HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Senate Bill 654

House Judiciary Committee Task Force on Health Care Law

Hearing Room No. 1 Ground Floor, North Office Building Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Wednesday, September 5, 2001 - 10:05 a.m.

--000--

BEFORE:

Honorable Kelly Lewis, Majority Subcommittee Chairman

Honorable Jerry Birmelin

Honorable Pat Browne

Honorable William Gabig

Honorable Steve Maitland

Honorable Ron Marsico

Honorable Harold James

Honorable Kathy Manderino

Honorable John Pallone

Honorable James Roebuck

Honorable Ed Staback

ALSO PRESENT:

Karen Dalton
Majority Counsel to Judiciary Committee

Mike Schwoyer
Majority Chief Counsel to Judiciary Committee

Judy Sedesse
Majority Administrative Assistant

Mike Rish
Minority Executive Director

Jane Mendlow
Minority Research Analyst

Beryl Kuhr Minority Counsel to Judiciary Committee

Cathy Hudson
Minority Administrative Assistant

CONTENTS

<u>WITNESSES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
The Honorable Edward W. Helfrick State Senator - 27th Senatorial District	5
Todd Roup Executive Assistant to Senator Helfrick	17
The Honorable Ronald S. Marsico State Representative - 105th Legislative Distric	18 ct
Christopher P. Markley, Esquire Senior VP - Community & Governmental Relations Pinnacle Health System	26
Marlene Guarneschelli Secret Safe Place Program Developer Pinnacle Health System	27
Wayne Stevenson Acting Director of Children, Youth and Families Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare	63
Anthony J. Rosini, Esquire District Attorney - Northumberland County	79
Edward M. Marsico, Jr., Esquire District Attorney - Dauphin County	84
Gary E. Tennis, Esquire Chief - Legislation Unit Philadelphia District Attorney's Office	88

CONTENTS (cont'd.)

WITNESSES	<u>PAGE</u>
Nina Williams-Mbengue Policy Specialist - Children & Families Program National Conference of State Legislatures	110
Patti A. Weaver Founder & President - A Hand to Hold	126
Roz Meston Director - A Hand to Hold	155
Carmen Schulze Regional Public Policy Associate Child Welfare League of America	158
Melissa N. Speck Policy & Regulatory Analyst Hospital & Healthsystem Association of PA	169
Laura L. Bauer Legislative Chair Delaware Valley Adoption Council	185

Written Testimony Submitted By:

Terri Houck, Director of Governmental Relations County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania

Shelly Yanoff, Executive Director Philadelphia Citizens for Children & Youth

Bundles of Joy, Inc.

1	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Good morning. I'd like to
2	welcome everyone to the Pennsylvania House of
3	Representatives Judiciary Committee Task Force on Health
4	Care Law hearing today on Senate Bill 654. My name is
5	Representative Kelly Lewis. I'm from the 189th District in
6	Monroe County, Pennsylvania.
7	And I'd like to welcome our presenters today
8	and any guests in the audience. And I'd like to have the
9	front table introduce themselves as, to my right, starting
10	with Karen.
11	MS. DALTON: Karen Dalton, counsel to the
12	committee.
13	REPRESENTATIVE MAITLAND: Steve Maitland,
14	State Representative from the 91st District in Adams County
15	and a member of the Judiciary Committee.
16	MS. MENDLOW: Jane Mendlow, House Judiciary
17	Committee Research Analyst with Representative Kevin Blaum.
18	MS. KUHR: I'm Beryl Kuhr. I'm counsel to the
19	Minority Chair, Kevin Blaum.
20	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you. We're honored
21	today to have the Senator from the 27th Senatorial District
22	here, Senator Edward W. Helfrick, to present testimony.
23	Senator Helfrick.
24	SENATOR HELFRICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25	Mr. Chairman, some years ago when I left the House of

Representatives for the Senate, everybody said that was a big improvement on the House. They also said there was a slight improvement on the Senate. So I think with all these improvements that we had here, we ought to be able to come up with a pretty good piece of legislation today.

Mr. Chairman, thanks for inviting me here to speak to the committee about the importance of enacting legislation to protect and save the lives of an untold number of newborn children, helpless babies, fellow human beings. We're all aware of the term safe haven legislation.

This could be the most important law in

Pennsylvania that will affect newborn children. I commend

the committee for its interest in this bill, and I commend

Representative Marsico for introducing the House version.

Mr. Chairman, in July, an employee of the Sunbury Municipal Authority in my district was about to empty the contents of a garbage dumpster into a compactor at the Sunbury Transfer Station. He saw what appeared to be the arm of a doll protruding from a garbage bag.

On closer examination, he discovered the body of a full-term newborn baby girl. The police investigation has resulted in the arrest of the baby's mother for murder. Her boyfriend has been charged with disposing the baby's body in the garbage dumpster.

The coroner confirmed that the newborn child had drowned and that toilet paper was shoved down her throat. The doctor who performed the autopsy cried during the examination of such a horrible, senseless destruction of a living human being.

Mr. Chairman, think of the lives that have been touched by this tragedy. A newborn baby has been murdered. Her mother has been charged with a crime that carries a possible death sentence. Her father is accused of dumping her body with trash and faces a long jail sentence.

The man who discovered the child in the trash compactor will remember this terrible event for the rest of his life. Concerned Northumberland County citizens have held candlelight services to pray for the child and have signed hundreds of petitions urging us to enact safe haven legislation to protect children's lives.

Mr. Chairman, safe haven legislation passed in the Senate by unanimous support, 50 to 0. I would hope you can enact safe legislation with equal support. And somewhere, there is a loving couple who could have adopted this child and would have brought happiness to her and fulfillment to their own lives.

I have served in this Legislature with you for many years. And I know you care as much as I do for our

fellow human beings, whether they are newborn babies or senior citizens in nursing homes. This is why we need to act as soon as possible to enact safe haven legislation.

It's not important to me whether we enact my bill or Representative Marsico's bill, but we must act. We need a bill that encourages a mother, in most cases a young, inexperienced, first-time, unmarried mother, to take her newborn to a safe haven for care.

In many cases, these young mothers are scared of the responsibilities of raising a child and have hidden their pregnancies from their family and their friends. In order to make safe havens work as intended, these scared, inexperienced, young mothers should not have to identify themselves. And I believe no questions should be asked.

Therefore, I have grave concerns over language in the House Bill requiring identification bracelets. This could discourage usage of safe havens and endanger children. We have no statistics and no way of knowing how often these horrendous acts are committed. Even one time is more than enough.

The other major difference in the Senate and the House bills concerns the procedure governing care and custody of the child once it is delivered to the safe haven. My bill uses the Juvenile Act, while yours uses the Child Protective Services Act.

I'm not an expert on custody issues and, frankly, have no strong preferences in this regard. Both the Senate and the House bills seek the same purposes: Protect children at once and provide for a procedure for the custody of the child.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that when a young mother decides to kill and dispose of her child, she destroys her life as well. As long as she lives, she'll never enjoy her life with the evil deed hidden in her mind. I urge you to help these young mothers and give them an alternative.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I believe everyone in this room would like to be in the right place at the right time to save another person's life. Enacting safe haven legislation gives each of us the chance to save innocent newborn children.

Mr. Chairman, in my heart, I think this is probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that we can enact. You know -- and I have no preference whether it's the legislation I introduced or whether it's the legislation Representative Marsico introduced, Marsico introduced.

What I want to see is the legislation enacted.

I would hope that this is a great alternative for the

young, scared, most of the time unwed mother. Give her a

1	better opportunity. And I think we as legislators, the
2	most important job we have here is to protect human lives.
3	And I take that very serious, and I'm sure you do.
4	And thanks once again for giving me the
5	opportunity to be here today to urge swift passage of this
6	legislation. Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you very much,
8	Senator Helfrick. And I think it's everyone's goal to get
9	the acceptable language together today and in the future to
10	get this to a House and Senate vote. Thank you very much.
11	At this time, I'd like to have our
12	Representatives that just walked in introduce themselves,
13	starting with Representative Gabig.
14	REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: I'm Representative Will
15	Gabig from Carlisle, representing parts of Cumberland and
16	York County, the 199th Legislative District.
17	REPRESENTATIVE STABACK: Ed Staback from
18	Lackawanna and Southern Wayne.
19	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Good morning.
20	Kathy Manderino, Philadelphia County.
21	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you,
22	Representatives, for attending today. At this time, I'd
23	like to entertain any questions for the presenter.
24	Representative Manderino.
	-

1 | morning, Senator.

2 | SENATOR HELFRICK: Good morning.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I realize that the language in the bill before us as currently amended by our committee is actually the Marsico language. And he is going to be testifying. But one of the questions that I had is an issue that you also raised in your testimony about the difference between your 2 bills, and that dealt with the whole issue of the identification bracelet.

And I would just want to ask you, while you have the chance, to elaborate on what your concerns are that you see with that part of the language in front of us.

SENATOR HELFRICK: Yes. It's a pointless legislation at work. In other words, if we pass legislation that really doesn't work, it's not, it's not worthwhile doing it. In my opinion, when a young girl is put in this position where she has hidden a pregnancy from everyone, she doesn't want to go and be identified.

What I would like to really see is to see that young girl be able to go in, drop that child off, and no questions whatsoever asked. I think that's the simplest solution because I think that's the, that's the way it will work.

Once the young girl has to identify herself and get a bracelet and go through all that, I think she's

going to be too scared to do that. I think she'll take the

the other alternative, not because she wants to. But I can, I

can appreciate the feeling of that young girl, what she

doesn't know in this life and how scared she is and maybe

scared of her parents finding out and different things like

that.

She's going to look for some other alternative. And we got to make it as easy -- in plain English, we have to make it as easy as possible for her. That's what I believe. It's not a cure-all. I understand that. But it's a -- I think our first responsibility is to save the life of that child. Everything else past that is secondary.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: One of the other distinctions that I noted between the language in your bill and in the Marsico bill, which I think is an important distinction that we have to consider, is language that the Marsico bill has with regard to the person giving up or leaving the baby for a safe haven and whether they actually have lawful custody.

As written in the Marsico bill, we have this term lawful custody, which I have questions about. How do we know if the person leaving the baby there actually has lawful custody? But in your bill, we didn't even have a definition of lawful custody.

So then I would ask the question of you, How do we as lawmakers address the issue of if we're not going to ask any questions -- and I, and I understand the motivation. But if we're not going to determine who's leaving this baby, is it their baby to leave, all that kind of stuff, how do we deal with this whole issue of whether that baby was lawfully that person's to give away, to give up?

SENATOR HELFRICK: I can understand your concern. And I thought quite a bit about that myself. But again, I went right back to the fact that the first thing we have to do is save that child's life. Everything else is secondary after that.

I thought about the part that, you know, maybe the mother would sometime come back and want to try to get custody of the child, you know, or even she'd have to go through the same adoption procedure as anybody else, or the father. But of course, today, we have DNA that would prove, you know, whether she's actually the mother or the father is the father.

Whether -- what we could do if she brought the baby there and it wasn't hers to bring there is -- I don't know how we can solve that through legislation. I honestly don't know how we can solve that through legislation. But I believe once we have the child in hands and the child is

safe, you know, we can, we can look at methods to try and determine if it's right.

In other words, something's going to come up. Somebody else is going to come and say she couldn't bring it here or this or that. And at that point, I'm sure you could just prove whether it was hers or whether it was somebody else's.

But whether we can put that into legislation to make this legislation work, I'm not sure if we can do that.

about this bill -- and it's clear that you've given it a lot of thought -- did you explore -- and I'm just thinking about this now -- but did you explore the option of instead of identifying one particular place where this is a safe haven or this isn't a safe haven and then have to get into this kind of distinction, we call the police because it was left in an apartment building but we don't call the police because it was left at a hospital or, I mean, something like that?

Have you thought at all about the whole issue of just how we, whether we should, should decriminalize the child abandonment and take it out of the criminal code and put it over into child welfare or something like that and what, what might be the potential downfalls of that?

SENATOR HELFRICK: Well, in this particular case, it should be decriminalized. In this particular case where they voluntarily bring it up to a safe haven, I think that should be decriminalized. It definitely should be decriminalized.

In other situations where a person abandons a child somewhere else, no, I don't believe so.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And finally -- I apologize for taking so much time -- we have a whole child welfare system. We have Children and Youth agencies, Department of Human Services in my city, et cetera. I'm sitting here wondering, wouldn't that almost make the better place for a safe haven, to, to turn your child over there and then we're not having these artificial distinctions between adoption law and safe haven law and, and the criminal system versus the social service system?

I mean, I'm just -- I'm troubled by all aspects of this. And I'm just trying to figure out what other options there are as well.

SENATOR HELFRICK: Yeah. I can understand that. And I believe that. But getting back to if we don't have a living, viable child, we have nothing. Everything else is just hogwash. We have done nothing there. And once -- I'm just fearful if we don't make a very simple piece of legislation like we're talking about here, we

don't have legislation that's going to work. 1 I mean, getting right back to the basics. 2 3 First, we need that young girl to deliver a living, viable child to somebody. We got to give her a reason to do it so 4 she's not scared and figure she's not going to go there. And when she gets there, the police aren't going to be 6 after her or anything else like that. 7 That's what we want to do here. And any other 8 springs we put in, I'm just afraid it won't work. And if 9 10 it doesn't work, why have it? Why even go to all this trouble? I know there's tough questions. And I don't 11 agree with that. But my belief is that we must first have 12 a living, viable child delivered somewhere, not to a trash 13 14 compactor. REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. Thank 15 you, Mr. Chairman. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative. Are there any other questions from the panel? 18 19 Representative Gabiq. 20 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Just to follow up on Representative Manderino's questions, which I did not find 21 22 lengthy. I found it very informative, the exchange there. SENATOR HELFRICK: Will you speak up a little 23 louder? 24 I found the exchange 25 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG:

1	there between you and Representative Manderino very
2	enlightening. But what other other than this sort of,
3	the anonymous part of your bill, what are the other major
4	differences between your bill and Representative Marsico's
5	bill?
6	SENATOR HELFRICK: Todd, would you explain
7	that?
8	MR. ROUP: Mr. Gabig, as the Senator
9	testified, the major difference is what happens following
10	the abandonment with care and custody of the child. The
11	Senator's bill follows the Juvenile Act, which basically
12	puts the county and Children and Youth services in charge.
13	The House bill follows the Child Protective
14	Services Law. And I believe that's the reason to hold the
15	hearing today, to try to determine what is the best
16	scenario once there is a case of abandonment.
17	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Todd, could you just
18	identify yourself for the Task Force?
19	MR. ROUP: My name is Todd Roup. I'm Senator
20	Helfrick's Executive Assistant.
21	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you.
22	REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you. Thank you,
23	Mr. Chairman.
24	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Are there any other
25	guestions? (No response) I'd also like to give

Representative Pallone a chance to identify himself and his 1 legislative district. 2 3 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Thank you, Mr. John Pallone. I represent Allegheny and 4 Chairman. Westmoreland County in the 54th Legislative District. Thank you. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative Pallone. And Senator, thank you very much for your 8 testimony and getting this bill from Northumberland County and those concerned citizens to Harrisburg. We appreciate 10 11 that. SENATOR HELFRICK: Thank you. And I'm sure 12 13 your committee will give equal consideration like we did. I feel certain of that, confident of that. Let's put it 14 that way. Thank you. 15 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Absolutely. Thank you. 16 Our next presenter is Representative Ronald S. Marsico of 17 the 105th Legislative District. Representative Marsico. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Good morning. Good morning, members of the committee, Mr. Chairman. Thank you 20 21 very much for giving me the time and the opportunity to 22 present my testimony with this legislation. I also want to 23 thank Senator Helfrick and his staff for introducing this concept in the Senate and their hard work with this. 24

25

I'm here today to voice my support for Senate

Bill 654, the Infant Protection Act. As amended by your committee in June, this bill is virtually identical to the infant protection legislation I introduced back in April to help save the lives of infants who might otherwise be left for dead in a dumpster or public restroom.

Pennsylvania needs this law because we must do everything we can to save the lives of these newborns. While we certainly don't want to encourage parents to resort to abandonment, our first priority must be to protect the child.

By creating safe havens at our hospitals, as the Infant Protection Act provides for, we give these desperate parents another option, an option that allows the child to live. The law provides a safe way for a person having lawful custody of a newborn to take that child to a hospital.

As long as the child is less than 28 days old and there are no signs the child has been a victim of abuse, the parent will not be prosecuted for abandonment. It also offers immunity to hospitals, meaning they will face no civil liability or criminal penalty for complying with the law. Most importantly, by having the child brought to a hospital, we can ensure the child is immediately examined and gets the care he or she needs.

the identification bracelet the hospital is required to provide to the person leaving the baby. The bracelet gives its possessor standing to participate in proceedings under the Juvenile Act in the event that he or she wants to regain custody -- let me repeat that -- in case in the event that he or she wants to regain custody of the child.

However, the child will not be returned to that parent without a court hearing. That's probably one of the major differences, as pointed out, both in my bill and Senator Helfrick's bill. Ultimately, our goal with this law is to prevent the tragic consequences of many child abandonment cases.

