RE: HOUSE BILL 1533 AND 1838, TASK FORCE ON ADOPTIONS, GUARDIANS AD LITEM, AND COURT APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATES

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF PHILADELPHIA 1700 SPRING GARDEN STREET PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

FRIDAY, AUGUST 25, 2000, 10:03 A.M.

BEFORE:

HON. CRAIG DALLY, CHAIRMAN

HON. DON WALKO

HON. LEANNA WASHINGTON HON. JOSEPH PETRARCA HON. BABBETTE JOSEPHS

ALSO PRESENT:

DAVID BLOOMER
JANE MENDLOW

TAMMY L. BOCK COURT REPORTER



ARCHIVE REPORTING SERVICE

2336 N Second Street (717) 234-5922 Harrisburg, PA 17110 FAX (717) 234-6190

1	INDEX	
2	WITNESSES	PAGE
4	Honorable Paul P. Panepinto	3 5
5	Barbara Ash	1719
6	Maxine Chalker	2528
7	Tara Gutterman	34 36
8	Mary Tomlinson	52 54
9	Margaret Zukoski	5 9 62
10	Bernard D. Faigenbaum	6266
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 CHAIRMAN DALLY: I guess we're ready to get 2 I would like to first thank those who are here 3 today. If we could introduce the Members and the staff, please. 4 REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I am Don Walko from 5 Allegheny County. 6 7 I'm LeAnna REPRESENTATIVE WASHINGTON: Washington, Philadelphia County. 8 9 CHAIRMAN DALLY: And I'm Craig Dally, Chairman 10 of the Task Force. I'm from Northampton and Monroe Counties. 11 12 MR. BLOOMER: I'm David Bloomer. I'm a research analyst for the House Judiciary Committee. 13 MS. MENDLOW: I'm Jane Mendlow. I'm a research 14 15 analyst for the House Judiciary Committee. 16 CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you. I appreciate everyone's interest in the very important issues before us 17 18 today. 19 And we're here to talk about Pennsylvania's 20 adoption laws and some problems that adoption parents as 21 well as the judicial system have encountered through this 22 process and the potential solutions that we in the General Assembly can enact. 23 24 We will be discussing two Bills this morning; 25 those of Representative Kevin Blaum dealing with consent

1.5

to adoption, adoption counseling, and some other issues.

We will also be hearing from people who are on the front lines of the issue, adoptive parents, Members of the Judiciary, and those who would adopt a child.

I think it's important that we as legislators and policymakers hear from people who are in the process of dealing with an adoption. They can shed light on what parts of the system are working and what area's we need to improve.

It's the job of the Task Force to ask the questions that have to be asked to find out what possible solutions there are for improving the existing law so it can better serve our children, our families, and our Commonwealth.

The testimony that you are about to hear today will certainly be an important part in developing and continuing to refine this legislation as we go forward.

So I would like to thank everyone for their participation this morning.

First on our list today is the Honorable Paul Panepinto. He's the Administrative Judge from the Philadelphia Family Court.

Your honor, before you get started, I'd just like to thank you once again for the most enlightening meeting yesterday and the tour of the Family Court.

_ -

_ .

I think that the Members truly got a feel for the problems that you're dealing and the success that you're having in changing the system.

JUDGE PANEPINTO: Thank you very much. I appreciate those remarks and the opportunity to be here. I'm just so sorry I couldn't offer lunch to everyone yesterday.

The 1:00 meeting went on -- and if I had known how long it was going to go -- and I didn't know what your schedules were like, we could have had it a little earlier and maybe had lunch brought around at the office.

But Members of this Committee, thanks again for the opportunity. I guess it is important to tour the building and see firsthand some of the things and some of the programs we have going.

And I think that was enlightening, I hope, for all of you. I think that that's what's difficult because a lot of the proceedings in Family Court are closed adoptions. But it's a happy court.

And it's a court I feel that is working. And the process of adoption is working pretty well in Philadelphia. There have been a number of things and improvements and ideas we've brought to the table.

I want to say that I'm proud of the work there and the initiatives that have been implemented, as I

mentioned to you this morning.

But as you know, the Adoptions and Safe
Families Act seeks to provide children with permanent and
safe homes in the earliest stages of their development.
And we have implemented an Accelerated Adoption Review
Court.

It's called AARC. That's one of the things that we brought forth to help the process. But we've used cases where the parents' rights have been terminated and adoption has not as yet been finalized.

Agency representatives, attorneys, child advocates, and foster parents appear at these hearings so that a determination may be made with regard to the obstacles that are delaying the finalization of adoption.

And each party is ordered by the Presiding

Master to complete their individual responsibilities by a

certain date and the case is given a new 60 day date.

Now, in most of our cases, the matters have been given a

finalization date prior to the 60 day review.

Now, the first step in insuring permanency is the freeing of a child for adoption. We all know that. But all of the literature we read advises how important early stability in one's life leads to healthy adolescence and a secure childhood.

Hence, by restricting the amount of time that a

consent to adoption may be revoked, we expedite the process of implementing a permanent plan for a child and comply with the mantra of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, and provide meaningful counseling for birth parents so they may feel comfortable in the decision they make regarding relinquishment and adoption are of utmost importance.

And counseling that is specifically related to adoption and the emotional issues surrounding relinquishment and adoption not only provides a comfort level at the time a parent makes their decision but serves as a foundation for how their decision and loss affects their lives forever.

Also, the parent now has been linked to a valuable resource that may be accessed in the event other issues arise surrounding this decision at a later date. And our adoption branch receives numerous inquiries from adoptees seeking to locate their biological parents. Sometimes they contact us desperately seeking to ascertain clarity regarding various genetic illnesses.

In response to this need, we have developed and implemented our own Birth Parent Medical Information Packet which is provided to attorneys and agency providers.

The Court requests that this packet be

completed and submitted prior to the finalization of adoption. Accordingly, we believe that any initiative directed at securing medical information is a worthwhile endeavor.

In conclusion, as to my former remarks, I would like to state that the happiest day in Family Court is a Friday. And I guess that it's fitting that we're here on a Friday.

This is a day when children come to court with their parents and finalize their adoption. We have them every Friday in Philadelphia. And these children now have permanency and stability, something they so rightly deserve.

In the Family Court Division, we have always worked hard to finalize and give permanency in the lives of children. So I think that is a long-standing goal and something that we think very important. Kids deserve no less.

And I know that's part of the mission of this Committee and the intent of the Legislature in passing laws. One of things that's so important is the fact that we have an opportunity to talk and dialog with the other agencies of government and specifically the Legislature.

And I think it's important that before laws are passed that you do look and consider all of the persons

involved in the system and hear what they have to say.

And that's why I looked at the list of those that are speaking.

And I think all of them have a stake in the system, have worked hard to make the system and improve the system. So I think that their remarks are very important.

As a judge, it's kind of difficult because I am not allowed to give my opinions specifically on a lot of issues. But I could tell you, as the Administrator of the Family Court, that we have 900 employees. We have 22 judges. We have a system that's quite large, the largest in the State of Pennsylvania.

And we are processing adoptions at a quicker rate. We're cutting down the barriers that impede getting permanency in a child's life.

And even in cases where there are no adoptions in the foreseeable future, we are moving along to work toward getting the kid, the child, the children in a more permanent place so they can be secure.

And they have the right to go on and get the kind of education and other benefits that go along with that. So I think that our court initiative is really moving along. And we're working in a model court which handles cases in a very different way.

Dependancy is an area where kids are deprived and abused. The kids come into our system with all kinds of problems. Parents may even just want to dump their kids.

It's getting -- it's happening at an alarming rate. But you may be causing neuroses, too, about problems in the community where parents are so upset.