I want to reiterate that we do not encourage young parents to abandon their children. But for those who believe the only way out is to abandon or even kill the child, we must provide another alternative. We must do everything to protect that child.

Let me just add that we worked a lot of the legislation, the details of the language with the, out with the Pennsylvania Hospital Association, the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association, and the Pennsylvania Catholic Hospitals Association.

So again, I thank you for the opportunity today and certainly am anxious to join the panel and ask some questions of the other testifiers.

1 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative Marsico. At this time, I'd entertain any questions from 2 3 the Task Force. Representative Gabiq. 4 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Just briefly, Mr. 5 Chairman. I want to compliment you, Representative Marsico, for your leadership on this issue as well as the 7 Senator. I don't think I said that when he was up here. I think I'm certainly very supportive of the intent. 8 As a former prosecutor that had to deal with 9 child abuse cases, including child murder cases, I think 10 that the goal here is a very worthy and noble goal. And 11 I'm sure like my fellow colleaques up here, we're just 12 trying to work out the best way and procedure to accomplish 13 14 that goal. So thanks for your testimony and thanks for your leadership. 15 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 16 Gabig. Representative Manderino. 17 18 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. Good 19 morning, Representative Marsico. REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Good morning. 20 21 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Representative 22 Staback and I were actually trying to figure out the whole 23 issue of what happens and what time limit, if any, and how the whole issue of reclaiming the child or reclaiming 24 custody would work. 25

And I understand from your testimony that that's the role of the identification bracelet. And I guess if we didn't have that identification bracelet, well, I guess you could do DNA testing. There would be other ways to figure out if this was, was the parent or not.

But I don't know if you can, can answer this.

I'm going to ask the question just in case somebody in the future or maybe afterwards probably better somebody on ours and/or Senator Helfrick's staff can answer this.

But I don't understand the specific difference -- and if that's one of the things we're supposed to be determining -- between whether or not this is something that will then come under the Juvenile Act or whether this is something that will come under the Child Protective Services Act.

And I suspect that that has a lot to do with the details of what happens after the fact, which are very important effects that we need to consider. And if you have anything that can help enlighten me on that, I would appreciate it. And if not, maybe our staff can kind of brief us afterwards on the technicalities of those 2 acts and how they would operate in these instances.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Thank you for your, for your question. I always look forward to your questions and your insight and your knowledge of the law. I always

1 respect your questions. Let me say that the bill is linked to the State Juvenile Act, like I had mentioned before. 2 3 The reason we did that was to provide -- we 4 feel it's important that we provide parental rights with regard to that, to the act and that the -- once, for 5 6 example, a parent or an uncle, a relative, or a grandparent that may want to regain custody, they would go through the 7 8 county's Children and Youth services, through the Juvenile 9 Act, and then ask for a custody hearing through the courts. We think that's very important that there 10 would be parental rights involved initially with this. 11 So 12 I don't know if I answered your question. But I think that, again, it goes through the Juvenile Act and then 13 through Children and Youth services in the counties. 14 I think staff may be able to help with the 15 interpretation of that question as well. 16 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: 17 Thank you. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Karen, could you provide 18 19 some insight on that? 20 MS. DALTON: Sure. This language that's in 21 Senate Bill 654 was recommended to us by Jim Anderson. And formerly, Jim Anderson being the Executive Director of 22 Juvenile Court Judges Commission. As the members know, 23 24 there's more than one way to get into the Juvenile Act. 25 Under the CPSL, if a child is brought in and

placed in protective custody because the child is abused, 1 there are procedures to notify the parents; there are 2 3 procedures to take custody of the child. Senator Helfrick's bill mentions the Juvenile Act. Representative Marsico's version that's now in 5 Senate Bill 654 follows the CPSL, but you still get to the 6 7 Juvenile Act. It's just another way to get in there. But it was just Jim Anderson's private suggestion which 8 Representative Helfrick decided to, to adopt to model the CPSL, thinking that that was probably just a little bit 10 finer tuned with respect to procedure. 11 But you still get to the Juvenile Act. 12 Representative Manderino asked me that in the end if the 13 14 parental rights are the same. The answer is absolutely yes, the rights are the same. 15 16 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: As always, thanks for your help, Karen. 17 18 MS. DALTON: Sure. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 19 20 Manderino. Are there any other questions? Jane Mendlow. Representative Marsico, I was 21 MS. MENDLOW: 22 wondering if you could help in one respect in advising us 23 as to whether or not you had considered any other avenues, 24 any other programs that were effective in reaching a

particular population of parents who are desperate, have

25

kept their pregnancy a secret, have not turned to 1 traditional medical care, maybe have had -- in fact, for 2 the most part, it seems they've had their babies outside of the hospital setting? 4 5 Have you, in your studies and work on this 6 issue, come across other programs that have been effective in reaching that population? 7 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: I could tell you that 8 we have not, that I have not examined any other programs. 9 We have -- this legislation concept was brought to us by 10 the Senate and of course by other states that have 11 adopted -- I think there was 25 other states or 23 other 12 states -- 15 other states have adopted and 23 others are 13 considering the legislation. 14 15 So we went this way, took this approach. have not -- although, I know that some of the testifiers 16 later on will testify some of the local hospitals have 17 taken this safe haven concept and, on their own with the 18 cooperation, of course, with the District Attorney of 19 Dauphin County, for example, have actually enacted this 20 concept in our county. But I have not taken any other 21 22 approaches. 23 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you. And thank you, Representative Marsico, for your presentation. And if 24 you'd care to, you can join us up on the Task Force panel 25

as well. 1 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: 2 Thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Next on our agenda, we have Christopher P. Markley, Esquire. He's the Senior Vice 4 President of Community and Governmental Relations for Pinnacle Health Systems. And also presenting is Marlene 7 Guarneschelli, who's the Secret Safe Place Program Developer with Pinnacle Health Care System. Christopher 8 and Marlene, thank you for coming today. MR. MARKLEY: Thank you very much for the 10 opportunity to testify. As Representative Marsico noted, 11 Pinnacle Health System here in Dauphin County has developed 12 a program similar to what would be contemplated by the 13 14 legislation. And we did that back last winter and actually opened it in the spring, and Marlene will talk a little bit 15 about that. 16 But we have some perspective then, from having 17 18 gone through the program and trying to set it up, on issues that need to be considered and some of the practical 19 operational factors that a hospital is going to encounter 20 and some of the needs that a hospital will have in 21 22 implementing this type of a program. 23 So first, I'm going to ask Marlene 24 Guarneschelli to testify. Marlene is really a community

activist that came to us with the idea for this program,

25

and she's going to talk about how it developed.

MS. GUARNESCHELLI: Good morning. My name is Marlene Guarneschelli, and I live here in the Harrisburg area. I prompted the development of the Secret Safe Place for Newborns at Pinnacle Health Hospitals. After reading about the program developed in Mobile, Alabama, I was determined to find a way to bring this concept to Central Pennsylvania.

I approached Pinnacle Health administrators hoping to find the support needed to launch this effort. Pinnacle Health not only offered their support but was also successful in establishing a program with the cooperation of the Dauphin County District Attorney and Dauphin County Social Services for Children and Youth.

I have attached this brochure, which was developed for this program. The Secret Safe Place program at Pinnacle Health has been in place since April of this year. The 2 emergency rooms located at Harrisburg Hospital and Community General Osteopathic Hospital are equipped with bassinets, instructions, and program literature for mothers.

Mothers are given the option of bringing the baby directly to a staff member or placing the baby in the bassinet and leaving. If placed in the bassinet, mothers are directed to push a button before leaving. This button

sets off an alarm alerting staff to the placement of a baby in the bassinet.

The alarm does not stop sounding until the bassinet is checked. There are also cameras in place at each location so that staff can monitor the areas should a mother neglect to press the button.

I believe an integral part of this program is to educate the community about Secret Safe Place for Newborns so women know they have options. To that end, I feel it is important to establish lines of communication through advertising, hot lines, or whatever means necessary to be able to reach those in need of this service before they need it. A statewide program would provide much more visibility to the public.

Finally, legislation is desperately needed to assure immunity from prosecution and liability to both the health care givers and the mothers and to prompt other communities in Pennsylvania to adopt similar programs.

Women in such dire straights do not need criminal punishment. They need our help.

I hope that you as a governing body will provide women with avenues to receive that help without condemnation or prosecution and with the option of complete anonymity. Thank you.

MR. MARKLEY: As Marlene said, she did

approach us with an interest in establishing this program once she had learned about it from Mobile, Alabama.

I -- one of my roles is general counsel to Pinnacle Health System. And so I immediately had some concerns from a legal perspective in, when Marlene first told me about this because some of the concerns were, as a hospital, if we have an infant dropped off, we have certain mandatory reporting obligations to the district attorney's office, the police, Children and Youth relating to child abuse and child endangerment.

And so, you know, one of the first questions is if there's an anonymous drop-off of a child, then do we violate our reporting requirements by not getting further information and by not taking some steps to identify the mother and call the police regarding that action? So that was one of the, the first questions we had.

Second was the concern about getting in the middle of a custody dispute. As pointed out, if a mother would drop off a child and, but without having told the father about it or not having, you know, discussed it with the father and the hospital, you know, doesn't have any protective legislation, then they could potentially be sued for any role they had in taking custody of the child and become embroiled in a custody dispute with the parents or, you know, relatives of the child.

And third, a concern about providing medical treatment to the child without any consent from any authorized party. You know, hospitals really need to rely on the consent of the patient or, in the case of minors, the consent of a parent in order to provide treatment.

So we really need to look to, you know, some form of authority that would have custody of the child to authorize medical treatment. One of the things you have to realize and one of the, I think, the benefits of using hospitals for this type of program is that many of these infants are going to be born, you know, prematurely; they may be born outside of a hospital in conditions that aren't ideal for that kind of birth; they may be born to a mother that hasn't received any prenatal care during her entire pregnancy.

And so the risks involving these children is pretty great, and that's why there's a benefit to being in a hospital. But there's also an anticipation that there would be medical treatment necessary for the child in that type of situation. And hospitals would like to be able to look to someone to say yes, you should do this or no, you shouldn't do that with respect to that treatment.

So those issues all were, were kind of identified when we first looked at the program. We were fortunate in Dauphin County, as was pointed out, is that we

were able to work cooperatively with the Dauphin County
District Attorney's Office and the Dauphin County Children
and Youth and work through some of these issues.

And I actually asked the Dauphin County
District Attorney to give me a letter regarding, you know,
his willingness to not prosecute in some of these
circumstances, like, for, you know, failure to report a
child if they were dropped off. And so we were able to get
some comfort from some of the issues that arose.

It certainly didn't address all 3 of those issues that I identified, and nothing short of legislation would. But we thought at that point that the benefits of the program would outweigh the, you know, the risks that may occur with respect to, you know, some of these issues.

So that's how we got to the point of establishing the program in April. And Marlene described that we do have a bassinet outside where there can be an anonymous drop-off of the child without even interacting with a hospital employee.

Now, this isn't some remote location. I want to assure you that it's in the ambulance bay to the emergency room so that, you know, there's frequent traffic in that area. And it is also monitored by videotape, as was indicated, and by live camera so that, you know, we would see if someone were to drop off a child and not press

the button as is requested.

Our experience has caused us, you know, to review the legislation and to have some questions. And I'd like to just raise some concerns, I guess, regarding the current form of the legislation. And one of those concerns really identifies the bracelet that we've, has been discussed.

In our current program, if a mother drops off a child, they're provided with an informational packet that really describes, you know, what happens to the child, what they need to do if they wish to reestablish their parental rights, who they need to call, phone numbers, and that type of thing.

We don't do -- we do, if the mother, you know -- under our protocol, if the mother would present the child to someone there, that person would then discuss with the mother any medical history that the, you know, infant may have or that the mother may have in order to aid with treatment of the child.

But again, there is the option where they could anonymously drop the child off. We're concerned that the bracelet may have sort of a chilling effect on people that don't want to have direct involvement with hospital personnel and are afraid that somehow that bracelet would be used to track them down or try to identify them at a

future time.

So, you know, that -- the other problem would be that if we are, as required by the law, required to provide them with the bracelet, then we would have to have, you know, a definite interaction with them. They wouldn't have the option of, you know, dropping the baby off in a bassinet because then we couldn't fulfill our obligation to present them with the bracelet, you know, as described in the law.

So that, you know, that would cut down on one of the options that we have, you know, in our current program. I would also be concerned, you know, what would happen if the mother, in the state of mind she's in, did receive the bracelet and then, you know, threw the bracelet away and then somehow that prejudiced her later right to claim custody, you know, if there was too much emphasis placed on that bracelet as a means of identification at a future time because in this mental condition that these mothers may be in, they may not be ever-anticipating wanting to reclaim custody but 10 days later, you know, things may have changed and they may have wished they had kept the bracelet or done something to, you know, enable that.

The second concern I have just in reading the legislation -- and it just may be the drafting -- but it

appears to me that this is mandatory for all hospitals to institute the program as it's written. And I would be concerned. You know, we have voluntarily undertaken this.

But there are hospitals in the state that really don't have the facilities; they don't have pediatricians available; they don't have neonatal intensive care units available; and they may not have full-service emergency rooms 24 hours a day.

And so I would just be concerned about making it a mandatory obligation on all hospitals as opposed to something they could voluntarily undertake and then receive this immunity as long as they run it in accordance with the legislation. And I don't know if that's what was intended or if that's just the way, you know, by definition that it appears to be, you know, currently.

The other issue that we noted was that we would prefer if there was some immediate custody decision or if the legislation would provide that immediately upon, you know, the hospital receiving the baby, they can call Children and Youth; and Children and Youth immediately becomes the custodian of that infant because that would address our need for someone to direct medical treatment.

We would have Children and Youth to look to to be able to authorize treatment and make medical decisions if there was a, you know, immediate need for those types of decisions. We don't want to see a delay where there was sort of a vacuum where no one had custody and it wasn't able to identify who we would look to for those types of decisions.

And then finally, the thing that hasn't been addressed by, by anyone so far is the reimbursement issue. And hospitals, unfortunately, have to look at that. In, I think, Senator Helfrick's bill, there's a provision that said the infant would immediately become eligible for Medicaid coverage upon Children and Youth taking custody of that child.

And that would provide, you know, some opportunity for a hospital to receive some compensation for care that was provided to the infant at the time it was dropped off. And again, some of these children may end up in a neonatal intensive care unit and could ring up, you know, substantial hospital bills in a short period of time given the level of care that may be required.

And so that was an important provision from a hospital standpoint, is that there would be Medicaid coverage for the infant as of the time that Children and Youth accepted custody.

So those are the areas. We commend both the House and the Senate for looking at this legislation, and we think it's essential to encourage more hospitals to

institute this type of program. And there's just a couple 1 of the operational things that we've identified. But we'd 2 be happy to answer questions. 3 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Well, thank you to both of 4 you for your presentation. And the program that you have 5 6 operating right now sounds very good. I'd like to open it 7 up for questions to the Task Force members at this time. Representative Marsico. 8 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Thank you, Mr. 9 Good morning, and thanks for your testimony and 10 your hard work with this issue. I want to commend both of 11 you for what you've done in Dauphin County. Let me ask 12 you, have you had any babies dropped off since your, the 13 14 initiation of this program? 15 MS. GUARNESCHELLI: Not so far, but that isn't necessarily a bad thing. 16 I agree with that. 17 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: 18 You were talking about the information package that you provide and that you suggest that that be part of this 19 legislation. Actually, we do have that actually as a 20 21 suggestion by the Pennsylvania Hospital Association. 22 Like I said, we sat down and tried to get some 23 suggestions and recommendations. It's not a perfect bill. 24 We're looking for ideas. We're looking for help in putting

this together, this bill as well as Senator Helfrick's

25

bill. Although, on page 9 of the bill -- I don't know if you have it in front of you -- but it does say that the Department of Welfare would provide training curriculum for the use by the hospitals and health care providers at hospital regarding this chapter.

It also will promulgate regulations to implement this chapter and also to provide information -- which is, I think, on the previous page -- to the public regarding the general health of the infant, et cetera. That may need to be worked out somewhat more, but we're certainly willing to do that. Thank you for your comments.

MR. MARKLEY: And one of the things that we thought about -- because we reviewed the legislation and looked at it in terms of if it passed in this form, how would we implement it? And one of the things we looked at with identification bracelets is that we could put a bracelet inside the informational packet that is, you know, available for when the infant is dropped off and that that bracelet could then be matched to a bracelet that we put on the child if they were dropped off.

But we would not in that instance physically be providing that bracelet to the mother because they would be taking it as part of a packet. And so if there was some way to, you know, make that less mandatory on the hospitals to have to, you know, that in order to get the protection in the act, that they have to provide it.

If you said made available, it has to be made available, then that's different than saying provide. So that, you know, that kind of thing could help with the anonymous drop-off if you intended or wanted to permit that type of, of drop-off of a child.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Representative Gabig.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: I guess I'll come back to the issue that Representative Manderino raised initially, the issue of anonymity. There seems to be 2 competing values that we're talking about. And I think if I understood your testimony, you seem to think that anonymity will encourage women, expectant mothers or mothers in this situation to come in.