They don't know where to place their children, what kind of help to get for their kids. So what happens is they're finding an increase in numbers that, Oh, you can just come to the Court and we're going to solve all their problems. Well, the judges can't do that. The Court system can't handle the overload that easily.

But working with other agencies in a collaborative and cooperative effort, we have been able at least to guide those families in the right direction. And I just think it's kind of difficult because of the overwhelming caseload. We have a large number of cases each day, maybe 30 to 40 in a courtroom, 5 judges, 5 courtrooms per day.

You need attorneys for fathers, mothers, for the child, child advocates, everybody has to be present in order for the case to move forward.

So you can see what happens if someone doesn't show up and there has to be a continuance. That's a delay

in that child's life. That's a delay in getting that family a final decision.

But we've been working in an effort to create the model court. I want to mention to this Committee, because we think it is really -- that's why it's called a model court, because it's something different in Pennsylvania.

And the true aspect of the model court is really to achieve what is everybody's goal and what this community is looking at is permanency for a child.

And we want to emphasize our strategy. Being one judge, one family where we have cases assigned to one judge to complete from beginning to end. And we're working in that area, and we want other agencies to work along with us.

That's one of the difficult things, the problem, because we need everyone on board in this program. We have a time specific and accelerated court calendar. Our cases are dealt with every 20 to 30 minutes.

And they're time specific. We have trained all parties prior so that they understand they're rights and responsibilities.

We have a collaborative effort with the various departments. That has been unprecedented before in

1 | Philadelphia.

And we have data collection and tracking which is always important to emphasize about where we're going, to show how we've done things, and what direction we should be taking. We've had to analyze it.

So we have that available to the Committee. We have that available to the public. We make this available to the City and to the Department of Human Services.

And in looking at this House Bill and in other ones to come through the legislature, my request, and something that I feel personally is very important, is that each and every time a tough -- when I say tough, I mean a difficult decision has to be made in changing the law or in accommodating someone because of a problem that exists that we, the Court, should also be consulted and advised.

And I'm not saying that what we say you must accept. But I think that if you can listen as you are doing today and make us a full partner in sharing with you our problems, I think we could come up with better laws and better solutions.

So it's in that spirit that I come here personally, not with all the answers and certainly not all the solutions to some of the things that you have to bring forward through this Committee, but certainly to assist

and to let you know what we are doing and we are

accountable for our actions. So I will address any

questions that I can. Thank you for the opportunity to be

here.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you, Judge Panepinto.

One of the concerns that had been expressed at previous hearings by perspective adoptive parents is the revocation of consent just prior to the Adoption Decree being signed. And one of the things that the proposed legislation does is it establishes a deadline of 30 days during which a natural parent can revoke the consent. And I would like your thoughts on that.

JUDGE PANEPINTO: You know, I personally feel that it's a sensitive matter from wherever you are coming from. If I'm going to adopt, and I want to adopt a child, I certainly want that child with me.

And once a parent allows and consents to that, to have that revoked, I guess, almost at any time is going to be heart-wrenching and very difficult.

So I understand the need for timelines. And whether it really is 30 or 60 days, there is no right answer I don't think.

But I think the sooner that the child is in his or her adoptive parents' home and they're knowing that's where he or she is going to be I think the better it is

for the child. I think the better it is for the family.

It's difficult for the person giving up the child to make that decision. But the circumstances under which they make it is more important, that they freely, honestly know that they are giving up a child and they know that they cannot any longer take care of that child.

The fact that the child is with someone else and is going to receive the important things in life that it deserves is what's important.

So I guess I haven't thought a whole lot of 30 days verses 45 days verses 60 days. But I'm in favor of certainty and some timeline where we can get moving with that child's life. So there's no in between.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Okay. Thank you. I'd like to recognize the Representative from Westmoreland County.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: Good morning. How are you?

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Questions?

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: First of all, Judge Panepinto, I'd just like to commend you and thank you for the thorough discussion yesterday which the testimony today was only just touching on the real substance behind what you're doing. And I also want to thank you for the tour and for allowing us to talk with Judge Ransom.

And, of course, I thank her for permitting us

into her courtroom. It seems that you're touching a lot of lives. And I just wanted to make that comment to you.

JUDGE PANEPINTO: Thank you very much, Representative.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Jane.

MS. MENDLOW: Judge, maybe you could help us with some particulars. Back in 1992, the Legislature adopted the amendment that became part of the adoption law provisions regarding funding for counseling for birth parents with the idea that there was a need for some protection to make sure that people understood when they were giving up their rights.

However, it looks like over the years, the past 8 years, that counseling fund that was connected to reporting intention to adopt, it really hasn't been working.

One of the things that Representative Blaum wanted to do in House Bill 1838 in particular was to try to make some changes to make sure that the \$75 fee that is made out that -- their intention to adopt.

That's supposed to go to the counseling fund to make sure that the counseling funds are available so that it would be connected to the issue of the revocation of consent so they would understand the choices.

And as you said, the circumstances would be

_ -

such that they would not be making decisions under duress and be confused about what the choices really are.

I was just wondering if you had any thoughts in respect to the suggested improvements in House Bill 1838 -- if you've had a chance to look at that because some of the points that we're trying to make, I guess, are that the Department of Public Welfare needs to kind of help the Courts a little bit and focus a little bit more on adoption-related counseling in particular to try to make sure that we somehow define what it is that people are supposed to be getting.

And the other thing is to make sure that the counseling is made available early on in the process, not way down the road when they're in court already, but to kind of help the Court.

If the money is connected to that intention to adopt, the Court's kind of involved and yet it's really more of a counseling function. So we're trying to make some improvements. So I was just wondering --

JUDGE PANEPINTO: One of the things that I think is real important is that the sooner we identify the problem and get to it, we'll get to a solution.

So if we have up-front services, and the sooner the better for those services, the more results and the better impact we're going to have.

So if you have any kind of counseling -- you're right. It's a way to get to see the Judge. And the Judge can make some kind of referral. And I'm sure he or she will be understanding of the issue. But the problems can be solved if we have the counseling and the referrals up front.

Now, I don't know how the money is distributed or where it goes. I guess I could look into it. But I can tell you that if it's through the Department of Public Welfare and if it comes to our division, I haven't seen it.

Unless we're collecting it as a fee when they file, if that's what you're saying, then we do collect it. But we don't have a system that I know of in Philadelphia other than a referral system.

So we don't handle it directly as the Court. I guess other counties, they have County Commissioners and through them the money comes through.

I really don't know how the Courts handle that. So probably somewhere this is an area where there's no cooperation or collaboration. Not that we can't cooperate, but I kind of think it's slipping through the cracks somewhere.

I wouldn't be able to give you guidance on it.

But I can look into it and give you suggestions on how to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

solve it, yes. And I would be glad to do that.

I think that our court, for instance, that's the purpose of that. That's like an intermediary stage. That master sitting there, he has no power to finalize that adoption.

What he's doing is saying, What were the problems here that are holding it up? And if there's a situation where there's counseling or there's something that is needed up front before we get to the final stages and the finalization itself, then that's where we could probably help.

And that's why we instituted that one step because it's a process and we have every agency there that's involved. Now, with the counseling related to House Bill 1838, I read the Bill.

And I think that those services that the agency has need to be certified. We have to be familiar with what they're teaching, what they're counseling about. Those are the timelines.

And when a law is passed, and it's an unfunded mandate, that's very difficult for us, as a court system, to handle because we can't just adapt to it overnight. that's where the cooperation and the discussion point comes in on, how it should be done.

I think it's important, as other agencies

should. And you'll probably hear from other speakers their ideas. I didn't get a chance to look at their testimony or to hear their remarks. So I will be very interested, and I'll stay for a while to hear some of that.

But I would like to look into that problem and try to offer some concrete solutions. And I don't know how long you're going to be working on this or how many more -- how much time I need, but I won't need that much time myself if it's not going to be finalized in 30 days. I think I can help you out in making some meaningful suggestions. I will do that.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: And we look forward to that input. Any other questions for the Judge? Thank you very much.

JUDGE PANEPINTO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: The next individual to testify is Barbara Ash who is the Deputy City Solicitor for the City of Philadelphia. Welcome, Attorney Ash.

MS. ASH: Thank you. I would like to start out by saying that I'm very nervous. I know you don't expect an attorney to admit that to you, but you have an attorney that's admitting to you that I've never testified for anything such as this.

I am proud that my name was given and that I

was asked to be involved. I would like to say that I am Solicitor of Health and Human Services for the City of Philadelphia Law Department.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Very good. Thank you.

MS. ASH: In regards to House Bill No. 1533 relating to consent, House Bill No. 1533, an act amending Title 23 of Domestic Relations of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes to provide consent to an adoption under section (a)(3) of 2711 will likely have little or no impact on the practice of the Philadelphia Department of Human Services.

Such is the case because of DHS's adoption matters; parental rights have been terminated before adoption proceedings are initiated.

Section 2714 of the Act provides that the consent of a parent to adoption shall not be required if a Decree of Termination of that parent's rights has been entered.

In cases where a parent wishes to revoke his or her consent prior to termination of parental rights, then counsel for DHS will determine if there are grounds to proceed to terminate parental rights involuntarily under Title 23, Section 2511 (a) 1-8.

In most cases, there are sufficient grounds to terminate parental rights involuntarily. Therefore, the

revocation of consent has not presented a substantial issue for the Philadelphia Department of Human Services.

In regards to House Bill No. 1838 relating to a putative father, the inclusion of a definition for putative father will not have a great impact on the Philadelphia Department of Human Services cases because, in practice, we have been using the proposed definition.

When DHS proceeds with termination of parental rights, petitions are filed and notice given to the father named on the birth certificate, the father named by the mother, and any person who claims to be the father.

If a mother is unable to name a father, then a petition will be filed to terminate the parental rights of the unknown putative father.

This practice ensures that once a child is freed for adoption, there are no outstanding claims to paternity and, therefore, no one can mount a legitimate claim to the validity of the termination and/or adoption based on a lack of appropriate notice.

Similarly, the other proposed amendments relating to the putative father and voluntary relinquishment of parental rights will have no great impact on our agency cases because when a child's goal is changed to adoption, we have determined grounds to involuntarily terminate parental rights that also exist.

Additionally, it is standard practice for our termination petitions to include information as to whether the parents have planned for, visited, or provided financial support and care for the child.

In regards to House Bill No. 1838 relating to adoption-related counseling services as to House Bill No. 1838 amending Title 23 of Domestic Relations of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes relating to adoption-related counseling services, we do not perceive any great impact on the Philadelphia Department of Human Services cases. DHS currently has a policy provision which is consistent with the proposed requirements.

In regards to House Bill No. 1838 amending
Title 23, the Philadelphia Department of Human Services
worked with the Philadelphia County Family Court Division
to ensure that a birth parent's medical information packet
is provided to the Court prior to the finalization of the
adoption.

In fact, if no medical information regarding birth parents is available, then DHS must submit an affidavit to the Court stating why such information is not available.

Birth parent medical information may also be found in the child's profile which is completed by DHS for every child whose parental rights have been terminated.

Therefore, DHS social workers and contracted agencies are aware of the importance of obtaining birth parents' medical histories.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you. Any questions for Attorney Ash?

MS. MENDLOW: Ms. Ash, I was wondering if you could comment on something. At the hearing that was held in Pittsburgh, one issue that did come up with the requirement under the Adoption Safe Families Act was that if a parent's rights to one child had been involuntarily terminated, then that would put the other children into a category under the Juvenile Act that is now part of the aggravated circumstances for a dependant child and would put it in a fast track for termination of the parents' rights in respect to the other children.

And one of the suggestions that was made at the hearing was that the parents should be advised of the opportunity if circumstances were such that the parent could no longer really parent the child in question, that they look at a consent to an adoption or voluntary relinquishment. And I was just wondering if that ever came up in Philadelphia at all?

MS. ASH: That has come up in Philadelphia. In fact, we've had approximately -- I do not have the exact figures for the Committee -- but approximately a 25

percent increase in voluntary relinquishments by the parents.

Now, we presume this is because a lot of our parents have children who have been through the system and continue to have a lot of the same problems.

Unfortunately, as we all know, drug problems and housing problems perpetuate, continue, and go on and on and on. I don't believe that there is -- we can agree that there is no effective way for drug treatment for most people in America today.

I believe that we are failing very, very much on our drug treatment policies and programs. So, therefore, we have a lot of our parents who have children who have more than one, two, three -- we have had cases where the parents can have anywhere from 10 to 12 children. And they still cannot get their drug problem under control.

There is still substance abuse, or they are still having housing problems, or they're still living on a property where they're still having whatever issues that caused their first children to come into care.

And what we're finding is that a lot of times parents in Philadelphia County -- I don't know how other counties do it.

But the one good thing about Philadelphia

County is that parents when their child is first brought into Court, when we first bring the case into court, counsel is appointed for the parents.

And at that point, the counsel that's appointed for the parents explains to them what it is the Department wants the parent to do so that we can effectively reunify the family.

The attorney advises the parents that the Department must seek to terminate parental rights if you don't get your act together within a year. And we start looking at our cases at about 12 months that a child has been in care.

And a lot of times if a child -- if a parent has not been able to address their issues which cause the child to come into care, then the attorney will suggest to them, Well if they involuntary terminate your parental rights, then that can be used against you at a later date if you have subsequent children.

And parents are starting to more freely relinquish their parental rights. The problem, however, is that there is nothing in the Adoption Act that assists us if we -- if the judge grants our request for aggravated circumstances, there is nothing that says we do not have to further have any efforts to reunify the family. There's nothing we can do with the Adoption Act really

1 until the time limits.

REPRESENTATIVE WASHINGTON: Thank you, Ms. Ash. First, I just want to say you didn't do bad. You did really well being nervous. So that lawyer part of you came out as you went on.

Now, I also want to say that I agree with you when you talked about the need for some drug and alcohol services for dysfunctional families because everybody on drugs doesnt' want to stay on drugs forever.

People do get to a point in their lives where they want to reunify their family, restructure their family. And we need to look at how we change that.

MS. ASH: And I'm proud to say to this panel, that in Philadelphia County, and with Judge Panepinto and our model court, we are now front-loading services and those cases. We are seeing successes.

We're seeing more successes in those cases than we are in the cases that we see down in the courtrooms that do not follow the model court's model.

And it's very unfortunate. I really wish that we had the money for every courtroom so that they could have that. We could have 20 model courts. That court is fantastic. It has made a difference in our children's lives and our families lives because I think it's important that we try keep our families together.

MS. ASH: Thank you so much for inviting me.

I really think that that is the backbone of the American society. And that is what is really wrong with some of problems with American society, that we're losing our families. And that really hurts me. I come from a family of three sisters.

And my parents were married for 46 years. And I do not know what it's like to be abused or neglected.

But I do see it every day. And as an attorney, I cannot tell you that -- I cry every day that I see it.

REPRESENTATIVE WASHINGTON: Just in response to your comment is that women have been the backbone of the family structure forever.

And with this new addiction for women, most importantly, moms who have the opportunity to be -- to have their children back in a structured environment, they should be given a different or special opportunity to go to treatment, as I see it. So those kinds of things we just need to look at.

MS. ASH: Well, I would just hope that we continue in ours and in other counties to see our model court as the model. Because I think it is fantastic. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: I will just add something.