But having seen a lot of very ugly things in life, it seems to me if someone would kidnap this child or take this child against the mother's will with malice towards that mother and towards the child and drop at this safe haven where there's no ability later on to then track, to prosecute a kidnapping case and return that, recover that child and return it to the mother or the parents, I think that, that is the issue that we're struggling with up here in terms of the complete anonymity.

I don't think we want to encourage that problem. So I think that's what we're struggling with up here. And I just would be interested in your response to that.

MS. GUARNESCHELLI: Well, I mean, Chris can probably tell, perhaps, a little more than me. But I guess our idea -- we've thought of those things, and I've thought about those things myself. And first of all, if someone else is maliciously dropping off this child, first of all, they are on tape. I mean, they are recorded.

We have cameras proving who dropped this baby off. So if you need to identify that person later on, we would have the means of doing so for prosecution. If it's determined that the person is not the parent dropping that off, that child off and you need to find that person, there is some way to do it.

Regarding having the person who wants to reclaim this child being proved the parent, I believe we're favoring the blood tests, DNA, as you mentioned, as means of providing definite custody. I believe that would be a very definitive way over anything else to determine who is the parent.

And once that's determined, the blood work between the child and the mother, then, you know, you can be assured then at that point that who you have is the

right person.

MR. MARKLEY: I think just to add further with the kidnapping situation, that certainly would be difficult. And the whole notion of, you know, lawful custody, someone dropping off a baby with lawful custody I think would put a hospital in a bind to try to identify whether, you know, if a woman showed up with a baby and said that she's Mary Smith and this is her baby and she wanted to drop it off, we would have no way of verifying that or knowing whether that was indeed her baby at that time.

And so we would have the same dilemma, you know, whether it was truly a mother dropping off a child or somebody who kidnapped a child and dropped it off. You know, we wouldn't be able to really pursue that at that time.

So I think the way we kind of view it is that once we have received the child and given it whatever, you know, treatment it needs and get it into a safe environment, then Children and Youth can sort that out later. That becomes them working with the police department or the district attorney's office to figure out if there has been a local kidnapping and if there is an infant and identifying that infant.

But that's something that the hospital's not

in a position to do at the time the infant's dropped off. 1 MS. GUARNESCHELLI: The number one goal of the 2 hospital -- I'm sorry -- is to provide safety for this 3 4 It's the number one goal, is first get the child safe and then sort out custody and, you know, whether 5 there's anything unlawful going on once the child is safe. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: I quess that's the stage that I'm talking about, the initial drop-off. 8 now it is a kidnapping situation. And if it was anonymous 9 versus being some identifiable event that occurred, how are 10 you ever going to prove that case, prosecute that case, 11 recover that child and return it to, to the mother? 12 That's a problem I have with the complete 13 14 anonymity. And I understand your problem to encourage it by putting up walls or barriers, psychological or whatever. 15 that the mother would lose that chance. And as the Senator 16 17 indicated, we're not going to have to worry about a kidnapping charge. 18 19 But that's, I think, what Representative Manderino raised. And it's also a concern that I have. 20 The other question that I had regarded the medical 21 22 treatment and whether Children and Youth should be 23 assigned. I mean, why can't somebody just from the 24

hospital -- I mean, I'd rather have a doctor making those

medical decisions than somebody -- I mean, with all due respect to my good friends -- at Children and Youth saying they don't know the child. And why wouldn't the doctors or hospitals, if we gave them some kind of immunity, wouldn't they be in the best position to make those kinds of decisions?

MR. MARKLEY: Well, I think one of the decisions that you can anticipate is, you know, whether there's, you know, a child is not able to be saved, you know, whether they're terminal and no further treatment should be provided to the, to the child.

And health care providers are generally very uncomfortable making those types of decisions, you know, when the child's in your facility and receiving care from them. It could almost be viewed as a conflict of interest if they're making a decision that no, this child no longer needs care.

And that's why in all circumstances hospitals and physicians look to a family member or look to the patient. In the, you know, foster care situation, they look to Children and Youth, they look to guardians so that the physician in the hospital isn't put in that situation of having to, you know, to make a decision to stop treatment.

It's easy to make the decision to provide

treatment. And, you know, hospitals would tend to go in 1 that direction. But if a decision needs to be made to stop 2 3 treatment, that's when you'd like to have an independent party evaluate it and make a decision. 5 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative Gabig. Are there any other questions? Representative 8 Pallone. 9 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Thank you, Mr. 10 11 Chairman. Mark, I admire the hospital for instituting the I think it's a model for other programs and 12 13 particularly this legislation. And we're dealing with the issue of anonymity and whatnot. 14 15 The protection of the child is the paramount I'm going to go so far as to ask the 16 issue. 17 question -- and it may seem ridiculous because we've 18 reached such a sad state in our society where we're 19 abandoning children. But the legislation right now only 20 exempts the criminality issue if I present the child and it 21 is not a victim of child abuse, for example. 22 Would it encourage that abusing parent, for 23 example, to be able to drop that child off without fear of prosecution because they've regained a moment of clear 24

thinking and saying, Hey, I'm either going to abuse this

child or turn it over without prosecution? 1 Do you think that would have any impact on the 2 3 incidence of drop-off for care? MR. MARKLEY: Well, one of the, you know, the 4 concern certainly with anonymity is if you have an abused 5 child dropped off anonymously. But I think the act 6 7 provides essentially that these provisions in the immunity only apply if there aren't evidence of abuse. 8 I know our program really, you know, looks at 9 that, that we would -- the first thing we would do is 10 11 examine that child. And if there was evidence of child abuse, we would still contact the authorities. And they 12 would go ahead and pursue, you know, their normal 13 14 investigation and, you know, prosecution for that abuse. 15 I think that what we're really trying to avoid is the notion that just dropping the child off in and of 16 itself is a form of, you know, abuse or endangerment. And 17 18 I think that's really what the act is intended to, you 19 know, protect. 20 But if we saw an abused child that, you know, had evidence of, you know, having been abused in some 21 22 fashion, we would still report that and would do whatever we could to assist the police in identifying that mother. 23 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: That's your current 24 25 program?

1 MR. MARKLEY: Right, our current program. REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: The prosecution isn't 2 3 your paramount mission. It's to protect the child. 4 MR. MARKLEY: Right, right. REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Okay. 5 Thank you. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 6 7 Pallone. Representative Staback. REPRESENTATIVE STABACK: 8 Thank you, Mr. Currently, in Pennsylvania, there are a number 9 Chairman. of women who are in jail, in prison because they abandoned 10 their infant children or, worse yet, because they murdered 11 an infant child. 12 Can you tell me, to the best of your 13 14 knowledge, has there ever been any studies done or 15 interviews done among these women to determine why they committed the crimes that they did? And more importantly, 16 what could have been done to prevent the crimes? 17 MS. GUARNESCHELLI: I think there have been at 18 19 least a number of studies or interviews, you know, maybe official studies down to talk shows where this issue has 20 been addressed. Women have been asked. And the bottom 21 22 line number one reason was always panic. 23 They -- these women are in total denial of their pregnancy. It's amazing what you can deny in your 24 25 own mind if you want to. And they will avoid this subject.

Once they're pregnant, they'll avoid this whole subject as
long as possible. They'll keep trying to hide the
pregnancy from everybody.

The fear comes from what are my parents going to think or my guardians going to think of me, what are my peers going to think of me, what am I going to do with this child? So in their minds, they try to stick their heads in the sand and basically forget about it for a while and hope that something will arise magically for them to solve the problem. And it, of course, usually never does.

So here they've reached this point where they now are in crisis. They're at 9 months. Their labor is upon them, and they have no idea what they're going to do. They've never really thought about it, thought it through. And they -- basically, their fear takes over; and they don't even think at this point.

Women have physically told other people that this is what happens. They physically just cannot think about it, and they will run and just try to get rid of the problem. To them, they've only thought of this as the problem. It's not a child in many cases in their minds at this time.

It is something they just want to run away from. And so they find whatever means they can to get the problem away so they can go on with their lives. And this

is where we try to avoid this, you know. I personally, I want to get the word out to as many women as possible ahead of time before they reach this panic state because once they're panicking, they're not thinking and there's nothing you can do.

Hopefully, if they know there is a place where they don't have to think about it, they don't have to worry what's going to happen to me, you know, what's going to happen to my child, they can just leave a baby somewhere at a safe place, then in their minds, their problem is solved.

Many times what happens is afterwards, these women start thinking about it. Once the initial panic phase is over, some of these women then start realizing, Oh, you know, I didn't have to worry this bad. My parents do accept me if they do find out about the pregnancy later on.

And all those fears they worried about ended up being not realistic. It was all in their head. So therefore, some of them will try to reclaim their child back. But, you know, it's this phase when they're in that 9-month term and their labor is coming upon them, they don't think. And that's usually what happens.

That's the reason why. That's why -- this encompasses all socioeconomic areas. This is not a poor inner city problem. This can happen anywhere to any woman,

young, old, older, affluent people as well. It's just simply if they fear that somebody is going to look down upon them, they're disappointing people because they got pregnant and they're not married. They don't think. They just run.

REPRESENTATIVE STABACK: Tell me, if I wanted to acquire the results of some of those studies, where might I look for them? Or better yet, are you in a position to make them available?

MS. GUARNESCHELLI: Well, perhaps I could. I never -- I'm trying to think. The person I have worked with mostly in developing this program initially before I approached Pinnacle and Ed Marsico was John Tyson, who is the district attorney from Mobile, Alabama.

His state, or his area has provided the first program, Secret Safe Place for Newborns. And I contacted him and got a lot of information from him. I have saved some articles from magazines and such. I know certain programs on TV that have shows devoted to this issue. And those are where the interviews came, from some of the women directly as well. I could try to see if I could find some of that information for you.

MR. MARKLEY: The Alabama program I think has had 10 infants that have been turned in to the Secret Safe Place since its inception so that --

MS. GUARNESCHELLI: And none -- since the 1 2 program started, no abandonment. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: I'd suggest we also may 3 have subsequent testimony that might answer some of your 4 5 questions as well. 6 REPRESENTATIVE STABACK: Thank you very much. 7 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 8 Staback. Representative Manderino. REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. 9 Following up on the earlier conversation with 10 Representative Gabig about the lawful abandonment issue, I 11 just wanted to point out to members that I don't think it's 12 sufficient enough for us to rely on the fact that Pinnacle, 13 14 who happens to be testifying in front of us now, has set up 15 a program that has a surveillance video camera because that 16 is not a requirement of the legislation and not something that I think we can rely on in law. 17 18 Having said that, in terms of that that's not 19 a good thing to rely on in terms of identification, I quess 20 I'm, I'm -- well, let me just stop with that point. 21 other question in the beginning of your testimony, Ms. Guarneschelli -- good Italian name -- one of the points 22 23 that you made is that we want to be able to get help to 24 these mothers and that they are often doing what they're 25 doing because of a state of panic and not clear thinking.

Is it good enough to kind of stop here? I mean, how -- if we just do what either of these pieces of legislation are proposing, how -- it seems to me like we're saying it's good enough for our public policy to stop short of trying to get help to that mother because how are we doing it?

How are we doing it through these pieces of information? How are you doing it through your -- this isn't by way of criticism. How are you doing it through your program at Pinnacle? I guess maybe the information that's in the packet that you hand out kind of tells them what resources are available and where they ought to seek help. Is that what you do?

MR. MARKLEY: Right. The information -- there's 2 things. If a mother actually interacts with one of our staff members, then they're offered the opportunity to get a medical exam themselves because they may have just delivered and they may have their own medical issues.

So they're offered that opportunity, you know, at that point again to -- even if they want to do it on an anonymous basis, they can receive a medical exam and treatment there in the emergency room. And then they are provided with the information packet that talks about, you know, resources available in the county and how to go

about, you know, if they want to reclaim their child at a later point, how they would go about doing that and who they would contact.

So that's the, you know, kind of what's directed at providing them with some help. It certainly doesn't deal with all of their psychological issues or things they may be going through. But, you know, it's, again, sort of hard to do that without mandating some kind of identification and registration of those people at that time.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Yeah. And I understand. As you can see, everyone up here is struggling with the, wanting to save children's lives and get healthy babies and then the very complicated aspects that go along with that.

But from what I have read and heard just in the popular media, even states that have instituted these -- and I do think that Representative Kelly is right, that some folks are going to testify later about what, what the findings. They have a longer track record.

But my general understanding is that they are not often used and that they are not in places that have them. Although, you just intimated that maybe Mobile, Alabama is a, is an exception to the rule. But the rule seems to be that the abandonment is still happening in

1 nonsafe haven places. 2 So I quess the other point is -- and I do note 3 that the bill -- I think both versions of the bill have a notification to police and child welfare requirements. You may not have to collect all of the information that you 5 currently have to collect, but you do have to notify. 6 And I guess I would suggest that that's 7 probably our better safeguard against lawful versus 8 unlawful abandonment because I would assume that we would still go through the same procedures that we go through now 10 11 in terms of public notification, news coverage of this baby 12 having been dropped off so that the general public is aware 13 and if somebody is out there looking for a baby that is missing, they will know who and where to contact it. 14 15 So you're not at all suggesting any changes in the, in the requirement to notify, just in the, how much 16 17 information you have to gather from the person dropping it 18 off; am I correct? That is correct. 19 MR. MARKLEY: 20 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. Thank 21 you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Representative 22 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Are there any other questions? Ms. Dalton. 23 Manderino.

coming. Mr. Markley, I have a couple questions for you.

24

25

MS. DALTON: Good morning. Thank you both for

Let's leave aside for a second this legislation. Let's leave aside for a second the program that you have at Pinnacle. Let's just talk for a second about someone that comes in. We won't identify who because we'll say it doesn't matter.

But somebody comes in with a child who's clearly been abused, who's black and blue, who's got broken ribs. It's an infant. Tell us the steps you now take under the Child Protective Services Act, if you would, step by step with respect to treatment, decisions, and payment.

MR. MARKLEY: With respect to the, the treatment, that's the paramount. Obviously, the first thing if a child is, you know, needs immediate medical treatment in an emergency, we would provide emergency treatment to that child.

We also have a reporting obligation under the Child Abuse and Protection Act where we would then notify the police that we have a child that has been abused. We would also notify Dauphin County Children and Youth, you know, regarding that. And they would then send a caseworker over that would then begin to, if the parent was on the scene, dealing with the parent or, you know, to further investigate, you know, the potential for abuse and the evidence that we have.

We also have, you know, almost forensic people

available in the hospital that would take pictures of the child. Particularly with sexual abuse, we have a whole program dealing with sexually abused children and working with the district attorney's office to make sure that that's properly investigated and documented and everything, you know, is done in accordance with what's required through the district attorney.

At that -- we would not -- the child would not be, become eligible for Medicaid or would not be on any kind of state insurance program until such time as they were taken into, you know, a foster care program or custody from the parents would be interrupted so that, you know, in that situation, we wouldn't have immediate eligibility for Medicaid and we would have to look to the parents if they had insurance or if they didn't have insurance, if they were on Medicaid for the actual treatment that was provided. So that's where we would look from a payment standpoint.

MS. DALTON: When you take these, this infant that I've hypothetically created into protective custody -- say it's not the parent that brings the child in -- and you notify CYS, as you must under the law, and they come in, do you then look to CYS to make medical decisions for that infant?

MR. MARKLEY: Not until there has been some,

you know, custody proceeding with respect to the infant, you know. So they would not -- if there's, you know, an immediate decision that was made and there was no one available, you know, we would probably, you know, document that we did talk with Children and Youth and got, you know, their permission rather than having no one's permission.

But if we're not in a position where anyone is available, you know, we would go ahead and provide the treatment and, you know, really worry about it after the fact. That's what -- a lot of our treatment decisions come down to that, that we don't have an immediately available source to provide that authority; but we still need to provide the treatment.

MS. DALTON: Right. Under the CPSL then, you would wait -- well, you wouldn't wait. But you'd want the first level of juvenile hearings to go forward, the restraining order hearing to see if you're going to keep the child in protective custody longer than 24 hours.

And Senate Bill 654 mirrors that, what we're just talking about with respect to the Child Protective Services Act. But we'll take a look at the Medicaid language. That was in the first version of Senator Helfrick's bill, and it didn't make it into this version. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Representative Pallone.