Judge Panepinto, you will have those 20 courtrooms.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you. Okay. Our next person to testify is Maxine Chalker. She is the Executive Director of Adoptions from the Heart. Welcome, Maxine.

MS. CHALKER: Good morning. Thank you for allowing me to testify today. I'm Maxine Chalker, the founder and current Executive Director of Adoptions from the Heart. The agency is a nonprofit corporation licensed in 7 states. We have 4 offices in Pennsylvania.

The agency was founded on the belief that open adoption placement benefits all parties involved in adoption.

Birth parents select the family for their baby.

They meet as often as they choose to, and they can either exchange letters and pictures through the agency or exchange names and addresses and have personal meetings after the placement.

We have been practicing this way since 1984. In 1999, the agency placed 291 infants from the U.S. and international countries, with 94 of the infant placements being from the United States. This year through June 2000, there were 44 infants placed domestically

I am also an adoptee that was placed at birth by a private attorney. I never knew much about my birth family. And, in fact, I received my pre-adoptive birth certificate before the law eliminated this option. And 1 the info

the information had been falsified.

However, I was fortunate to find a very compassionate judge in Philadelphia who assisted me with information that allowed me to find my birth family 17 years ago, immediately before I began the agency.

Prior to this, I worked for Delaware County
Children and Youth Services, a public agency, for 9 years
in the Adoption Department.

In regard to House Bill 1838, this Bill should be commended with addressing the issue of how to access the funds that have been established for counseling and have been accumulating.

There was nothing in the law that clearly stated how to access these funds prior to this Bill. And women should be able to have their counseling paid for. However, the Bill states that DPW will compile a list of counselors, but does not state the criteria for this selection.

I recommend that it should stipulate that only licensed adoption agencies, social workers with a minimum of a MSW degree, or psychologists, or psychiatrists with prior adoption counseling experience be on this list, and that they show proof of education before they are placed on it. Otherwise, there will be no assurance that nonprofessionals will not be added.

Every piece of legislation must be viewed with the idea of protecting the children who cannot speak for themselves. They are an anonymous party to this adoption agreement and must be protected.

In regard to House Bill 1553, this Bill focuses on allowing a birth parent only 30 days to change their mind after signing a consent to adopt.

However, many times, birth parents do not sign their consent in 72 hours. They may sign it 5 days after birth rather than 3. 30 days is too long a period of time. This should be shortened to no more than 7 days.

In New Jersey, as you all may already know, the 72 hour surrender is binding, if it is done by a licensed agency. This is because they can be assured that there has been mandated counseling.

In addition, there are several other things that should be changed in the adoption law. One major one is who may place a child for adoption. Several times in 1533, it states that a revocation must be served upon the agency or adult.

This is a serious problem because just recently there was an article in the paper about a woman in Lansdowne, PA, who was letting pregnant women stay in her home and then finding adoptive parents for their babies.

A woman in Southwest Philadelphia was arrested

for taking money from prospective adoptive families for babies that didn't exist. This bill should state clearly that only a licensed agency or attorney can place a child for adoption.

There is currently no statute of limitations on birth parents. A birth father, who claims he did not know about the birth, can come forward at any time, even after the adoption is finalized, and reclaim the child.

Once again, in New Jersey, they passed a law setting up a birth father registry so that birth fathers have to come forward and register with the Bureau of Vital Statistics and state that they are the father of baby X so that they can maintain their parental rights.

I believe that they should have no more than 90 days to do this. This is a very important issue for the permanency of children. The final adoption decree should be just that, final, with no chance of disruption. Thank you for your kind attention.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you very much. Any questions for Ms. Chalker?

MS. MENDLOW: Maxine, thank you very much for your very helpful testimony. I was wondering if you could clarify something. In the New Jersey law, and I'm thinking in terms of Pennsylvania law as well in contrast, but in New Jersey law, the registration of paternity does

not automatically guarantee the father, the putative father, retains his rights.

Are there not other tests that he has to meet to show that he's had a substantial relationship or has provided some support for the child? Could you give us some information about that?

MS. CHALKER: Well, I'm not an attorney first of all. And I don't believe that he does. I think, obviously, if there was a question about his ability to parent, then an agency or an attorney would file for involuntary termination of parental rights.

But I think if he came forward and the birth mother said he wasn't the father, or if there was a question, there may be a paternity test required. But other than that, he would have -- at least it would give him standing whereas he would have no standing.

I think the obligation that is on the man is to make -- find out if he has relations with a woman whether she gets pregnant and not to all of the sudden want to be a father a year later or two years later and disrupt the plan of the birth mother and the child that are now in that situation.

MS. MENDLOW: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you.

MR. BLOOMER: I just have a quick question.

I'm iust a little bit unclear. I'm sorry if this question 1 2 was already asked. But it deals with the New Jersey provisions 3 where the father has to -- where the putative father has 4 to register with the Bureau of Vital Statistics. 5 Do you know exactly how that happens? Are 6 7 there notices put in newspapers in New Jersey? Or is this purely the responsibility of the father to -- if he thinks 8 9 he may, in fact, be a father of somebody that he would 10 have to register? Do you know any specifics on how that actually works in New Jersey? 11 MS. CHALKER: I'm not positive. But I do know 12 that it's his responsibility --13 MR. BLOOMER: Okav. 14 MS. CHALKER: -- to find out if the person that 15 he was with became pregnant and had a child and what 16 17 happened to that child. MR. BLOOMER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN DALLY: Any other questions? 19 REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: Yes, I have one. Ms. 20 Chalker, you're comfortable with the 7 day period like 21 22 they have in New Jersey? 23 MS. CHALKER: They don't have it actually in New Jersey. It's when they sign in 72 hours. If they 24 sign with an agency, it's binding. There's no court 25

1 hearing.

And the reason for that in New Jersey is in the state regulations, not the law, but the agency regulations, there's a mandated three session counseling before a birth mother can sign her rights away.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: And that is where you get your comfort with the short-time period with a licensed agency with training, obviously?

MS. CHALKER: I really would prefer to see an agency being able to take a binding surrender and take that time away from the Court so that the Court doesn't have to go through a hearing, so that the family doesn't -- no offense to attorneys here -- pay an attorney to file a petition to terminate parental rights.

When the birth mother is consenting and voluntarily signing and she has counseling and it can be proven that she had counseling, that should be sufficient.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Did you say that there are three counseling sessions within that three day period?

MS. CHALKER: No. Before she gives birth.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Oh, okay.

MS. CHALKER: The three counseling sessions are mandated whether she comes -- hopefully there would be more if she came in when she was 7 months pregnant.

4 5

1	CHAIRMAN DALLY: I see.		
2	MS. CHALKER: But if she gave birth and then		
3	immediately called an agency, she wouldn't necessarily		
4	sign in 72 hours.		
5	CHAIRMAN DALLY: Right.		
6	MS. CHALKER: It might be 5 days. It might be		
7	a week. It depends on how she's feeling. She might say		
8	she's not ready to make that decision right now. It might		
9	be a week, or two weeks, or a month, or whatever.		
10	REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Perhaps this is a dumb		
11	question. I'm sorry. And Jane sort of sparked my		
12	question. The 72 hours, is that only after the baby is		
13	born?		
14	MS. CHALKER: Right.		
15	REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Only after the baby is		
16	born?		
17	MS. CHALKER: Yes, absolutely.		
18	REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Okay.		
19	CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you very much.		
20	REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I'm sorry.		
21	CHAIRMAN DALLY: Go ahead.		
22	REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: One more question. So		
23	the counseling, though, can occur during the pregnancy?		
24	MS. CHALKER: Yes.		
25	REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Maybe that would add		

24

25

some comfort to it if it was after the birth, the counseling after the birth, when the mother sees the baby MS. CHALKER: Well. I would think that most agencies that are planning on placing a baby -- a woman comes to them and says she's considering this plan that when she gives birth, they go and see her. And they do ask her, Is this still your plan or do you still want to do through with this? We've discussed the options, things like that. So it's not like she wouldn't get any counseling afterward. And, in fact, most agencies will do counseling long after she surrenders her parental rights. Because even though she doesn't have parental rights, she still needs support and counseling with her decision and with the kind of comments she might get, or any kind of problems she has with her family or the father of the Thank you. Thank you, CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you very much. We're going to take a quick break for our stenographer. CHAIRMAN DALLY: Okay. Our next person to

testify is Tara Gutterman.

MS. GUTTERMAN: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and the House Committee Members.

My name is Tara Gutterman. And I am an attorney and Executive Director of the Adoption Resource Center, a Pennsylvania and New Jersey licensed nonprofit adoption agency.

I am honored to have this opportunity to come before you today to speak about the proposed adoption reform legislation. I have been a practicing attorney for nine years and involved in reform adoption issues for eight of those nine years.

For the past six years, I have acted as founder and executive director of the Adoption Resource Center.

We have placed close to 300 children into safe and permanent homes.

We have also worked with close to 1,000 birth families in the area. Most of the children that we place are considered special-needs children. Special-needs children are those children who are defined by Federal and State Statute as difficult to place.

In a very general definition, special needs children can be defined as children who are born or who develop a handicapping condition. Or they may be children who are simply healthy members of a minority group.

In any event, we believe all children have the

1 right
2 me st
3 Commi

right to a stable, safe, and permanent home. First, let me start out by saying that I commend this honorable Committee for recognizing the timeliness and importance of these new proposed Bills.

These new laws will effect all parties involved in an adoption. As an adoption professional, I am blessed to see all sides to the adoption triangle. I am lucky to meet the birth parents who put their own interests aside to make the best plan for their children.

Most of these families are hard-working, caring individuals who cannot be parents to their infants at this time in their lives when they may be struggling financially, emotionally, or both.

I have held back my own tears on many occasions as I watched a heart broken birth mother kissing her infant goodbye for the last time.

On the other side, I have also had the joy of watching people become parents for the first time, a dream that they never thought would come true.

Yet, even when their dreams do come true, they still cannot relax for 4 to 6 months during the legal risk period of time in which the birth parents can change their mind according to Pennsylvania law.

At each and every placement, an adoptive parent takes a leap of faith that this child that they hold will

be theirs forever.

At each and every placement, they ask me to take off my lawyer's cap and tell them that I know that the birth parent will not change their mind about the adoption and that this baby will be theirs forever.

Unfortunately, I cannot give them that kind of comfort.

I have always told my adoptive parents that so much of what happens is out of our control due to Pennsylvania's long legal risk adoption period.

I can never describe to you the pain that I have seen when I have had to ask adoptive parents to return a baby to the agency because a birth parent had revoked his or her consent. Therefore, I feel that the proposed 30 day revocation period is a vast improvement over the current law.

I am unsure from my reading of the statute whether or not the proposed statute will make this period automatic or whether it will be necessary to have a court hearing to terminate the rights.

I wish to address the issue under the assumption that the consent is binding after 30 days and that there is no need for a hearing. In the event that this will be an automatic termination at the end of 30 days, I have a few suggestions.

In many of my suggestions, I will compare and

contrast New Jersey statute since it is right over the bridge and because Adoption Resource Center is licensed there as well.

One of my suggestions deals with the actual signing of the consent. Currently, and even under the proposed law, anyone may take a consent and anyone may witness this legal document. Also, you need not produce any identification to sign this legal document or consent.

It is my suggestion that Pennsylvania implement the requirement that this consent be taken in front of a Pennsylvania notary. My rational for this is two-fold. First of all, a notary will ascertain the identity of the person signing the consent.

Secondly, if at a later date, a birth parent challenges the validity of the consent, the notary can act as an independent witness to the parent's affect at the time of the consent's execution.

I feel that if we are going to automatically have someone's rights terminated after 30 days based upon one document, this document should be as official as possible.

As a point of comparison, New Jersey law requires that the surrender, which is taken as early as 72 hours after birth, must be executed in front of a New Jersey state notary.

This surrender in the state of New Jersey is final, irrevocable, and binding. In essence, it terminates the birth parents' rights.

Getting back to the proposed Pennsylvania statute, since this document is going to be binding after 30 days, I would respectfully suggest that the statute mandate who may take this surrender.

For example, must a licensed agency be present when the consent is signed, or a social worker with a masters in social work, or an attorney?

I feel that this birth parent should have certain safeguards to protect their rights when they sign a final document.

If we take a quick drive to New Jersey, their law states that the final surrender, which is the equivalent of the consent to adoption, must be signed in front of a licensed agency representative or else it is not binding.

While this is a lot of responsibility to give to an agency, they leave it to their Department of Welfare to regulate these agencies strictly to ensure that proper staff and procedures are practiced.

It is in this way that they protect the rights of birth and adoptive families. Clearly, I am an advocate of this procedure and feel that our families in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Pennsylvania would benefit from such a statute.

As an agency that specializes in birth parent counseling, I was thrilled to see its proposed statutory inclusion in the petition for voluntary and confirm consent petitions.

All too often, we have had birth families tell us that when they did a private adoption, they were never given any options for their unplanned pregnancy other than Moreover, they tell us that no one ever explained the Pennsylvania law to them or their right to revocation.

One young lady that comes to mind is named Melody. She was working with an adoption facilitator. adoption facilitator, as you may know, is not necessarily an attorney or social worker, but someone who can still make adoption matches in our state.

Melody received money from this woman for living expenses throughout her pregnancy, which is illegal in our state.

After she had the baby, she was matched with a family that she did not feel was stable enough. They had each been through two divorces, and the wife had not completed high school.

Melody expressed her discomfort to the facilitator who turned a deaf ear and went forward with 1 | the placement.

When Melody changed her mind one day after the placement and before the consent to the adoption was signed, the facilitator told her that she could not have her baby returned to her and that she would have to pay back all of the money.

Melody knew enough to call a licensed agency and after ARC instructed her as to her rights, Melody called the facilitator and demanded the return of her child. The child was returned to her.

At this point, Melody was distraught because although she still felt that adoption was the best plan for her child, she needed counseling. And she wanted to select a good family for her child.

Melody needed to feel good about where her daughter was going in order to assist her through the grief and loss period which she surely would have experienced.

Because Melody still wished to place her child for adoption, ARC provided counseling to her over the next several weeks and ongoing grief and loss counseling after the placement.

Melody was given several profiles of different families which showed their photos, the house, and a letter they wrote about why they wanted to become parents

ΙU

1 | through adoption.

After several days of looking through profiles, Melody finally selected a young, childless couple who had been married several years.

They were educated and intended to provide the same for their new baby. When Melody put down their profile, she smiled and cried, These are the ones. She now had a sense of peace.

Melody had the opportunity to meet the couple, and they still send photos and letters back and forth even three years later.

Had it not been for the counseling that Melody received and the ability for her to make her own plan, this birth mother would never have felt good about the difficult decision that she made.

I have seen that the counseling component is crucial to the success of the entire process. I commend the Committee on realizing its value.

Unfortunately, some clients do not want to deal with their pain at the time of adoption and will refuse all counseling efforts. They close up so that they do not feel the pain, and they can get through the process.

It is for this reason that I feel it is important for the counseling statute to implement a waiver document which all agencies can have the birth parent sign

stating that they have been offered counseling but that they refuse it.

As I stated before, licensed agencies usually only do placements with one in four or one in three of the birth parents whom they counsel prior to delivery.

As such, we are fortunate to help most of our birth families stay together by connecting them up with services. One of our caseworkers, Lisa, had a birth mother named Kelly. She had a six-year-old, severely retarded son and an older stepson.