1 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Thank you, Mr. 2 Chairman. I have one additional question as a follow-up on 3 Representative Staback's questions. Does your current program include a component for prebirth counseling? And 4 if it does, do you openly advertise that? 5 MS. GUARNESCHELLI: Well, we do have -- of 6 7 course, we have pamphlets being developed for this so that if they do seek any kind of medical care, for whatever 8 reason, themselves or because of their baby, their unborn 10 child, then there is some pamphlets and things available to 11 them. There's also a hot line. If they are even 12 13 considering, you know, what to do with their child afterwards, they can contact this number -- the information 14 15 is in English and Spanish at this point -- where they are told what options they have. And we do try to encourage 16 counseling for them. You know, I don't know --17 18 MR. MARKLEY: One of the other things is 19 that -- a big aspect of this program, as Marlene touched 20 on, is really marketing it and getting the information out 21 to the public. And we have, you know, we're working on a series of marketing efforts, including working with all 22 23 the, you know, local middle schools and high schools and 24 local colleges and areas where, you know, you could have

potential for pregnant women than would be in this kind of

situation. We'll also be doing a certain amount of, like, 1 radio and television advertising, you know, to make sure 2 3 people know these programs are available. On a whole separate line, we also have a whole 4 series of prenatal programs that are available to people 5 without regard to, you know, whether they can pay for the 6 services. So, you know, that if someone comes in seeking 7 prenatal care, they would probably go that route as opposed 8 to the Secret Safe Place route because that's, you know -- we would try to then work with them and they could 10 11 work through normal channels if they were interested in adoption or, you know, working with them. 12 We have social workers that could provide them 13 14 with information if they were interested in those types of The Secret Safe Place is, as pointed out, really 15 options. when they've gotten to the end and haven't made any prior 16 17 arrangement and suddenly they need to deal with the infant. 18 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: So there's really no secret safe place prebirth program that I can come 19 anonymously --20 21 Right. MR. MARKLEY: 22 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: -- and talk about 23 what my options might be or whatever? MS. GUARNESCHELLI: There are people who we 24

refer these women to who will take over. It's not the

1 Pinnacle Safe Place program per se that does it. But we refer them to proper people who will help them in the 2 3 system if they're thinking along those lines. But this program that I developed basically 4 deals with the crisis situation when these women are at 5 that point. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Postdelivery. nothing predelivery of the child? 8 MS. GUARNESCHELLI: Well, we sort of channel 9 10 them in another direction where someone else who might be better able to counsel them. 11 MR. MARKLEY: If they call us in the 8th month 12 13 and say I'm going to have this baby, I don't know what I'm going to do about it, what we would do is refer them to a 14 social worker that could help them work through adoption 15 options and put them in touch with an adoption agency or 16 17 some kind of a program that would help a mother deal with that kind of side of it. 18 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: And are all those 19 programs, if you know, available through all medical 20 21 facilities that would be dealing with --MR. MARKLEY: I think all medical facilities 22 23 have social workers and have the ability to, you know, contact county resources with respect to, you know, 24

adoptions. And there are adoption agencies working, I

think, at almost every place, you know, where there's a 1 2 hospital. 3 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: I think you suggested 4 earlier, though, that not all hospitals can deal with the 5 pediatric needs. MR. MARKLEY: Right. They might not be able 6 to deal with the crisis situation. I think that's one of 7 8 the concerns we had. You know, if a hospital chose not to participate in this program because they don't have 24-hour pediatric coverage or they don't have a 24-hour emergency 10 room -- because there are hospitals in the Commonwealth 11 12 that don't have 24-hour emergency services -- you know, 13 they might not be an appropriate place to have, you know, a safe haven or a secret safe place. 14 And so it should be voluntary on their behalf 15 16 whether they want to participate or not. 17 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: But they would most 18 likely have these other referral agencies. 19 MR. MARKLEY: Right. If they had the time to deal with the referral situation, they'd be able to access 20 21 those referrals. REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: 22 Thank you. 23 MS. GUARNESCHELLI: I'm really trying to work 24 on right now getting the word out through as many channels

as possible so that any woman, not just today who's going

through this but in the future, a year, 10 years from now, can be aware of this program and they know, when they hear Secret Safe Place for Newborns, they know what that's about instantly.

I'm working on funding right now. I think to address what Representative Manderino -- I'm sorry -- what she had brought up was a question as to why some of these programs are not working in other areas. And although there is -- I don't have any hard statistics on this.

But the general feeling seems to be that the programs that do work are effective in their advertising. That is the only way these women are going to know about the program and to take advantage of it. That's my number one goal right now is I need to get the word out.

I'm hoping this bill, if made into law, will be just another means for them to hear about it, to know that there is something safe for them to do.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Christopher and Marlene,

I'd like to thank you for your presentation. I'd just like
to keep the Task Force meeting moving along if we could
because we're running so far behind schedule. Go ahead.

MS. MENDLOW: I'm sorry. But I would like to know, your hospital right now -- if you read the bill, you probably have some way to give us some assistance on this point. Currently, the bill talks about providing immunity

from prosecution in cases involving infants who are less than 28 days of age.

And what I'd like to know is in other states, they've had some difficulty on this point, you know, where doctors not having birth records or anything really can't always fix the age of the child. And I was wondering if anyone in the hospital has thought about that.

And if this is not something you want to discuss now, if you wish to give us some information about that point.

MR. MARKLEY: Yeah. I think that the age that you're going to cut this off is going to, you know, by its very nature, going to be arbitrary. I think our current program is 72 hours. We don't even go 28 days. Yeah, we accept infants that have been born within the previous 72 hours, again, because we want to deal with that crisis period.

And we don't want somebody, you know, that's had a baby and 3 weeks later -- you know, at least in our initial design of the program, we hadn't intended it for somebody who's had 3 weeks, taken care of the baby for 3 weeks and then suddenly decided I don't like being a mother and then goes and drops the baby off.

So that we had limited ours to a shorter window of time. You know, again, 72 hours, you don't know

1 whether the baby's 72 hours or 96 hours or -- you know, you're going to have to use a best quess. But I think any 2 3 type of time limit is going to be a little bit difficult to -- but, you know, I think the idea is not to have a 3-year-old dropped off and, you know, because there's a 5 custody dispute and they want to be rid of them or 7 suddenly, you know, someone wants to leave town and just 8 abandons their child at the emergency room. 9 You know, that's a fear that we would have, too, is that this doesn't just become, you know, some kind 10 11 of an abandonment place for unwanted children of any age. 12 We need to keep it limited to the women that are really in 13 this panic period and have no other options. 14 MS. GUARNESCHELLI: I think our thoughts were 15 as long as if the baby is a newborn, it looks young, very young, again, the first goal is to get that child safe. 16 Worry more about the age specifics later. It's just to get 17 the child in if it's a newborn. 18 19 Again, like you said, a 3-year-old is a little 20 different story. But if it is a newborn, we want to get 21 the child in, get it in safe custody and get medical 22 treatment, if necessary. And then the rest of it is sorted 23 out at a later point. 24 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you once again.

Next on our agenda, we have Wayne Stevenson, the Acting

Director of Children, Youth and Families with the 1 Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare and also --2 3 MR. STEVENSON: This is Mary Whalen, the 4 Special Assistant at the Office of Children, Youth and 5 Families. 6 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Wayne. 7 MR. STEVENSON: How do you do? Thank you. appreciate being given the opportunity to provide you with 8 the Department's position on Senate Bill 654. As you're 9 aware, the intent of this legislation is to develop 10 procedures that would permit the custody of a newborn 11 infant to be transferred from a parent to a health care 12 provider at a hospital. The parent would not be subjected 13 14 to any negative legal consequences due to his or her transferring the custody of the child. 15 16 On behalf of the Department, I want to express strong support for the intended purpose of 654. We have 17 all been horrified by the stories we have read in the media 18 19 about babies being abandoned in dumpsters, along the side

of the road, or in public restrooms.

20

21

22

23

24

25

In 1998, the US Department of Health and Human Services Survey counted 105 infants abandoned in public places, of which 33, or 31 percent, died. These infants are usually abandoned because the mothers are fearful, feel isolated, and are unable to reach out for support from

individuals in their life.

Although it is important to provide protections to parents so that they feel they can safely leave their infant with trained medical professionals, what is most important is the health and safety of the infant. There is no time when an individual is more innocent or vulnerable than at birth.

Newborn infants should be given an opportunity to grow and develop in a nurturing and safe environment.

They should not have to suffer a tragic fate because of the fear and anxiety that his or her mother is experiencing over the child's birth.

This legislation may also help the child before birth. This is because stress in the life of the mother while she is pregnant can have an effect on the development of the child. A mother that is overwhelmed by her pregnancy, unwilling or unable to discuss the pregnancy and not certain of how to respond after the child is born may feel some relief if she knows that she can anonymously leave her child in a safe and secure place.

Although we strongly support the intended purpose of 654, we do have concerns with some of its specific provisions. And I want to outline those concerns about the current version as well as provide you with some recommended amendments.

The bill requires that a person transfer possession of the infant to a health care provider at the hospital and requires that the health care provider distribute an informational pamphlet to the person transferring possession of the infant.

In addition, Senate Bill 654 requires that the person transferring custody of the infant receive from the health care provider an identification bracelet. We strongly recommend that the bill be amended to strike these provisions.

Under these requirements, an individual would not be able to leave the newborn infant at the hospital without having contact with a health care provider. While these provisions are well-intended, a distraught individual who is struggling with the birth of a newborn will most likely not want to discuss his or her actions with anyone or receive any materials related to transferring the custody of the newborn infant.

These requirements may lead to parents feeling that they cannot anonymously leave a newborn with a health care provider and ultimately discourage them from taking the newborn to the hospital.

In Section 6406(a), reporting possession of infants, requires that, quote, A health care provider at a hospital shall make a report within 24 hours to the county

agency and the police department regarding an infant transferred under Section 6405 relating to the accepting possession of infants.

We recommend that this language be amended to require that the county Children and Youth agency be notified immediately by telephone regarding the transferring of custody of the infant. If a county Children and Youth agency is notified immediately, the county agency can take the appropriate actions.

In addition, we recommend that the police not be notified. Section 6340(a)(10) of the Child Protective Services Law requires that law enforcement officials receive certain reports of child abuse. We do not believe that a separate reporting system should statutorily be created for these cases.

Section 6409(a), duties of the county agency and the police department, requires that the police department shall investigate the circumstances surrounding the birth and transfer of possession of an infant if it is determined that the infant is a victim of child abuse.

We recommend that the bill be amended by striking this subsection. The Child Protective Services

Law has specific provisions regarding the investigation of child abuse cases. These include the requirement that county agencies are responsible for investigating

allegations of child abuse. Again, county agencies are required to report certain reports of child abuse to law enforcement officials.

In Section 6409(d), duties of county agency and police department, requires that in no case shall protective custody under this chapter be maintained longer than 72 hours without an informal hearing under Section 6332 relating to informal hearing.

If, at the hearing, it is determined that protective custody shall be continued and the infant is alleged to be without proper care or control or is alleged to be a dependent child under Section 6302(a) relating to definitions, the county agency shall, within 48 hours, file a petition with the court under Chapter 63 relating to juvenile matters alleging that the child is a dependent child.

We recommend that the bill be amended by striking these lines. The Juvenile Act outlines the requirements and procedures regarding finding a child dependent and subsequently his or her disposition. Once the county agency takes custody of the child, the agency is legally required to follow the established procedures in both the Child Protective Services Law and the Juvenile Act.

Section 6413, duties of the Department,

requires that the Department make available a training curriculum, promulgate regulations, publicize the provisions regarding infant protection, provide health care providers and hospitals with informational pamphlets regarding infant protection, and report to the General Assembly on whether a dedicated toll-free telephone line regarding infant protection would be useful, feasible, or cost-effective.

We do not believe that it is necessary to put these provisions in statute. This initiative would not result in enough phone calls to sustain a dedicated toll-free phone line. Questions regarding this initiative could be handled through our existing resources such as ChildLine, our toll-free child abuse hot line; our regional Children and Youth offices; and the Department's web page, dpw.state.pa.us.

In fact, one of the responsibilities of ChildLine is to receive calls on alleged child abuse and/or neglect cases and refer these cases to the appropriate county Children and Youth agency. With regard to promulgation of regulations, we do not have licensing or other enforcement authority over hospitals.

In summary and closing, I want to reiterate that the amendments we are proposing to this bill would provide a parent, most likely a mother who has just gone

through the trauma of giving birth, with the security of 1 knowing that she can leave her newborn infant with a caring 2 medical professional without having to face negative legal 3 consequences or be identified as the person leaving the In this way, the health and safety of the infant 5 would be protected. 7 Thank you for providing me with the 8 opportunity to testify on this important legislation. 9 I'll be happy to take any questions. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Wayne. 10 there any questions at this time? Representative Gabig. 11 12 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you, Mr. Mr. Secretary, I have one sort of broad question 13 that's been the theme that we've been talking about and a 14 more specific one. So I'll ask the more specific one so I 15 don't forget it. 16 You have several recommendations in here in 17 18 terms of amending the bill. Would it be possible that you 19 could provide us with something what the bill would look like with those several amendments? You see what I'm 20 saying? Like, if we could have something like here's the 21 bill we would like because you do have several substantive 22 23 amendments in there. If you could do that, it would probably make 24

25

it a little easier for me to go through what the bill would

look like in the end.

MR. STEVENSON: I think what we're trying to do is not duplicate laws that are already in existence and seem to be working well. The Juvenile Act and the Child Protective Services Law provide certain provisions, and they would kick in once a child is abandoned at the hospital.

At this point under the Child Protective

Services Law, the hospital could take emergency custody.

That would initiate a call. And this is in practice. A call would come to the child protective services agency, the county child welfare agency.

They would file an emergency petition with the juvenile court, and there would be a 72-hour dispositional hearing at that point to confirm the allegations of dependency. So all of that would kick in, and it would not be necessary to include all of that in this legislation.

So basically, this would provide for a safe haven for the child to be dropped off where medical attention could be provided.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: No, no. I understand that. And I honestly appreciate a lot of the advice to amendments. All I'm -- technically, you say strike this, strike this, add this. And if I could just see the bill that had those things done to it, it will make it a little

easier for me to study and see and understand the bill that you would like.

MR. STEVENSON: We could do a mock-up of that, if you'd like, and submit that to the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Exactly. I guess that's the term I was looking for. Secondly, the broader issue, the policy issue, you said at the beginning of your testimony that the bill was designed -- I think you used the term parents. But the term that they use is the term someone, a person with lawful custody.

And that gets back to my whole issue. It seems to -- it just doesn't talk about mothers or parents and giving them immunity from prosecution. It says somebody with lawful custody. And if you get back to the situation where somebody takes that child and basically puts them in the system where you very well might never find that child again, it seems to me it becomes very difficult to prosecute that kidnapping case with that anonymous drop-off.

And so I guess that's, you know -- again, I
have -- I appreciate -- I think we're all on the same page
in terms of the intent of the legislation. But I'm still
very much struggling with that particular issue on the
anonymous anonymity of dropping off at the secret safe
haven versus somehow trying to identify the person that is

dropping off the child. 1 So -- but I very much appreciate your 2 3 recommendations to strengthen this piece of legislation. 4 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 6 Gabig. Representative Manderino. REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thanks. Following 7 8 up on Representative Gabig's last line, you're recommending immediate -- I think the bill says 24-hour notice to the 9 county agency and the police. You're saying immediate 10 notice to the county agency, no need to notify the police 11 unless child abuse? 12 Right. MR. STEVENSON: 13 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. 14 15 practicality -- I don't really know how it works now -- but it would seem to me that an important component of this 16 legislation in terms of our concern about lawful custody 17 and abandonment or safe haven and kidnapping and that whole 18 kind of issue is whether or not the word gets out as it 19 does -- I mean, today, you watch the news. And if a baby 20 was abandoned anywhere, it's on the news. 21 Who does that notifying? Will that still 22 23 happen if we take the police out of the loop? You know, 24 how do we assure that kind of word gets out that if anybody

has any claim or right of concern about this child who's

been left here, here's your public notice to come forward? MR. STEVENSON: I think in any situation, 2 3 certainly in any abandonment but certainly in a newborn 4 abandonment, there is normally a process to go through to terminate parental rights if you're going to proceed under 5 the Juvenile Act and dependency and move that then into the Adoption Act. 7 So there would be a due diligence to find the 8 parents, both mom and dad, because you would have to do 9 that in order to terminate parental rights. Or if 10 you've -- following due diligence, then you would have to 11 just file under the abandonment thing. You wouldn't have a 12 13 parent. But normally, there is a process in practice 14 15 that agencies follow to try to locate the child's parents. REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Maybe you need to 16 explain to us a little bit more how that works so that I 17 have any bit of confidence that it would have an ability 18 19 to -- I mean, I see the news report the night and the next day after the baby is left on the doorstep. 20 21 I don't see a news report a month later that says, Hey, this baby still hasn't been claimed. 22 I don't see that news report. So I quess my question is, I don't 23

know what somebody behind the scenes is going through to

try to identify that and --

24

1 MR. STEVENSON: There's not now an established procedure to do that, if that's the answer you're looking 2 3 for. There really isn't at this point. I think that generally the juvenile court is looking for and the orphan's court is looking for some due diligence to try and identify the parents. 6 And that might be a notice. That might be 7 8 getting into the community and talking with families in the 9 neighborhood. REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: One of the concerns 10 11 that Jane Mendlow raised with the last testifier was the whole notion of the age of the child. And I do think that 12 that was an important point that we hadn't discussed 13 14 heretofore, that many of us are thinking about newborns the first day, the first 3 days, maybe even within the first 15 week. But I'm not sure anybody was thinking of a 16 4-week-old, month old child. 17 In terms of how things kick in from your end, 18 19 does it make a difference? And do you have any advice as to what this bill should or shouldn't do in terms of the 20 21 age level? 22 MR. STEVENSON: I think that the bill is intended for that newborn. And the sooner we can intervene 23

with that newborn, the greater the chances for survival and

a normal life developing. I think the theory is based on

24

the notion that these parents, particularly the mother, is isolated, does not have a support group, does not have those she can turn to.