She was a single mother and had placed a child for adoption through our agency two years prior to this pregnancy.

When Lisa met with Kelly for the first time, she was unemployed, had not gone to a prenatal visit, did not have any services for her son, and was behind with her bill payments.

Over the next three months, Lisa met with Kelly on a weekly basis. She aided her with a medical assistance application, accompanied her to prenatal appointments, assisted her in making a household budget, and helped her son reconnect with Ken Crest who has programs for special needs children.

When Kelly delivered her baby girl, she decided that she did have the skills and means to be a good parent

to her, thanks to Lisa's intervention. Kelly still keeps the agency abreast on how she is doing and sent us a wonderful note of thanks.

These counseling programs by our nonprofit agency, Adoption Resource Center, are unfunded at this time and free of charge to all birth families.

In the future, it is our hope to partner with the State to receive funding for our counseling services and to keep them available forever.

I would like the express my enthusiasm at the proposed law for terminating the rights of the putative fathers. I feel that in order to be a parent, you must act like a parent, and this statute makes it clear as to how a birth father must assert his rights.

It is not enough to simply object to an adoption. You must now file a claim to paternity, contribute financial support, and make a plan for your child.

I know that all too often we have had young birth mothers forced into parenting a child because the father objected to the adoption plan, only to find out months later that this father never contributed a dime to the care of his baby.

I feel that this statute will alleviate these problems and ultimately assist in better care of the

children either through adoption or through making the father more responsible.

What do we do with putative birth fathers when we don't have an address? In Pennsylvania, each court has its own mandate as to what constitutes an acceptable search.

I respectfully suggest that it is time for a Pennsylvania statute to mandate what comprises an appropriate search since the timeframe for revocation is being shortened.

It is my experience as an agency director that over 50 percent of the time the birth mother will not have an address for the putative father. As such, the search for the birth father is a vitally important step in the adoption process.

If we denote, by statute, what has to be done, then there is no question. I would suggest that the statute require a letter to the last known address, the Department of Public Welfare, the Department of Voter Registration, the Department of Motor Vehicle, and the Department of Corrections.

If no response is received by the agency within an allotted amount of time, then it should be deemed as a negative response.

Lastly, I wanted to get back to the children

who I represent the most, special needs children. Over 1 the past four years, I have been litigating for adoption 2 subsidy for special needs children placed through private 3 agencies in our state.

Adoption subsidy is ongoing medical and financial assistance funded through the federal government funneled through the states to promote the adoption of special needs children.

In order to be deemed eligible for subsidy. the public county agency where the child lives must deem him or her as such. Yet, Pennsylvania continues to vary county to county as to whether they will deem special needs children placed through private agencies as eligible.

For example, a few years ago ARC placed Kevin, a child with Down's Syndrome, for adoption. Kevin was from Luzerne County, my home county.

When I requested subsidy on behalf of the adoptive family, the County agreed immediately and sent me the contract.

In contrast, ARC placed a child born with Sickle Cell Disease in Philadelphia and had to fight four years through endless briefs and court orders to finally have the contract initiated with back-pay.

As such, I would propose a statute which grants

24 25

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

subsidy automatically to children who meet the medical criteria as special-needs children and are placed through approved Pennsylvania agencies.

The bureaucracy is too tangled and too expensive for most adoptive families to fight. So they give up and the children go without their benefits. That is truly not what the federal law intended. The legislators fought for families in the passing the federal laws.

Now, we need your help and tenacity to make sure that the law is being followed to the letter and applied fairly to everyone. I really feel that with these new proposed reforms, you have shown that adoption issues are important to you and to our families.

We really appreciate that. Thank you for your time and thank you for forging ahead to make necessary change.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you, Tara. Any questions from the panel? Jane.

MS. MENDLOW: I did want to say first off,
Tara, you have so many excellent points and some things
that I definitely would like to go back as a staff person
to look at in more detail and perhaps follow up and talk
to you about as far as concrete suggestions.

There was a point you made here as well about

special-needs children. While this legislation doesn't specifically deal with the subsidized adoption program, I did want to share with you the fact that there has been legislation introduced that would make a change in that law to basically have the State, in conjunction with the federal government, pay for the adoption subsidy eliminating the county's share because of those concerns that have come up with many parents who have found that sometimes the counties have not evenly handled the determination of eligibility of the subsidized adoption program. So I'd be happy the get that Bill and send that to you.

MS. GUTTERMAN: Thank you.

MS. MENDLOW: And I just wanted to thank you. There was one question I had. And that was in terms of the issue of the adoption facilitators. This has come up before in terms of who is an intermediary.

Are you suggesting that basically the law clarify that only certain people can be intermediaries?

And it should better clarify what the intermediary's role should be?

MS. GUTTERMAN: I do. And I am also suggesting that we're very careful about who is taking these consents, if they're going to be so binding. I really feel that that's important.

New Jersey makes it very clear. If you don't 1 2 do it in front of a notary and in front of a licensed agency, it's not valid. 3 And that's surely the last thing you'd want, 4 because the law is very clear there. Your rights are 5 terminated. So I think we need to do the same thing here. 6 REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: We hope they're tougher 7 on notaries in New Jersey than they are in Pennsylvania. 8 MS. GUTTERMAN: I'm a notary. And I'm pretty 9 tough. 10 CHAIRMAN DALLY: Any other questions? David. 11 MR. BLOOMER: I just had a quick question for 12 13 you. And I am not sure if you can answer this. 14 In new Jersey you say -- I'm looking at page 3 of your testimony about the surrender in the State of New 15 16 Jersey is final, irrevocable and binding. In essence, it terminates the birth parents' rights. 17 MS. GUTTERMAN: Right. 18 MR. BLOOMER: Are you aware of any major legal 19 challenges to this? 20 21 MS. GUTTERMAN: There are always legal challenges. I mean people will say they signed under 22 duress. So you can always challenge anything. 23 MR. BLOOMER: Here's a follow-up question. 24 25 successful has New Jersey been in weeding out legitimate

legal challenges to this or to keep it on -- to keep their 1 intent on an even keel? 2 MS. GUTTERMAN: Well, I think what I heard was 3 that there is litigation going on. And a lot of times the 4 Court will try to find out, is there going to be any harm 5 6 if you return the child to this birth parent? 7 But I think that the agencies have been firm in 8 their attempts to fight all change because if there's a 9 statute, we want it to be followed. And I think that this is pretty clear that this is the standing law. 10 11 MR. BLOOMER: Just one more quick follow-up question. Has anything reached the New Jersey Supreme 12 Court? Have they ruled on anything like this? Is there 13 anything? 14 MS. GUTTERMAN: I'm not aware of anything 1.5 currently. 16 MR. BLOOMER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 18 CHAIRMAN DALLY: Yes, Jane. MS. MENDLOW: Yes, I had another question in 19 20 respect to the consent to an adoption versus voluntarily 21 relinguishment. 22 If you could explain to the Committee, in your 23 experience, why the parents choose to go with a consent to 24 an adoption versus a voluntary relinquishment. What are the factors? 25 Because those are two processes that are

allowed for under the law.

MS. GUTTERMAN: That's right. There are two ways to terminate voluntarily a birth parent's rights.

That's with the voluntary and the confirmed consent petitions.

And a voluntary birth parent must actually come to court and testify. I think that I have had one birth parent ever come to Court and testify. It's an extremely painful experience.

I can't -- I don't even know how to express to you what it looked like when the birth mother was on the stand testifying. I think that nobody wants to do that. Nobody wants to have a judge. And usually a lot of the judges are men that handle the adoptions.

And these are women that are coming in. It's also like a very -- just from that perspective, it's very difficult for them.

And they have to answer questions about the birth father. Most of my birth mother's just opt for us to do the confirm consent.

And then we notify them of the hearing. And they don't come to court. They just sign that they've received notice. And that's it.

And in Philadelphia County, that is fine with our judge. He will do a voluntary. But 9.8 times out of

the confirm consent is what we process the 1 10. termination under. 2 CHAIRMAN DALLY: Any other questions? Thank 3 4 you, Tara. MS. GUTTERMAN: Thank you. 5 I would also like to recognize 6 CHAIRMAN DALLY: 7 the presence of Representative Josephs from Philadelphia County. Welcome. 8 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN DALLY: Okay. Next. Mary Tomlinson 10 from the Delaware Valley Adoption Council. 11 MS. TOMLINSON: Good morning. 12 CHAIRMAN DALLY: Good morning, Mary. 13 MS. TOMLINSON: My name is Mary Tomlinson. 14 the Chairman of the Delaware Adoption Counsil. 1.5 to thank you for this opportunity to speak with you today. 16 The Delaware Valley Adoption Council is a 17 consortium of over 50 public and private agencies, 18 individuals, and groups in Delaware, New Jersey, and 19 20 Pennsylvania who promote permanency for children and 21 advance the cause of adoption in the Tri-State region. We meet monthly in Philadelphia. Our meetings 22 are devoted to continuing education, interagency sharing 23 24 of practice issues, and the exchange of ideas with the 25 goal of providing information and support to the Delaware

Valley Adoption Community. The DVAC is having its 30-year anniversary this year.

Because of the diversity of our membership and representation of all the members of the adoption triad, adoptive families, adoptees, and birth families, we have a wide range of opinions on issues of our field. Paramount, however, is the best interests of the child in an adoption.

The long-term mental health issues of the adoptee must be carefully considered and decisions about their placement made carefully in order that their existence and destinies are given value.

DVAC has been interested in reform of adoption regulations for some time. Earlier this year, we submitted proposed changes developed by our legislative Committee to the Joint State Government Task Force on Adoption.

We believe the lack of updated regulation is an underlying issue that negatively affects adoption in Pennsylvania.

I would like to give our input on the issues raised in House Bill 1533 and 1838. One is adoption-related counseling.

Our members respond positively about adoption-related counseling and the essential nature of

support to the birth family in making a profound and life-long decision.

Allowing access to counseling and its funding to any parent contemplating adoption is a positive change. Who should be on the Department of Public Welfare's list to provide counseling services?

To limit the resources to only agencies eliminates a range of mental health professionals with a great deal of objective experience in adoption who are an important part of our adoption community.

Opinions vary as to who should be providing counseling. All agree that counseling should be provided by professionals experienced in adoption.

Some felt the adoption agencies would not be able to provide truly objective and unbiased services as they may have financial pressures to complete a placement.

Establishing a monitoring system for the funding is appreciated when clarity is needed as to who is responsible for reporting on the flow of funds. Currently the content of adoption-related counseling varies widely from agency to agency and professional to professional.

Chester County Children and Youth provides information and referrals on a wide range of options, including foster care, placement with relatives, termination of pregnancy, and adoption. The Catholic

Social Agency provides information about parenting and adoptions.

The law or regulation should further define options in counseling to include a broad range of information sharing.

Adoption-related counseling should be mandatory and defined for all types of adoption, public and private, occurring in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In regard to consent, the provision to require that a birth parent provide a written acknowledgment that counseling services have been offered in the consent is positive. This provision should be required for parents of any age who are making a decision about adoption.

Any consent requirements proposed in this Bill, not given before 72 hours and that become irrevocable after 30 days, should be an equal process for both the birth mother and birth father.

Allowing the birth father to give consent at any time, even before the birth, dismisses his responsibility and involvement in the experience of making an adoption plan.

The long-term impact of ignoring the birth father will most likely be detrimental. Regarding timeframes, a very difficult issue, the pressures of the birth parents from family and perhaps agencies are intense

as they are making a decision about their child's future.

The medical and postnatal condition of the birth mother does not allow, ordinarily, a calm decision-making process.

However, during waiting times, the child's legal status is in limbo. And they are occasionally placed in temporary foster care until the termination of parental rights is complete.

Adoptive parents express an inability to fully bond with the child until the legal risk has passed.

Adult adoptees and birth parents, however, often respond that a sufficient amount of time is needed to make this decision. And 30 days is not considered sufficient.

Most feel that less than 30 days to reconsider the consent would not be fair considering the profound decision being made. Medical history registers have been helpful to all members of the triad who need information that is often a problematic issue for adoptees.

Making medical history information forms more readily available and the register more widely accessible, used, and understood will benefit all members of the adoption community.

Lastly, we would like to encourage the Committee to hear the voices of all of the adoption triad, birth parents, adoptees, and adoptive parents and give

them equal weight. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you, Mary. Questions?

MS. MENDLOW: Yes, I do have a question, Mary.

I guess one would be on page 2 of your testimony. I'm

wondering, are you suggesting that maybe it would be

helpful to add into the adoption law the changes that

we're looking at in House Bill 1838 here in respect to

some kind of protection for making sure that there is no

duress; that a parent who is undergoing the counseling is

not signing a revocation of consent with some duress

during that counseling?

Is that one of the points that you're trying to make at the top of the page, making sure they're getting objective advice and services?

MS. TOMLINSON: Certainly that protection would be needed as well as information about all of their options, not just the option that that particular provider would be providing to them.

MS. MENDLOW: The other question I have is in respect to trying to figure out who can actually provide adoption-related counseling.

And one of the problems is that the Department of Welfare doesn't really license individuals. It only supervises, and oversees, and approves agencies.

Do you have any thoughts on that? How else

would you envision this? Because you're suggestion at the bottom of page 1 talks about, you know, trying to expand the adoption-related counseling to any individual who could conceivably do it. And who would -- or how would you see that working? Do you see the problems?

MS. TOMLINSON: There might not necessarily be a licensing structure from the Department of Public Welfare.

But there is a licensing structure for social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists. The standards are -- there are standards set in some counties.

At this point, each county makes up its own list. And they all do it very differently. Some have professionals and agencies fill out an application.

And it asks them how much experience they have in adoption and what their field is and what their licensure status is.

Other counties don't have any sort of application like that. So if there could be some consistent standards about licensure requirements --

MS. MENDLOW: Well, that was, quite frankly, one of the dilemmas that Representative Blaum faced in terms of how do you hone in on this and have some consistency since having an MSW or being a psychologist or even a psychiatrist doesn't necessarily mean that you have

understanding as to what is involved with an adoption and 1 the kinds of issues that a parent may have to deal with in 2 that unique situation. 3 MS. TOMITHSON: And that was a theme that 4 everybody felt very strongly about was that there is the 5 need for professionals to have adoption experience. 6 would request that that be the case. 7 MS. MENDLOW: Okay. Thanks. 8 9 CHAIRMAN DALLY: Okay. Dave. 10 MR. BLOOMER: Yes. I just wanted to make a 11 quick comment. It was regarding that last point you made 12 about hoping we would hear from everybody that deals with this process. 13 I just wanted to let you know this is actually 14 the third hearing we've actually had on behalf of the 15 Committee. 16 I can attest that we've spoken, literally, with 17 almost conceivably everybody that's involved in this. Our 18 19 first hearing was in October. And we talked with a lot of birth parents, a 20 21 lot of adoptive parents. And that was primarily our focus of our first hearing. And that was in Harrisburg. Our 22 23 second hearing was in March in Pittsburgh. And we had more adoptive and adoptee parents 24 25 from the Pittsburgh area. But we had more people that

dealt with adoption agencies and more people in the legal sector. And this is our third hearing today.