It becomes -- as the child gets older and time goes on, it becomes less and less likely that those kinds of situations will result where the child would not be known to somebody else and that infant not be identified as a life in the community.

I think that this bill is intended to -- the mother has hidden her pregnancy from others for 9 months. Hiding an infant for 4 weeks is highly unlikely I think. But I don't think it should be beyond -- I mean, I think there should be some cutoff point because, as was the previous testifier, abandoning children should not be encouraged as a way of dealing with the problems.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: My final question is -- and I concur with your assessment. I don't think the volume is going to be such that we should be mandating in legislation a dedicated toll-free line, et cetera. But what I do think is if we're going to pursue something like this, I think that if we have -- I don't know how much we have learned from what other states have done.

But I do think one thing that we have learned is that if these mothers don't know about it, you haven't done anything to help anybody.

MR. STEVENSON: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So have -- and there was just an article in this past Friday's New York Times about a young 19-year-old woman who abandoned her baby in a well-lit apartment building and was prosecuted under the law for abandonment. This was in Indiana. They passed a safe baby law 6 months before.

But this young woman, in her panic, in her fright, she wasn't even aware of it. So my question is, I mean, I think if we are going to do this, that we have an obligation to do more than just the feel good part of it. And we have, at the very minimum, an obligation to vest some teeth with this legislation in terms of education, publicity, et cetera.

I think that to have individual, rely on individual hospitals publicizing their program is going to be a hit or miss kind of thing. Who would the proper entity be to vest -- and I'm saying that vest knowing that in our realm, that means you probably got to put some dollars, you should put some dollars in to make it happen.

But who would that entity be? Would it be your particular department or someplace else in state government? And if so -- not necessarily off the top of your head -- but give some thought and get back to us some information about what might it cost to have an effective

publicity campaign statewide on this kind of program.

MR. STEVENSON: If I could respond off the top of my head. And we can add some of that into what we're, a mock bill. It seems to me that there should be some initial public relations around this bill, announcing it, and making that information available to the public. And certainly, the Department of Public Welfare can take a lead in that.

But I think that if we're going to be effective, that this information needs to be imbedded in a variety of different places in the community, in the schools, in your health providers as well as social services and not think of just one place. It really does need to be imbedded in -- for instance, we have, we have a website for a Statewide Adoption Network, for instance.

It's information that should be imbedded in that generally so that the example earlier of the woman 8 months pregnant calling up and saying what am I going to do, get her information through the Statewide Adoption Network to get counseling to help her think through this issue.

And we also have 800 lines in terms of ChildLine, et cetera, and getting referrals. But the schools are working with kids. That's where kids are. And of course, I'm thinking naturally teenage mothers. But

there are young adults who are also in the community; and 1 they, too, need to learn about this option as well. 2 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. 3 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 6 Manderino. Are there any further questions? I'd like to thank you for your presentation, 7 response.) Wayne and Mary. Thank you very much. We've been joined by 8 Representative Pat Browne. If he'd like to introduce 10 himself and tell us his legislative district for the 11 record. REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: Pat Browne, 131st, 12 13 Lehigh County. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 14 15 Browne, for that hunting season presentation. Next on our agenda, we have the Honorable Edward M. Marsico, Junior, 16 17 the District Attorney of Dauphin County; Gary E. Tennis, 18 Esquire, the Chief of the Legislation Unit of the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office and --19 MR. TENNIS: Anthony Rosini, the District 20 21 Attorney of Northumberland County, Chairman Lewis. you for having us here. I just want to introduce Mr. 22 23 Rosini first. He has to leave at noon. He has a meeting with the Attorney General up in Northumberland County at 24 25 1 o'clock. So we were going to ask if he can go first.

1 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: That would be fine. 2 MR. TENNIS: So I'll turn it over to him. 3 MR. ROSINI: Thank you, Gary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, and members of the Task Force. 4 My name is Anthony Rosini. I'm the District Attorney of 5 Northumberland County. And I'm here to testify in support of the safe haven legislation in Senate Bill 654. 7 8 And I note that Senator Helfrick is my I live in his district. I was here for his 9 Senator. remarks, and I concur totally in the remarks that he gave 10 11 earlier and the perspective that he provided. Some of my 12 testimony will echo some of his testimony, but I think it bears repeating because the case that was related to you 13 14 that I'm going to relate is the perfect example of why we 15 should have a safe haven legislation. I want to tell you about the incident we had 16 in Northumberland County that occurred approximately 10:30 17 a.m. on July 16th of this year. The operator of the 18 19 Sunbury Municipal Waste Transfer Station observed something unusual as the municipal waste truck was emptying its 20 21 contents into the hopper at the transfer station. hopper area is an area where municipal waste is dumped from 22 collection trucks and compacted for transfer to a landfill. 23 24 The operator of the hopper area, Michael

Kerstetter of Sunbury, stopped the operation of the

compactor to examine what he thought looked like a baby's leg protruding from a broken garbage bag. After examining the items of garbage from a distance and then using a pole to remove some of the debris, Kerstetter, along with the truck operator, Larry Treas, confirmed that they had seen the body of a small baby in the trash.

A call to the 911 center was made. And the police as well as the coroner's office, district attorney's office, and other entities responded. The Deputy Coroner, James Kelley, of the Northumberland County Coroner's Office and troopers from the Pennsylvania State Police Records and Identification Division processed the hopper at the transfer station. They uncovered the body of what appeared to be a newborn child in with the trash.

The child had apparently been placed in a garbage bag that burst when the truck ran its own smaller compactor. The body was removed by Deputy Coroner Kelley and placed on a plastic tarp with some of the material that surrounded the body.

While processing the material around the body, pieces of junk mail with names and addresses were recovered. Officers used this information to determine the area of Sunbury from which the body had originated. The county detective and an officer from the Sunbury Police Department, Jamie Quinn, as well as Corporal Richard

Bramhall of the Pennsylvania State Police immediately went to that area and began interviewing individuals. They were looking for a woman who had recently been pregnant but had no child.

After interviewing several individuals, these officers ultimately identified the mother and father of the child. A full report of the autopsy of the child's body has not yet been received. But a preliminary report indicates that the child was a normal, full-term, female infant. There was no evidence of any medical disease. The baby had open and normally formed alveoli.

I am informed that these findings indicate that the child had taken a breath after birth and was therefore born alive. The preliminary cause of death has been listed as consistent with asphyxia or drowning.

The investigation revealed that the mother of the child had given birth to the baby in a tub of water and allowed the baby to drown. The mother then inserted a piece of what appeared to be toilet or tissue paper into the child's throat, which was recovered during the autopsy.

The community -- and I think at the urging of our county coroner -- has named the baby Baby Mary. The mother of the child was 32 years old and had told people she did not want another child. She had other children who were taken from her by Children and Youth services, and she

would not cooperate in any contacts by CYS in the past and certainly would not have gone to them to give up her child.

This case has touched the hearts of our local community. The deputy coroner donated a casket and funeral services. The local cemetery donated a grave plot, and almost 200 people attended the funeral. But I think we need to do more for the children that are living to prevent another tragedy like this.

I can't tell you that a safe haven legislation would have affected the mother's decision in this case. I can't tell you that Baby Mary would have lived if such a program were in effect. But I can tell you, without any program or legislation, Baby Mary had no chance for life.

I believe that giving women who have unwanted children the opportunity to take them to a place where they can be dropped off with no questions asked, free from any interference by any government agency, may save the lives of some, if not all, of these children.

And I concur with Representative Manderino that a well-advertised, publicized program has the potential to be effective. I also note that I have had conversations with Senator Helfrick with regard to the issue of anonymity, and I believe that it is extremely important that the parents of the child be permitted to remain anonymous.

I believe the parents of unwanted children are more likely to take advantage of a safe haven if they are totally free from government interference. Obviously, there must be some protections for the child. And in reviewing the bill, I believe, that's before you, there are options that cover that.

Some parents may find themselves in a position where they are unable to care for a child and are unwilling to turn over the child to a government agency. They may not want to have the interference in their lives or public embarrassment that that would cause.

If a parent is able to drop off a child at a hospital anonymously, he or she may lose those inhibitions and take advantage of a safe haven program. And I want to commend District Attorney Marsico for establishing a program here in Harrisburg in Dauphin County. A program safe for the parents as well as the children is important.

In the Sunbury case, the mother of the child was adverse to any government influence but may have responded to a hospital program if it was available.

Again, as I said earlier, I cannot guarantee that such a program will work; but I can guarantee that taking no action will result in the loss of more innocent children's lives.

I recognize that there are many complicated

issues involved here. But I think it's important for you to focus on the life, of saving the life of the child. As 2 a prosecutor, we are in a better position to prosecute any 3 cases that had been mentioned earlier with a live victim 4 rather than a dead body. Thank you very much. 5 6 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, District Attorney Rosini. Are there any questions from the panel 7 for District Attorney Rosini? He's on a tight schedule 8 (No response.) Seeing none, thank you very much today. 10 for your testimony and traveling down to Harrisburg today. MR. ROSINI: Thank you for your help. 11 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you. 12 13 MR. MARSICO: Good morning. My name is Ed I am the District Attorney of Dauphin County. 14 And I am also here today to support the legislation 15 introduced by Senator Helfrick to provide for safe havens 16 17 in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, as prosecutors, too often we 18 are called to the scene of a crime where a newborn child 19 20

Unfortunately, as prosecutors, too often we are called to the scene of a crime where a newborn child has been abandoned by a parent. In recent years in Dauphin County, we've had 2 newborns killed by their parents. One was placed at the bottom of a clothes hamper, and the other was placed in a portable toilet at a neighborhood playground on Mother's Day.

21

22

23

24

25

In both cases, the abandoning parent was

prosecuted on murder charges. I would rather never have to prosecute another case like that again in my career. They are troubling cases to deal with for all involved. While both of these women chose to kill their babies knowingly and deliberately, I believe that it is incumbent upon us to offer alternatives to parents of a newborn who decide they may want to abandon a child. Accordingly, like many other prosecutors across the nation, I have partnered with others in my community to try to see that this does not happen again.

Marlene Guarneschelli, who you heard from earlier, was really the woman who spearheaded the effort here in Harrisburg. She contacted me several months ago with the idea of starting a program that would provide a safe haven for mothers who are faced with this type of situation.

She convinced me and the Pinnacle Health
System as well as our county Children and Youth services
department to begin a program that we had entitled, as
you've heard, Secret Safe Place for Newborns. That was
after many meetings on the part of the hospital staff,
myself, and Mrs. Guarneschelli.

As you've heard, at 2 local hospitals, we now have a bassinet placed inside the emergency room. It's next to a buzzer that is a place where a parent can drop

off a newborn basically with no questions asked. By bringing a newborn to the hospital setting, we can assure the child safe, prompt medical attention. And the mother, if in need of such attention, can also receive medical assistance.

I know there is many programs throughout the Commonwealth and throughout the country where people are trying to combat this problem. And there's been places where you can drop off a baby on a porch, at a church. And there are a lot of different ideas. To me, it made the most sense to have this at a hospital.

Some of us were concerned that perhaps even a hospital was too much of an institutional setting for someone that was in fear of being identified. But nevertheless, we determined that a hospital setting is a place where the child, if it's in need of medical attention, as many children are, can receive it promptly and saving the life of that child became the top priority.

No legislation will certainly serve as a cure-all. But as prosecutors, we must work with you, our legislators, to attempt at any way possible to save these lives. Our efforts in Dauphin County to get our program up and running have been successful so far. Publicity is a key component of that effort. Hopefully, that will make a difference here.

In Dauphin County, we have had a community group offered to help fund raise. In fact, they held a fund-raiser here this summer that they entitle a Backyard Bash, a picnic, so to speak, where monies raised were given to help us publicize our program locally here and in our I think that's a key component of any program. schools. We have had phone calls to the program; although, we've had no babies dropped off. But we did have a phone call where a woman inquired about the program and was told about it. She actually was from outside of Dauphin County but had seen news reports about it, nevertheless called and was given some referral information as well. What effect that had, we don't know. Certainly, we would rather see every parent welcoming a newborn happily into their household. Where a parent is planning to abandon a baby, we must provide an option to protect that child. For these reasons, on behalf of the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association, I want to express my support for Senate Bill 654. And thank you for the opportunity to be here today. I'll be glad to take any 22 23 questions at this time. MR. TENNIS: Would you like me to testify

1

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

first and then --

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Maybe Gary can present the testimony, and we'll question you both at the same time.

MR. TENNIS: Great. Good morning, Chairman Lewis, Representative Marsico, other members of the Task Force. My name is Gary Tennis. And I thank you for the opportunity to offer remarks in support of the bill on behalf of the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association.

I won't waste your time going item by item through the bill. You're already familiar with that. Last spring, our executive committee voted to support House Bill 1582 introduced by Representative Marsico and voted to support Senate Bill 654 in so long as it had certain amendments, which Senator Helfrick graciously agreed to and were put into the bill in the Senate.

The specific protections we wanted were that only hospitals be deemed safe havens; that police stations not be included; and that the bill clarify that there's no immunity where there appears to be child abuse. That arguably was in the bill to begin with, but we wanted to make sure that that was very clear.

We had a vigorous discussion in the executive committee about the proposal even with the changes. Like any piece of legislation, you're hearing today that it has its pros and cons. But the concern that overrode all others was the desire to save the lives of innocent babies

who might otherwise be abandoned to die.

These tragedies where newborn babies are left to perish are absolutely heartbreaking, and we must do everything in our power to stop them. We recognize, as prosecutors, that our role is to attempt to -- currently, coming late -- to attempt to salvage some justice after the tragedy's occurred. And we know also that we're not child custody experts.

I've been advised of 3 major concerns of, points of concern about the bill from people that are concerned about the bill. First is the argument that there's a lack of hard evidence proving that the programs were effective.

Second is the argument that there are other ways to address these problems that may be more effective. And third, some have expressed concerns that individuals who would have used conventional adoption procedures with all of its protections and safeguards will instead use this shortcut safe haven approach.

Although we really lack the expertise to give conclusive answers to these objections, I'd like to provide a few thoughts the committee may want to consider when it weighs the evidence presented today and decides what to do.

As to the first issue of the effectiveness of these programs, one critical question -- and we've heard it

talked about ad nauseam today. And I'll weigh in with that -- is how well-publicized the safe haven programs are, particularly among at-risk populations, which would be probably high school age.

Apparently in Texas, where little was accomplished by their safe haven program -- and in fact, several babies were abandoned apparently after the safe haven program went into effect -- there was really little or no publicity about the program.

By way of contrast, in Mobile, Alabama, where there was an aggressive publicity media campaign, 6 babies were brought to emergency rooms. And in addition, 2 teen mothers who called the hot line were given direction and guidance that eventually led to them choosing traditional adoption procedures. The conclusion to be drawn is just common sense. As Representative Manderino had said, safe haven programs will work only if the people know about them.

The second issue, if there are more effective ways to reduce the number of abandoned baby deaths, then the General Assembly should definitely aggressively pursue those policies and those approaches. From the Pennsylvania DAs Association's perspective, our ultimate interest is doing everything possible to save these children's lives, whether that means more outreach, education, counseling, or

other approaches.

And I believe that our association would support any reasonable legislation that will accomplish that goal. Different means for accomplishing the goal doesn't, don't necessarily have to be mutually exclusive. So just because there are other things that could be done also doesn't mean that this shouldn't be done.

The last concern I heard was whether individuals will use safe havens law who otherwise would have used just ordinary, the regular adoption procedures. I think certainly common sense would say you'd have to concede that in most situations where a baby's brought into a hospital under the safe haven law, that we often usually won't know for sure whether that baby otherwise would have been put up for adoption or whether it would have been abandoned to die.

But it seems probable that at least some of those babies would have been abandoned to die. And if that is the case, then it's the position of the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association Executive Committee that preventing those deaths must be our overriding concern.

For these reasons, the PDAA Executive

Committee supports Senate Bill 654 and also stands ready to

work with this Task Force to make any further improvements

on the bill or explore other means for preventing these

1 terrible tragedies. Thank you. 2 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you both for your testimony and for your background, also the District 3 4 Attorneys Association position. Those are great recommendations. Are there any questions from the Task 6 Force? Representative Gabiq. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you, Mr. 7 8 Welcome, Mr. District Attorney Marsico and Gary 9 Tennis. I've often wanted to say that to my good friend Ed Marsico, who I used to serve with in Dauphin County as an 10 Assistant DA many, many years ago. Today's my birthday. 11 12 I'm feeling a little old here. A long time ago. This is a terrific effort, I think. 13 think we all agree with the intent. And I'm a cosponsor of 14 15 this bill; although, you might not have been able to notice it by some of my questions today. But I think the -- I'd 16 like to ask a couple of factual questions, and you might 17 not be able to answer them. 18 19 I think we heard testimony about 3 criminal 20 cases, all involving mothers and very, very newborns. 21 mean, the one case in Northumberland just, maybe just barely was born and immediately killed upon birth. And the 22 23 cases that you mentioned, Mr. Marsico, I think were similar 24 type cases.

And I guess the question I had with the

language is it uses the term person with lawful custody versus, say, mother. And it also has the 28 day versus some shorter time to deal with these cases where we're talking about the panicking mother.

And it just gives me that concern about, you know -- you've also handled cases, I know, of paramours and, who are not the father and they kill the child of a woman. So he, instead of killing that child, takes that child from New York, comes down here. And are we opening up too broad of an area to deal with the more narrow case scenario that you sort of discussed here?

MR. MARSICO: I think the -- I mean, arbitrarily you're going to have to decide how many days you want in the legislation. I think Mr. Markley, when he testified earlier about Pinnacle, said we arrived at the shorter term basically because that's the overriding concern we have, what we've seen from the research we've done.

The person with lawful custody, I realize where that could be a concern also because oftentimes it is a paramour, a boyfriend that's involved in these situations. But again, I think there's steps that we can, you know, if that's the case, just like we do in criminal cases where we're prosecuting those individuals, we can identify them.

You know, I know you've been concerned about the anonymity provision in the act. And that certainly was a concern of mine, thinking as a prosecutor that, Boy, I'd like, you know, what if there is something wrong? I want to be able to identify who did something to harm that baby.

But preventheless, our fear was that when you

But nevertheless, our fear was that when you take away that anonymity provision, then you're going to have a reluctance of the parent, and most likely the mother, to come forward in those situations. And now, you know, if a child's dropped off, you know, behind the Capitol Building, we have no way, other than investigative techniques, of locating that individual and figuring out who did it.

So we'd really be, I think, Representative Gabig, you know, in the same position that we are in some of these cases now where we don't know who the person is that's abandoned the baby. We have to use our investigative techniques to identify them.

If there's going to be a custody concern, which hopefully there would be because the baby would be alive and continuing to thrive, we can now determine paternity through DNA procedures somewhere down the line in a court proceeding.

MR. TENNIS: Just to follow up on that kidnapping issue, I think it may be worth this Task Force

exploring. There may be things already available, or maybe they need to be developed -- I understand there are 28, 29 states that have adopted legislation along this line -- some kind of a clearinghouse or data bank of information both for kidnapped infants and also taking the same information so that whenever there is a baby dropped off in a safe haven, that that information, in addition to being provided to local police, is provided to this national data bank so that you have -- I think you could have a situation you're talking about.

Someone may kidnap a baby in North Carolina, bring it to Pennsylvania and drop it off. And I think that, I think there are ways in the 21st Century now, with the Internet technology and computer technology, that we should be able to, without tremendous expense, be able to set up a data bank so that people know where to check for the babies. They can find out where all the babies that have been dropped off in the country at any given point in time.

I think that the -- because I think that the concerns that both of you expressed are really critical ones. And they should be, have to be addressed.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: What are your thoughts -- I know it's not part of your prepared testimony. Maybe you want to look at it before you

respond -- of making that a statutory obligation on 1 somebody's part to check into, if there's this national 2 data base as you say, to do that soon after the drop-off? 3 MR. MARSICO: I think that's something you 4 I think Representative Manderino, in her want to examine. 5 6 questioning earlier, pointed out that you see the publicity day one and then you don't. You never hear day 25, Hey, we 7 still have this child or, you know, we're still looking for 8 the lawful custodians of this child. So there should be some way of determining 10 11 that. Again, there isn't a widespread instance of abandoning babies, fortunately. So I don't think that 12 13 would be that difficult to do. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Well, there's somewhat 14 15 of a reporting problem there, too. A lot of these aren't even ever discovered. But I mean, that's beside the point. 16 MR. MARSICO: 17 Right. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: The last question I 18 19 have regards the, Mr. Secretary Stevenson's recommendation that a report not go to law enforcement as currently 20 21 required under the proposed statute, that it only go to 22 Children and Youth versus the dual track. What would your 23 response be to his recommendation? 24 MR. MARSICO: Well, I believe there are 25 already provisions that would require the reporting to law

1 enforcement authorities if there's any suspected abuse. Frankly, I think that provision being in there only helps 2 law enforcement get in more quickly to do an investigation 3 as quickly as possible. So I'd rather see that provision 4 kept in. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you, Mr. 7 Chairman. Thank you, gentlemen. 8 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative Gabig. Representative Manderino. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. I quess we're into good afternoon. While I have law enforcement in 11 front of me, let me ask you some crime questions. 12 In the specific instance that the District Attorney from 13 Northumberland County, the story that he told us, there was 14 15 clearly, based on the evidence, a chargeable crime of 16 murder or attempted murder or something where you had a, evidence of a live birth, of a drowning and suffocation. 17 18 MR. MARSICO: Correct. 19 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: An actual intent, intent kind of issue where somebody intended the harm. 20 other instances and in what we're talking about with regard 21 22 to developing any kind of safe haven, we're talking about 23 what crime, the crime of endangering the welfare of a 24 child, the crime of recklessly endangering another?

I mean, what is the chargeable crime; and is

it a malicious intent crime? Is it -- I don't know if I'm wording this right.

MR. MARSICO: I think I know what you're saying. Obviously, in his scenario, you had some type of intentional act that caused the death of that child. Where the child is merely abandoned, say, with no other action other than the abandonment, that's what you're focusing on?

I think that could fall into a variety of different categories. One could argue that was third degree murder, that there's malice that one possesses by putting a child -- if I were to take a child and --

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: How do we charge now, or does it just depend on every district attorney decides what charges to bring?

MR. MARSICO: The facts of the case and the DA's decision. Probably what most likely happens is a charge of criminal homicide is brought generally. And if it were to proceed to trial, the fact finder would ultimately decide what degree of criminal homicide it were to be.

I think one can argue even taking a child and placing it in the woods, what else could your intent be for that to happen to a newborn? I think one could argue the only result that's going to happen to that newborn is death. So I think arguably you could make a case of first

degree murder.

Obviously, you would not have as much evidence of specific intent as in the Northumberland County scenario that we heard about from Mr. Rosini. But more than likely, it would probably be a third degree murder where there's some malice but not a specific intent to kill or even an involuntary manslaughter where you have gross negligence resulting in a death.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. But I guess
I would argue the baby still alive in the trash bag in the
woods who happens to be found before it dies is a lot
different than the baby found wrapped in a blanket left in
a well-lit vestibule of an apartment building.

MR. MARSICO: Certainly.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. Is there any way, given how our laws are written, that you can -- and again, if what we're saying is, A, we want, ultimately we want to do whatever we can to protect that child; and B, we want to help a frightened, confused, and panicked mother at that immediate stage of panic and abandonment, is there any way that we can somehow separate or delineate the way we classify the crimes for which folks could be charged in this instance to say these are ones where clearly there is some problem, some panic, some nonmalicious intent and we ought to decriminalize these and get these folks into

family services, et cetera, versus these are the ones where we need law enforcement to protect that larger societal interest and to prosecute a crime?

MR. MARSICO: I think certainly you could do that, tweak the existing laws to do that because as you said, putting the baby in the woods, abandoning it is certainly different than doing it at a downtown apartment building where there's going to be a lot of different people. Even though I think one could make a case, both would constitute reckless endangerment in a sense.

Certainly, as a prosecutor, you'd have a much better case in the woods scenario than the apartment scenario. I like to think -- and what I said to Pinnacle Health when they were determining whether to go ahead with this program was, Look, if somebody brings a baby to a hospital, even if it's the front lobby before we have this program set up, and drops the kid off there and takes off and there's no other harm to the child, I'm not going to prosecute that case.

I want to encourage people to do that. That's a step. And the same thing probably in that apartment scenario. As a prosecutor, you and the General Assembly have vested discretion in us whether or not to charge. I am not going to charge in a case like that where the ultimate goal is saving the child's life and seeing that no

harm occurs.

so while I think statutorily you could examine as part of this Task Force maybe having a different grading of the offense of endangering welfare of a child for the one scenario versus the other, I still think ultimately it's going to come down to an individual prosecutor's decision do I even charge in a case, you know -- say a mother were to come to Harrisburg Hospital this afternoon, not go to the emergency room where we have everything set up but go to the other side of the hospital and drop it off.

Of course, I'd rather it be where we set up our program. But I'm going to be hard-pressed to prosecute someone in that case.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TENNIS: Just one more quick response. I think that often when we think of the mother being prosecuted is we're going to be coming in and seeking a conviction for the greatest offense and trying to put them in a state prison and state penitentiary. That isn't often what happens.

After a conviction and sentencing, often there are kind of what would be termed, I guess, more constructive interventions in the sense of counseling

services being provided. We know certainly in the drug and 1 2 alcohol area, with the leadership of the legislature, increasingly sentencings involve putting people into drug 3 and alcohol treatment or providing other kinds of services. 5 So sometimes that criminal justice 6 intervention can be the most, can be an effective positive force even in the life of a mother in this instance rather 7 than just a negative situation. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you. Thank you, 10 Representative Manderino. Are there any questions? Representative Marsico. 11 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Thank you, Mr. 12 Thanks, guys, for being here. I appreciate your 13 Chairman. time and your effort with this legislation. Just for your 14 knowledge, this legislation, Senate Bill 654, was amended 15 in the House Judiciary Committee with my legislation. 16 forget the House Bill number. Okay. 17 So the legislation we're talking about today 18 is the amended version of the House Bill. Okay. Which 19 is -- there's like 3 or 4 areas that are different from the 20 21 Senate Bill. One is, there was much discussion today about the identification bracelet that the hospital is required 22 to provide to the person leaving the baby. 23 And I just wanted to get your thoughts. 24

reason that -- a very important component of this

legislation is to provide family rights. If a mother does abandon the baby, we want to make sure that the father or the grandparents or the uncle or the aunt have an opportunity, through the courts, to gain custody or perhaps even the mother after a change of mind, a change of heart after so many days.

Again, there's been much discussion about this. And I know there's not support for an identification bracelet. I just want to again see what your thoughts are on that.

MR. MARSICO: Sure. And I'm speaking not on behalf of the District Attorneys Association but as a DA in Dauphin County. My own thoughts are that having sat through a lot of meetings when we developed our program here locally, our gut feeling was anything that reeks of government intervention might frighten someone away.

And personally, I think the identification bracelet has that effect. I do not like that idea because I think if someone thinks, Well, now I got to wait here. I got to get a bracelet before I can drop off my baby. Maybe it is easier if I just drop the baby off somewhere else.

There are provisions. What we've said up here in Harrisburg is that the child be brought, given to a hospital employee. The hospital employees have all been trained by Pinnacle to ask a few questions: Is there any

family medical history that we should know about; were there any complications during delivery; and do you need medical attention?

The mother or whoever would drop the child off is free to answer or not answer. We'd hope they'd answer those questions. And they're also told none of that information will be used to identify them later. And in discussions with our county Children and Youth agency, they assured us that they will, they will assume custody of the child once it's placed in the hospital after appropriate postnatal care is delivered.

But at a future court proceeding, there is nothing to prevent the mother from reinstating her parental rights, nothing to prevent the father from seeking his parental rights. All of that can occur in the normal way through court procedures.

And I really don't see what effect -- the identification bracelet I think would just be one piece of evidence that the court would have to weigh in determining, A, whether or not this is actually the person that dropped the child off or not.

But merely because the person dropped the child off doesn't necessarily mean that's the person who has lawful custody. So I really don't see what you're gaining by that identification bracelet. I know we all

struggle with that concept of anonymity.

And believe me, as a prosecutor, it runs against my grain to do that. But if our ultimate goal is encouraging a distraught parent to bring this newborn, a living, breathing child, to a place where it can get attention, I think we have to do everything we can to do that.

Worry about saving the life of the baby first. Everything else is secondary in my mind.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Representative Browne.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony. Just a quick follow-up on the conversation on practices in district attorneys' offices regarding the application of the abandonment statute.

District Attorney Marsico, you said in your practice, you wouldn't take a case where a mother dropped off an infant into a hospital setting, you wouldn't charge them for abandonment. Is that the common practice among district attorneys in Pennsylvania?

MR. MARSICO: I would think. I mean, I think you'd be hard-pressed to argue down the line to 12 members of your community that this person is criminally harming their child when they've taken the steps of, you know, at least coming to the hospital.

1 Believe me, I prosecuted personally the case of the child that was put in a Port-O-Potty. And that was 2 that mother's third child that she placed in that 3 Port-O-Potty intentionally and left it to die driving right by a hospital a short distance away from that park. 5 I would much rather any attempt at having 6 prosecute that case, any attempt to get to a hospital. 7 8 think all of us as prosecutors are going to be more than likely not to charge in those situations. 9 REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: If you had -- just 10 from your experience and, Gary, your same experience in 11 terms of what would happen if it was a case like that, if 12 an infant was brought to a hospital in a blanket, it was 13 taken care of by the hospital professionals, was placed 14 with the county Children and Youth and was put in a very 15 safe setting and that case was brought to court in front of 16 a jury, do you think the inevitable result of that -- I 17 18 don't know if there's a case like that -- would be that the mother would be acquitted of the charges? 19 MR. MARSICO: I'd like to think most 20 prosecutors wouldn't bring charges in a situation like 21 that. Gary, you might --22 23 MR. TENNIS: Well, I'm not aware of any cases like that being brought. But you're saying hypothetically 24

if they were, would a jury convict?

1 REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: Would a jury convict? MR. TENNIS: Well, I think you'd have a pretty 2 3 hard time getting -- you'd have to have unanimity on guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. I think you'd have a pretty 5 tough --REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: Is that a reflection 6 on the jury's reasonable people standard or how the law is 7 8 written? MR. MARSICO: I think both really, how the law 9 is written -- and I don't know that you want to change the 10 law to criminalize that other than what we already have on 11 the books. And I think 12 members of the community are 12 going to say, Look, they came to this point. Everybody's 13 heard the stories. 14 You know, every juror would have heard stories 15 over the years about children being abandoned in dumpsters 16 or other horrible places. So I would think they'd say this 17 person took the step of getting this child some help. 18 Let's do what we can. 19 MR. TENNIS: By the way, Representative 20 Browne, we have not done a survey of all the DAs on the 21 22 issues. So there may be cases that we're just not aware 23 of. Usually, you hear people talk about these kind of cases. And in conversation, we've never heard any like 24

25

that brought.

1 REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 Thank you, Representative 3 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: 4 Browne. Ms. Mendlow. 5 MS. MENDLOW: Yes. I have a brief question for Mr. Tennis. In your testimony, you mentioned that there's a possibility that outreach, education, counseling, 7 8 or other approaches might also be very important in terms of prevention of infant abandonment. 9 And I was wondering if you felt that without 10 some kind of counseling programs out there that would offer 11 information about options for adoption and how to handle 12 that, if we might not inadvertently promote the idea of the 13 infant abandonment. 14 15 So I guess the issue, I guess, I'm pushing or asking about is if you, your association would be 16 17 supportive of basically any kind of information or 18 education out there that, if legislation should be passed, might be available on this type of program in a hospital, 19 that it not be done in isolation but in conjunction with 20 explaining to vulnerable young adults about the possibility 21 of the need for getting appropriate counseling so that they 22

might look at some other options that in the end might be

more satisfying and more helpful for the entire family?

23

24

course, any particular issue has to be looked at on its own 1 merits. But my expectation is that our association would 2 be fully supportive of any kind of resources at all that 3 you can get to that have been shown to be effective both in helping the young mother and in saving the life of the children. So I think we would -- as I said, it is just 7 my expectation based on working with the DAs. But I feel 8 fairly confident that we'd be very supportive of that. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Ms. Mendlow. I'd just like to add with the custody support matters, 11 there's often the shortcut through the PFA, Protection From 12 Abuse Act, which is sometimes used commonly, sometimes 13 abused, so to speak. 14 15 But it's been a way for some people to get quick relief and also protect families from abusive 16 situations. And if this, if this in any way encourages 17 people to use the safe haven thing, we should encourage 18 that. And it might be a way for us to get publicity on 19 20 this matter quickly. 21 MR. MARSICO: I totally agree with that. And we've seen those abuses in the past. And if this would 22 23 help, I think we should get some more publicity for it. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: I want to thank you for 24

your testimony. And thank you again for providing that

25

1	insight. Thank you. Next up, we have Nina
2	Williams-Mbengue, the Policy Specialist with Children and
3	Families Program for the National Conference of State
4	Legislatures. And you also have a guest with you as well.
5	MS. WILLIAMS-MBENGUE: Yes. This is Carmen
6	Schulze from the Child Welfare League of America, and she's
7	going to turn slides for me. Good morning, or good
8	afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Task Force. On
9	behalf of the National Conference of State Legislatures,
10	I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to come here and
11	talk about states' abandoned infant legislation.
12	I will briefly discuss what we know about
13	infant abandonment, provide an overview of some of the key
14	aspects of the state legislation, describe some state
15	experience with the new laws, and discuss some of the
16	policy implications for lawmakers. And I'll just go over
17	this briefly. Some of this has been referred to.
18	What do we know about infant abandonment?
19	Unfortunately, very little. There was a Health and Human
20	Services media survey done that indicated some numbers, as
21	has been mentioned before. 105 babies abandoned in public
22	places in 1998.
23	Again, states do not collect this information.
24	Most states don't collect separate data on infants
25	abandoned in this manner. And at this point, the federal

government does not require or ask that they do so. That's part of the problem. Likewise, research -- we have very little research on the mothers who abandoned their children.