I just wanted convey to you and everybody else here that we have been talking to almost, literally, everybody we possibly can on this just to touch on all of these issues.

MS. TOMLINSON: I wanted to mention that an adoptee is somebody. They are identified as the anonymous party involved in this process. And often times they aren't heard. They are very much in the background.

And I had the opportunity, as I was researching for this testimony, to talk with adoptees and groups that represent them. And usually their opinions are different than other people who are involved. And I think they are equally valuable.

MR. BLOOMER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Very good. Thank you.

MS. TOMLINSON: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Okay. Magaret Zukoski, Program Specialist for the Pennsylvania Council for Children and Youth and Family Services. Welcome.

MS. ZUKOSKI: Good morning. Thank you very much. My name is Margaret Zukoski, and I'm a social worker at the Pennsylvania Council of Children, Youth, and Family Services.

The Pennsylvania Council of Children, Youth, and Family Services is an alliance of over 100 private, nonprofit child welfare agencies serving children and families across Pennsylvania.

The Council's mission is to enhance the ability of member agencies to improve the quality of children's and families' lives to our communities.

Representing our member agencies, the Council would like to thank the Committee for the opportunity to offer testimony on House Bills 1533 and 1838.

We commend the House on their work and are pleased this public hearing was scheduled to discuss critical issues affecting the well-being of Pennsylvania's children.

On any given day, our member agencies serve thousands of children and families through in-home supports, foster care, residential services, outpatient treatment programs, alternative education programs, and adoption services.

The majority of children served by council member agencies are dependent children who were placed in substitute care, foster care, kinship care, or residential care because of findings of abuse and neglect. Most children in the dependency system do return to their parents' homes.

However, when reunification does not occur, county children and youth agencies initiate the process of terminating parental rights so children will be able to find permanent homes. Council member agencies work diligently to find these children adoptive families where they will thrive.

The primary goal of the child welfare system, as embodied by the 1997 Federal Adoption and Safe Families Act, is to ensure that children are returned to safe and permanent homes in a timely manner.

The recognition of the adverse effects of living in a state of impermanence can have on children was the impetus for the federal legislation.

House Bills 1533 and 1838 address the barriers to children achieving permanency by limiting to 30 days the time birth parents have to revoke their consent to adoption.

This time limit would remedy the current open-ended time period that permits birth parents to revoke their consent to adoption for any reason and any time prior to either the Court's final adoption decree or the Court's termination of parental rights, whichever occurs first.

Pennsylvania clearly lags behind many of our neighboring states which have established clear time

limits for revocation of consent to adopt. Our General Assembly has recognized the need to take steps to change our current laws.

The Joint State Government Commission Advisory

Committee on Adoption Law was convened through a

concurrent resolution, adopted by both the House and the

Senate to establish a task force and advisory committee to

study the Commonwealth's adoption law and make

recommendations regarding the law to the General Assembly.

Since 1998, the Advisory Committee has been reviewing the entire Adoption Act. The Committee is currently preparing suggested legislative amendments that will address many of the issues raised today, including relinquishment of parental rights, rights of putative fathers, and adoption counseling.

By analyzing recommended changes in the context of the entire Act, the Advisory Committee hopes to avoid recommendations not having their intended effect. It is our understanding that the Advisory Committee's recommendations are forthcoming.

While the Council agrees with the principles underlying House Bills 1533 and 1838 and commends the drafters for their work, we will respectfully reserve support until we have had the opportunity to review the recommendations from the Joint State Government Commission

Advisory Committee on Adoption Law to ensure consistent 1 policy changes. 2 Thank you again for this opportunity. 3 4 CHAIRMAN DALLY: Any questions? I would just say that I think that we, too, are going to be looking at 5 those recommendations. I think that we want to be working 6 on this in a unified manner. Thank you. 7 Our last witness today is Bernard Faigenbaum. 8 9 He's a practicing attorney here in the City of Philadelphia. Welcome. 10 11 MR. FAIGENBAUM: Thank you. My name is --12 thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is 13 Bernard Faigenbaum. I'm am Co-Chair of the Philadelphia Bar 14 15 Association's Family Law Section Adoption Committee. 16 I have been a practicing attorney in Philadelphia for over 17 years with a practice specializing in family law. 17 First of all. I commend the authors of these 18 Bills and the Committee. The proposed changes are largely 19 reflective of the needs of the children involved as well 20 21 as the adoptive parents, the birth parents, and 22 practitioners. 23 The proposed changes are a major improvement.

And we hope that these types of provisions can continue in

24

25

this important area.

I would strongly support the proposed amendments to section 2711(c) and (d) regarding the 30 day limit on a parent's right to revoke consent.

These changes address this need for permanency at as early a stage as possible as well the need to reduce the period of instability and uncertainty experienced by adoptive parents and children.

In conjunction with the 30 day limit, I would also agree with the amendments concerning adoption-related counseling services for the birth parents.

And I would also touch on the issues that have been raised by several other witnesses which is the very important need for licensing regulations for agencies, adoption facilitators, and private intermediaries.

Unfortunately, the number of the so-called facilitators and intermediaries has been increasing rapidly due to internet searches and web sites.

And people are surprised to learn that in Pennsylvania today these types of individuals are totally unregulated.

State regulations governing adoption agencies must be updated in order to protect the children, the birth parents, and the adoptive parents in the adoption process.

We need regulations regarding the

qualifications, the training, the experience, the education, the backgrounds, and the responsibilities of those involved in the adoption process.

It is my understanding that House Bill 1840 has been proposed regarding licensing regulations for providing adoption services.

And I would respectfully suggest that it be considered that House Bill 1840 be included as an amendment to House Bill 1838 so that this issue of providing licensing regulation for the agencies and determining who can serve in this role as facilitators and intermediaries can be addressed, because the problem, as I've indicated, is increasing rapidly.

And if you do an internet search for adoption and adoption-related agencies, virtually anyone can post a web site with no qualifications whatsoever and start collecting funds from innocent victims.

And because of the issues involved in the adoption process, the need for these types of regulations is critical. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DALLY: Any questions from the Committee?

MS. MENDLOW: Mr. Faigenbaum, thank you very much for your comments and your suggestions. I was wondering if you had already had an opportunity to convey

some of your concerns to the Department of Public Welfare, 1 and if you received any reaction or suggestions from that 2 agency, from the state agency that does oversee and 3 promulgate regulations for adoption agencies? 4 MR. FAIGENBAUM: I have, as has the Adoption 5 6 Committee. And they are in full agreement that these 7 types of regulations are necessary. 8 The number of complaints are increasing on a 9 monthly and daily basis. And everyone from the adoption 10 agencies to the adoptees and the parents seems to be in full agreement on this issue for the need for regulation 11 in this regard. 12 MS. MENDLOW: But has DBW indicated that it has 13 some ideas as to how it could make some revisions or 14 strengthen protection? 15 MR. FAIGENBAUM: My understanding is that it's 16 17 something that they're working on. And they're in the process of promulgating suggested revisions on this issue. 18 19 I have not seen anything in writing. 20 MS. MENDLOW: Thank you. 21 MR. FAIGENBAUM: Thank you. 22 REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you. 23 CHAIRMAN DALLY: Thank you. Okay. This 24 concludes the hearing. Thank you once again everyone who 25 took the time to come out and testify this morning.

1	(The hearing concluded at 11:36 a.m.)
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same. Tammy Bock, Court Reporter

RECEIVED		
COST		
NUMBER OF PAGES/TAPES		
COPIES SENT TO:		
PERSON/TITLE	LOCATION	DATE SENT
Reg Blaum		9/13/2000
RyDrlly		9/15/2000
Rep Orie		9/15/2000
Rep Wogan		9/15/2000
<i>U</i> //		9/15/2000
Rep Walko Rep Washington		9/15/2000
		