There have been some studies, which I do have, on mothers who commit infanticide which suggest that they're very much in isolation and denial of their pregnancies. They do not access any prenatal care at all. And they do seem to come from various racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

What's been the state response so far? We've been tracking the legislation. And we see that 35 states, including 19 in the 2001 session, now have some type of safe haven legislation. And this is since 1999 when Texas adopted the first law.

As you know, all of the statutes generally promise that women who drop off unharmed infants at designated safe locations, such as hospitals and fire stations and police stations, will either not be prosecuted or they can use their action as an affirmative defense to prosecution.

Let's see. Immunity is generally granted to employees who have to accept and care for the infants. The age ranges of the infants do vary from 72 hours old or up to 30 days old or younger. Twenty-four states specifically

allow for anonymity in which the person leaving the child is not required to disclose any information.

And we're assuming that the other states that's not mentioned in the legislation, they're presuming anonymity. Twenty-two states of the 35 address the issue of anonymity and the termination of parental rights of the infant in several different ways.

They either state that the act of surrendering the infant terminates parental rights and they waive their notice to any type of hearing of a judicial proceeding, or the legislation does provide for some type of notice to the parents, or they require the departments to conduct a reasonable search or diligent search to locate the biological parents.

Some of the other provisions including studies of the issue: Five state legislatures have requested additional studies, and this may include trying to find out what's going on or just reports on the numbers of infants abandoned in this manner.

Other provisions covered as is in your proposed bill: The use of identification bracelets given to parents dropping off the infant. A lot of states are requiring a check of the state or local or national missing child registry to make certain that the child has not been kidnapped.

States have also dealt with sort of custody, how the parent can request custody of the infant. And public awareness seems to be a critical issue. Twelve states that we can see so far require media and public awareness campaigns to publicize the law. And some states are requiring a search of the putative father registry, another way to find out if there's a parent that would care for the child.

How effective have the laws been? I actually contacted all 16 states that passed legislation in 1999 and 2000. I just contacted their department of human services. And first, I found out that a number of states are not officially collecting data at all.

Either the statute did not require them to do so or they're in a state that is state supervised/county administered and there's no central repository for collecting the data or they don't separate abandoned, newborns abandoned publicly from abandoned children. So they don't track it. And some states said, Well, they're not separately tracking safe haven infants. They can probably pull the numbers out if they had to from the material that they had.

So far, the laws appear to be having a somewhat limited effect. As of August 31, according to my telephone survey, an approximate total of 33 babies have

been legally relinquished through the new laws. And I broke them down in the slide, and there's a copy of the slides in the handouts.

R

I found that 35 infants were illegally abandoned since the passage of the laws. In other words, those babies were still left by roadsides. And an additional 7 were illegally abandoned and found dead. And I'm sure that's an undercount of infants.

All the numbers are approximate because they include unofficial counts. Media counts in several states said that they, you know, they're not officially collecting but they've heard through the media -- like Alabama, I think 5 or 6 babies have been turned in through the new law.

And these numbers include, for example, 5 infants surrendered through the Texas safe haven law but only since the beginning of a public relations campaign in Texas. Texas had 12 illegal abandonments before their publicity campaign began but after their law was passed.

Michigan had 9 illegal abandonments, which they're calling attempts. And they include one case in which a mother changed her mind, another case in which a mother contacted emergency medical services who picked the infant up. But this could not be considered a safe haven baby because it didn't technically count. It wasn't turned

into a hospital.

And there was one case and the only one that we've heard so far like this in which a judge ruled that the abandonment was inappropriate for a safe haven. And apparently, the judge felt that the hospital did not provide the parents with enough information about their legal rights.

And we're assuming that the infants that, you know, didn't make it into the safe haven law, that the parents would be treated accordingly, prosecuted if they knew them, if they could contact the parent.

While the other states that I spoke with reported that the children have gone pretty rapidly through the termination of parental rights process and were even preadoptive or adoptive homes.

Other areas that states looked at: Again, the public awareness seems to be a really key issue. Also, collecting as much information on the infants, especially medical information, as possible. The age limit of infants was a concern that came up because a number of states mentioned that they had infants that they couldn't count because they were a day or 2 or 3 beyond the statutory age requirement.

And I assume probably the parent wouldn't be prosecuted. Some states said they were treating them as

such; and other states said, Well, they couldn't. Also, states seem to be saying it's important to conduct a search of the missing child registry in the state or nationally and also the use of DNA testing for maternity and paternity and also to screen for medical problems.

And just a few of the areas of concern that we notice that we're still hearing from other lawmakers or from child welfare experts: One is the anonymity provision conflicting, as I mentioned before, with the termination of parental rights hearings.

And as I said, states are attempting to address this issue by providing some type of notice or search for the biological parents in an effort to include them in any judicial proceeding. So states would want to carefully look at their termination statutes to make sure they're not conflicting with the safe haven legislation.

The anonymity provisions also allow the parent or whoever is dropping the child off to walk away without providing any medical information that might be critical to the child's future health. Others are concerned about the father's rights.

You have fathers who might very well want to be involved in their children's lives, but they may be unaware of the child's birth. And again, several states have tried to address this by requiring searches of their

putative father registries.

And the folks that we talked to, they recommend that states do examine all of the existing statutes relating to adoption, paternity, custody, judicial proceedings, and anything associated with child abandonment as well as clarifying your definitions of infant abandonment in statute. And I think Carmen may talk a little bit more about some of the federal legislation.

Adoption advocates are particularly concerned about the lack of information about the adoptee's background and what effect this will have on the child and its family in the future. They also point out that, you know, legislation may not be necessary because most states, as we heard before, will not necessarily prosecute women who give birth and relinquish their newborns in the hospital. And in addition, of course, every state allows women to voluntarily relinquish their infants legally for adoption.

A major area of concern seems to be the lack of data. And collecting, somehow collecting information on the infants and their mothers would be extremely useful in crafting policy. States will also want to know the numbers of infants that have been abandoned prior to the new laws in order to judge whether or not the laws are effective.

And I did find that when I called states,

again, they had not necessarily been collecting this type of information. So there was not a baseline. One state official that I spoke to recommended something that one of the prosecutors talked about, states forwarding the data that they're able to collect to some type of central clearinghouse where the data can then be researched in order to develop a profile of mothers who engage in this type of behavior to better target your prevention and intervention efforts.

I do know that there was federal legislation introduced calling for a collection of data, perhaps stored in the Bureau of Justice Statistics so that it could be looked at on a national level.

Many child welfare experts state that while safe haven legislation is a good idea, it needs to be part of a larger effort to enhance services for women who are at risk of abandoning their infants.

This would probably involve experts from the fields of child welfare, mental health, youth services, the health field, teen interventions and working with young parents to examine the existing system of services and hoping that such an examination might provide answers as to why this population of parents is unwilling or unable to use the services that are out there.

Some critics are concerned that states are not

viewing safe haven programs as part of their child abuse prevention efforts. Has infant abandonment been considered in the state's child abuse prevention efforts? Does your child abuse prevention strategy, does it target young women at risk of abandonment?

These are just a few questions that

policymakers may want to ask as they work with public

health and child protection, child abuse prevention, mental

health and others to develop a comprehensive strategy to

prevent infant abandonment and other types of child abuse

and neglect.

And finally, a concern that we do hear from other lawmakers is about encouraging parental irresponsibility. Since we know so little about the women who are dropping off the infants, what conditions and situations they're in and why they're doing this, I guess there's no proof, other than some of the numbers that we're getting now, that the legislation will discourage the mothers from leaving the infants in unsafe places.

And for women who might otherwise seek help from family or traditional social services, we don't know if, you know, the enactment of these laws is just encouraging them to use the safe havens rather than the traditional network of support.

A Kansas official I spoke to stated that in

their program, they were targeting social service and community service providers to educate them about the law. And they were setting up a website specifically geared for the service providers so that they might offer this as one option to their women clients at risk.

So it's not as though there was a statewide campaign. But for example, if you have a woman that's using a mental health or medical clinic, if she's offered the legal adoption alternatives and pre- and postnatal care in addition to this type of program, they just felt that that might be more effective in sending out a different message.

And again, we're still tracking the legislation and what's happening with states at NCSL. We do have a website, and it's in your material. And you can feel free to call me, and I'll be glad to follow up on any information that you might need and see what's happening with other states' efforts.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: We definitely thank you for that information. I think it answered a lot of questions that we had earlier in the Task Force meeting, especially on the numbers. And those are disturbing numbers across this country.

Are there any questions of the Task Force?
Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. Thanks for being here. I'm not sure if you can answer this question. And if not, maybe somebody who comes later from the Child Welfare League or from the Adoption Council can. But I'm looking at an article that was just in this Friday's New York Times, which you were quoted in. So you probably have read it.

"Few choose legal havens to abandon babies."

And a subheading is, "An untested idea politicians found easy to embrace." And they talk about that folks who are proponents of the law say that if only more money is put into publicizing it, it would work.

And then folks who -- I don't know necessarily oppose -- but are very concerned about the law say one of the points that you make is that the problem goes much deeper and we don't really know if the folks who are abandoning in safe havens are folks that would have abandoned in unsafe places before or folks that would have used a more traditional social service.

And there's at least some that speculate that the women most likely to respond to any publicity campaign are ones who were not likely to have endangered their child to begin with. Now, having said that, I guess the bottom line question becomes, What is the harm?

I mean, even if states spend money in

campaigns encouraging the use of safe havens versus traditional support services, if I understood what happens after they leave the child at a safe haven and at least the way we're talking about our law written so that it kind of gets to the, to the Child Service Protective Law and the Juvenile Act and the court proceedings with regard to termination of parental rights, won't they still then have the opportunity for traditional support services? I quess I'm sitting here thinking I'm not sure this is a good idea. I'm not sure it's a bad idea. I'm looking to see what the potential harm to the infant is if we do this. And I've heard cautionary flags, but I haven't really heard that we know that there is some specific harm to the child. And I don't know if you can help me identify that there is. MS. WILLIAMS-MBENGUE: Yeah. I'm not sure about that. I think it does point to the critical need for states to start collecting information and understand why this is happening in the first place. I spoke to a few people that maybe have attended some of the trials and gotten somewhat of a profile on the mothers that do this.

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that would be a place to start, the information that we do have, women that have been prosecuted because I don't think we really understand what's going on, why there is a small population of women

that are doing this.

I mean, we do know that there's something like 30,000 infants as of 1998 in that same survey that are abandoned every year in hospitals. And those are the border babies or the babies where the moms are addicted to drugs or HIV-infected.

So then we have the smaller population of infants that, where the mothers are not taking advantage of that and we don't know, you know, what, you know, what is the problem, what is the profile. So I think it's really hard to understand, to make that, you know, designation of whether or not they would have benefitted or not.

I can't see -- I'm probably not the person to answer that. But I certainly can't see where there would be any harm to the infant. I just think the other thing that we're leaving out is the mother walking away. What is her situation? Does she have more children at home that are in danger? Will she go on and do the behavior again? Was this the results of rape or incest or something like that?

It's possibly a lost opportunity. I see the whole thing as a great opportunity to try and provide more services for children and try and cut down on this happening in some way. And this is the beginning of a discussion to look at the system.

1 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. Thank 2 you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 3 4 Manderino. Representative Gabiq. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: I think -- I appreciate 5 the testimony regarding the other states. And I notice that you said that several of the other states had 7 8 statutory obligations to check these national registries; is that correct? 9 MS. WILLIAMS-MBENGUE: Yes, that's right. 10 11 few states, yes. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: And maybe from your 12 research, you might be available -- I mean, this might 13 answer my whole problem with the kidnapper. Is the medical 14 15 technology such that, you know, the baby's dropped off at the hospital and there's somebody out there looking for 16 this kidnapped child and they're on the registry and to 17 18 identify the mother or the parents and the child, does the 19 medical technology exist, is DNA advanced enough to say, All right, this child, we know that DNA, the parents come 20 and we think that's our child or can we check to see if 21 it's our child, can we test our DNA to see if this recently 22 dropped off child at the secret haven is our child? 23 Is there existing medical technology, to your 24 25 knowledge, that is out there?

She's the

1 MS. WILLIAMS-MBENGUE: I believe so. I don't know the exact mechanics of how that would work. 2 I would assume that they would do DNA testing, that there's 3 some -- if a parent is registering a child as missing and it goes onto a data base and there's some match-up, then 5 they can do DNA testing. That's how it would be done. It would be done through law enforcement. 7 The 8 legislation that I've seen requires a contact with law 9 enforcement to conduct that search of that registry. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you very much. 10 Ι appreciate your testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative Gabig. Are there any other questions? We're going to take 13 a very short and quick and prompt 5-minute break to give 14 15 our stenographer a little chance to not move her fingers so quickly. We're going to be back in 5 minutes. And at that 16 time, we'll have Patti Weaver as our next presenter. 17 18 (A brief recess was taken.) 19 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: I want to call our Task Force meeting back to order. We've just recently taken a 20 21 5-minute break, give or take a few minutes. But we're glad 22 to be back. We have with us Patti A. Weaver, the founder 23 and President of A Hand to Hold. And you also have a guest with you as well. 24

MS. WEAVER: This is Roz Meston.

25

1	Director of A Hand to Hold.
2	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: What was her last name?
3	MS. WEAVER: Meston, M-e-s-t-o-n.
4	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you.
5	MS. WEAVER: I'd like to just start out by
6	thanking you for the opportunity to be here to discuss the
7	now revised Senate Bill 654. A Hand to Hold is a
8	hospital-based program in Allegheny, Lawrence, and Fayette
9	County; and it involves a network of 19 hospitals. And by
10	the way, not all of our hospitals have OB/GYN or pediatric
11	wards.
12	I'd like to start out today just by showing
13	you what the media or what the public knows us as by
14	showing you our new television commercial and the message
15	that we're trying to convey to young mothers. What's
16	interesting about this whole baby abandonment issue is
17	there are a lot of organizations that are doing a lot on a
18	shoestring.
19	And this was given to us by an organization in
20	Long Island. So they've we've pretty much, we've been
21	operating on a shoestring. We've done an awful lot
22	considering. This is our commercial.
23	(A brief video was played.)
24	MS. WEAVER: I also want to say, frankly, I
25	started working a year and a half ago with then US Senator

Melissa Hart in asking her to initiate some kind of safe haven legislation. When we began, there were only a few states that had any kind of legislation. Now there are 35 states.

The problem that we're dealing with today in Pennsylvania and across the nation is young mothers who are throwing away unwanted babies, leaving them in places to die like trash cans, rivers, toilets, and woods. These are newborns, healthy, full-term newborns, infants sometimes with their umbilical cords attached. They're people who are thrown away.

And although the young mothers who throw away their babies may not want the baby, there are millions of couples across the United States who are unable to have children who would be absolutely delighted with any baby. And the baby to them would be a gift of immeasurable worth, a person who could bring them more joy than they ever imagined, a treasure.

What I think the safe haven law should do is, number one, facilitate the transfer of unwanted babies as quickly and as easily as possible from the mothers who don't want the babies to the mothers who do want the babies; and secondly, save as many lives as possible.

And to do so, the law must be reasonable, written with the birth mother in mind, treat both the

mother and the baby fairly, compassionately, respectfully, confidentially, honestly, and in a simple straightforward manner.

How big is the problem? There is a number that has been, it's from the US Department of Health and Human Services from a 1998 study which says there are 105 babies that are abandoned a year. This number is grossly misleading because it's an understatement of how many really are abandoned.

I spoke with an epidemiologist and scientist in that same US Department. And she does, she studies infanticide. And what she has told me is she believes the person who wrote the article was a summer intern and got the number from news articles. But she frankly believes that the number is at least 10 times that reported number of 105.

So what we're really dealing with is now an issue where we're dealing with maybe 1,000 or more babies a year in the United States that are abandoned. And why do these mothers abandon their babies? Most of these mothers abandon because, well, they're young teenagers and they're in denial about their pregnancy.

And they haven't told anyone that they are pregnant. Sometimes they're in denial to the point where they don't really realize that they are pregnant until the

baby is being born. A lot of them never wanted the babies in the first place. They just want to get rid of them as quickly as possible.

Now, there is another segment of girls who abandon their babies. And these are mothers who keep their babies for a little bit. They think the babies are cute and adorable and they're fun. And then the novelty wears off. And the reality of long hours, hard work, sleepless nights, expenses and restrictions associated with a newborn become too much.

And at this point, it's kind of like puppies at Christmas where people buy them because they're great. If you go to the pound in January, you can find some purebred dogs that nobody wants anymore.

This is not a new problem that we're dealing with. In the past, there was a solution. And the solutions were foundling homes and orphanages which were recognizable, established places to leave unwanted babies quickly and with little hassle. But we have nothing that's equivalent to that today.

Referring to that New York Time article,

contrary to what was written -- and I think that the

journalism there, that reflects no research whatsoever into
any of the current results. But those programs do work.

Tim Jaccard's program of the ATM Children of Hope has

received 11 babies in the year 2000, 11 babies year to date in 2001. Plus he also encouraged 36 separate mothers to put their 36 babies up for adoption through his program.

John Tyson's Secret Safe Place for Newborn programs in Mobile, Alabama has received 11 babies in 3 years. Debi Faris's Safe Arms program in California has received 6 babies in the past 8 months. And the Texas Baby Moses program has received, the child welfare I believe said 6 babies; but that was once they began advertising.

And really, when you convert these numbers onto an annual basis, that's more like 41 babies or so a year. And that's only covering 20 percent of the country. So it's got to prove that the accuracy of that 105 is way off because they're saving an awful lot of babies.

What my organization is is a baby abandonment program that serves Western Pennsylvania, 3 counties. We firmly believe that if we provide a safe, legal, acceptable, well-publicized place to drop off unwanted babies quickly and anonymously, just like foundling homes, that we will receive babies.

Our organization is a year old. And our mission is to save the lives of babies that might otherwise be abandoned by providing the birth mothers with a positive alternative to abandonment. With each baby that we save, we also save the mother from the lifelong memory that she

has destroyed or abandoned her baby.

Our focus is narrow. We discuss only live babies. We advocate adoption as a good choice. And this is how our program works: With A Hand to Hold, a mother can leave her unwanted newborn up to 30 days old with emergency room nurses at participating hospitals.

The babies are then placed by the hospital social service workers with the hospital's social service agency, private or public, and then up for adoption. As long as the baby is unharmed, the drop-off is confidential. There are no questions asked, and the mother does not need to give her name. Services are free to the mother. And Mercy Hospital's labor and delivery nurses staff the 24-hour hot line.

With our program, if a mother changes her mind and she wants to get her baby back and we deem that she is fit to have it back, she can do so. We try to encourage her to come back within 30 days, to not prolong the process.

In the absence of safe haven law, we have also had District Attorney Steven Zappala and the other DAs in the other counties make a public statement, which is on the back of the brochure that you have in my testimony, which says that they will not be prosecuted if the baby is unharmed.

Over the past 3 years, there have been several -- I'm sorry. Over the past year, there has been several mothers who we have helped. And we haven't really started airing our public service announcement. The only way we're getting our message out has been through talk shows, through just announcements for the programs joining, the program starting, the addition of new counties.

But what we can say is in the last year, we have not lost one baby in Allegheny County. And we're also getting calls from mothers. And we do know that there are mothers who are going to hospitals and having their babies in the hospitals, then saying I don't want the baby anymore, you take care of it, which has been something that we have advocated on the talk shows because we know from our research that unwanted babies that are born in hospitals are safer than those that are born at home.

The hospitals that are helping us with the program are enthusiastic about the program. And not one hospital has declined, not even hospitals that don't have labor and delivery or pre, or pediatric wards. And Children's Hospital has a child advocacy center.

The director of that program says that she believes that what we're doing is a critical step to prevent injuries. And there's a little quote from her here. But when you make your law, I want you to think of 3

distinct cases of mothers who have abandoned their babies.

One was a baby that was abandoned in Oakland, which is a portion of Pittsburgh.

And this baby was left with a note attached that said, "This is Jacob. Please help him. He's 6 days old. I can't keep him. I'm only 12. He's very good baby." And it was left with him. So it was a young mother.

In a second case, in the summer of 1998 in the Pittsburgh area, a baby was thrown from a car window. And the baby was not seriously harmed remarkably. But the baby was adopted into a loving home where the adoptive mother claims that the little girl is very bright and that the only thing wrong with her is that she's spoiled by her brothers and her parents.

In a third case which occurred in the winter of 2000 in Allentown, another mother took her baby to the curb with the trash. She then called the police and said that she heard something in the trash. The police discovered the baby alive and questioned the mother, who denied being the birth mother.

Interestingly, the mother, this birth mother was living with her mother. And her mother claimed that she had no idea that her daughter was pregnant and that the baby found in the trash can was in fact her granddaughter.

As has been discussed before, the average birth is a traumatic experience. It's physically very exhausting work to deliver a baby. The mothers may go many nights afterwards without sleeping if they're taking care of their child. And the child -- if they're unable to make them happy, the child can cry itself to sleep; and that can be numerous hours. So we're dealing with a fragile situation.

With this in mind, I'd like to just discuss some of the specifics that you have in your House Bill and say, first of all, I like the fact that the bill establishes hospitals as safe havens. They make sense. They're open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and can provide medical care and attention if the mother needs it. Also, they have established social services in place.

Second, the bill promises the mother the freedom from prosecution as opposed to a defense to prosecution; and it ensures the mother her anonymity if she chooses. Third, you provide immunity from prosecution to the hospital employees, the hospital, and the medical staff. They deserve that. They're our number one volunteers with this program.

Also, you provide for Medicare funding for payment of services, which the doctors and physicians deserve. Your time frame of 28 days I think is a good time

frame in that it covers that second wave of mothers, the ones who keep the babies thinking maybe they're cute and adorable and then change their mind later on.

Debi Faris, who has something called the

Debi Faris, who has something called the Garden of Angels in Southern California where she has dead babies, 46 at this point, says that 28 days, 30 days would cover almost all of her babies.

I also would like a person having lawful custody as opposed to just the mother being able to transfer the baby. The mother may be physically exhausted and incapable of doing that or she may be too timid and/or embarrassed going into that environment. And to some people, hospitals are scary places.

What I don't like about Senate Bill 654 and do recommend changing are as follows: Just as an overview, I'm not in favor of anything that would complicate the drop-off process or increase the difficulty of implementing the program in any hospital.

One, I'm not in favor of the identification bracelets or mandatory pamphlets. Genetic testing can be done with 97 percent accuracy. And the pamphlet should be given. But, you know, I don't think they should be, necessarily be mandatory.

Second, I don't favor making CYS the exclusive recipients of the abandoned babies. Our hospitals have

indicated to us that they choose to have public or private organizations. They want the choice. Some think that the private organizations provide better care, better homes, and quicker placement.

And if that's true, by all means, I think that the private agencies deserve to have, receive the babies.

And to some girls, the CYS alone, the fact that it is a CYS organization, that is a scary thing.

Third, I don't favor requiring the mother to attend a mandatory hearing to get her baby back. The primary objective of our program is to save the lives of babies that might otherwise be abandoned. And anything in the design of the program that makes it threatening or unfriendly jeopardizes the effectiveness and may result in the loss of lives.

Having to go to court and be at the mercy of the law is extremely intimidating. Also, the best person to evaluate a mother, whether or not she's capable of handling the baby, I think is a physician because they would be able to determine whether or not she has the proper mental health to handle that; and they would be able to make that judgment. Also, physicians are used to making life and death decisions, which this is.

Fourth, the issue of termination of the mother's rights. I firmly believe that the mothers who

abandon their babies are different from the mothers who work with adoption agencies. In the best interest of the babies, I think they should be adoptable after about 30 days of the drop-off. If the mother doesn't return for the baby within 30 days, her rights should be severed.

Likewise for the father.

An adoption attorney in Pennsylvania said most birth parents are confident with their decision to abandon the child and want the matter resolved as quickly as possible. Rarely does a parent come to the termination hearing such that long waiting periods of termination hearings serves no purpose but to delay the process of the infant's abandonment.

In the California program run by Debi Faris and the New York City program run by Tim Jaccard, they encourage mothers to sign adoption papers at the point of transfer. And Debi told me the other day she's had 6 mothers who do that; they don't have any qualms about it; and they never come back; they never ask for their babies back.

And I think this is something that we really need to consider with our own program, asking them to sign off if they'd like that. You at least have the identity of the mother. Fifth, I think for other programs that are offering safe havens or organizing, I think that we deserve

immunity from prosecution also.

Six, the safe haven program, for it to be effective, it will need to be publicized. In Texas, they received no babies until they publicized their program. Seventh, rather than have a state-run agency run this program, it would make sense to have A Hand to Hold or other people who are working with this to be involved with this and maybe in partner with the state in doing this.

We've done a lot of the research and have done, put an awful lot of work into this and know the issues. I know the, what the hospitals want and need. Eight, since Pennsylvania has rural areas without hospitals, we need alternatives or specifically designated drop-off locations such as fire stations or police stations that are open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to take care of, to receive babies.

From a business standpoint, it makes sense to have only one program for the states. There are some economies of scale with advertising. And having one message and keeping it simple and straightforward makes sense. Also, you'd only need one 800 number, one name, and one educational program.

To start up and efficiently run a program, it will require extensive search, entrepreneurial skills, teaching experience, and experience in marketing. And the

longer you wait, the more lives that may be, you may lose.

And we have done extensive research into the issue.

We've established our hospital protocol that's been approved by our hospitals. We built a hospital network of 19 hospitals. We have a staff to man an 800 number. We've written a brochure. We've produced a web page. We produced a public service announcement, television spot, or radio spot.

And we will soon have an educational video. We're waiting for the law to be passed. And with our program specifically, it was designed to be expandable in the state of Pennsylvania. It was really designed to be a state program. And it's easily expandable. You know, if we could modify the public service announcement we have, then you can have, you know, at least a message in very little time.

In closing, I'd just like to say that the babies that might die from abandonment now deserve a chance to live, a hand to hold, and a future. And I respectfully request that there's speedy passage of some bill for the state of Pennsylvania. That's all. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you very much for your testimony and the great work that you guys have done out in the Pittsburgh area. It's very good. Are there any questions? Do we have any questions? Representative

Gabiq.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you. I agree with your sort of analysis of the numbers issue. And I think the one case you talked about with the young girl in Oakland sort of gives a clue as to why it's almost, I think it's fruitless to even go down that route.

Many of these young girls that find themselves in this situation -- that girl, for example, was a victim of child rape if she was 12 years old. That's against the law in Pennsylvania. If she's never been pregnant before, she barely even knows what she's going through. It could be an incest situation.

And they never told anybody they were pregnant. There's no reporting of the pregnancy. Nobody ever knew it. And so I don't think we'll ever know what the numbers are. You can't in these situations. And I think trying to use whatever social science methods you have, you'll never know that problem.

So the fact there is a problem, we know that.

And I think your approach is a good approach. I think that this hearing's been good for me in terms of the issue of, one of the primary concerns I had about this kidnap issue because I did prosecute paramours that, nonbiological fathers that kill young infants.

And to me, I certainly don't want to encourage

that behavior either. That's just as deadly, obviously. 1 But I think with DNA -- and I think you mentioned it. And 2 you must agree with the previous testifier that genetically 3 if we had these clearinghouses, I think is the term that was used, that the parent that was looking for a recently 5 kidnapped child could get on that clearinghouse and, with the genetic DNA testing, would be able to identify the child. 8 9 Do you agree with that previous testifier that that could be a possible solution? 10 MS. WEAVER: I believe that could be a 11 possible solution. I think that there's, the DNA tests, I 12 think, are 97 percent accuracy. They're not infallible, 13 but they have a very high level of reliability. So I think 14 15 that would be one way. And we're also, too, we're not talking about, 16 we're not talking about having to do DNA testing on lots 17 and lots and lots of kids. It may just be a few children. 18 19 And you should be able to determine something fairly 20 reasonably. 21 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Secondly -- I think her 22 name is Ms. Mbenque, if I pronounced it correctly -- the 23 previous testifier, she said that several states have 24 statutory obligations on the part of either the hospital or 25 the safe haven or the Children and Youth, I quess, the

receiving people or organizations to check these registries, these national registries, that they would be, that would be one of their duties, so to speak, that they have to check these registries to make sure there's not somebody out there looking for this child.

What are your thoughts on, on the advisability of that approach?

MS. WEAVER: I'm not familiar with the registries other than what I just heard. But I do think that's a good idea. By all means, we don't want to take the babies away from mothers who want the babies. And the mothers, if they want the babies, they deserve to have the babies.

What we're trying to do is just prevent unnecessary death or unnecessary harm to infants. So I think by all means, post it. And if someone comes back and says that's my baby, and if it is, by all means, get them back together again. Do the testing, the genetic testing, and find out. And if it is, by all means, let them have them.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: The one recommendation that you made that I think would be a little difficult is the issue of having the doctors or the medical people decide of a possible subsequent custody issue. I don't know if you heard some of the testimony earlier where they

didn't even want to make some of the medical decisions much 1 less the legal decisions. So I don't know if we're going 2 3 to get them to agree to that part. But anyway, I very much appreciate your coming 4 5 here and the efforts that you're making. Thank you very much. 7 MS. WEAVER: Can I say this to you? Just with 8 making the decision, a lot of times, they can call in other people to make the decision with them and to do the 9 assessments of homes or whatever is necessary. 10 11 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: I think the way it's typically done in Pennsylvania is that the lawyers and the 12 judges would call on the medical people for their expertise 13 versus vice versa. But whatever the system is, that's 14 15 secondary to the initial effort to save that child. 16 And I commend you for your efforts in that regard. And thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 18 19 Gabig. Representative Manderino. 20 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. Thank you for your testimony. One of the first things I have 21 written down about your testimony, too, was either I didn't 22 23 understand or maybe just didn't agree with that suggestion 24 with regard to getting rid of the mandatory court hearing

with regard to the return of custody.

25

Unless there's something I don't understand about the process, I guess I can't figure out why you're suggesting that.

MS. WEAVER: When I was -- we have had instances where the mothers have, there was one mother who came to our hospital and wanted to give up her baby. She gave birth at a hospital. And she gave her name. She gave her insurance card.

And she said, I want to give up my baby and I want to use this program, our program. And we said, Fine. You know, we were setting things up. And then later on, she changed her mind. But what we believe we provided for her was a safety net so that she could sit back and say, Okay, do I really want to keep this baby or don't I?

And it gave her a little bit of breathing room. And afterwards, she said, No, you know, I've decided I want to keep the baby. I want to see him. Bring him in. And knowing that she wasn't going to have to go through a legal process at that point to get the baby back and there wasn't anyone who was going to prevent her from having her baby, I think it was probably easier to make the decision.

But when she was going to relinquish the baby initially and she knew that the only way I'm going to be able to keep this baby is if I go to court, she may not have had that breathing room right after the delivery to

say, You know what, it makes sense that I keep the child.

We had another case, too, where a mother was brought in with her baby, called 911. And this is a story that was told to me by the communications director from the City of Pittsburgh. The woman called 911 and said, I think I want to give up my baby.

They brought her into a hospital. And they counseled with her, and they realized she really wanted the baby. She just was going through a crisis of some sort. So they allowed her to go back with her baby. But had she relinquished it, she would have had to go through the court proceedings where it seems like it's another intimidating factor for the mother if there is, if they do have to go through court proceedings.

If it's only a few days, I believe there's some of the other programs, they just go through counseling, the other programs in the United States. They make the mother go through a little bit of counseling, make sure she's okay, and then they turn it over.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. Maybe I don't understand. Something isn't sitting right with me about what you're saying. And either it's my lack of knowledge about how things currently work. And I'll try to get that clarified somewhere else.

I watch that commercial. I call that 800

number. Tell me exactly what happens on the other end of 1 the phone in 2 conditions: 1, I'm a mother who hasn't 2 3 given birth yet; and 2, I'm a mother who has a new baby. 4 MS. WEAVER: Okay. If it's a mother who 5 hasn't given birth yet, she is directed to get prenatal care from an area hospital, depending on where she lives. 7 They ask her, We're working with these hospitals. What's closest to you? And would you please go for prenatal care? 8 It will help the baby; it will help you should there be any 9 complications. 10 She's directed for care. And then 11 she's -- the hospital -- she's allowed to deliver her baby 12 Then in the case where the mother has the 13 at the hospital. 14 baby -- and this depends somewhat on whether or not she's in Pittsburgh or outside of Pittsburgh proper -- she's 15 asked which hospital she'd like to bring the baby to. 16 And we tell her the hospitals that are near 17 that are participating in the program, what part of town 18 19 she's in. Okay. We have these hospitals that are participating. If she's calling from Fayette County, there 20 are only 3 hospitals. 21 22 If she's in Allegheny County, we ask her if she'd like transportation, can she get transportation 23 there. We try to get her to commit to coming in, get a 24

time when she'll be coming in. And once we know that she's

coming in, we notify the hospital and say, Okay. There's 1 going to be a girl that's coming in the next 20 minutes. 2 3 Look for her. She's going to be bringing you a baby. that the ER is prepared to receive a baby. But we try to get her there. And if she needs 5 transportation, we can have an unmarked paramedic vehicle 6 7 go and pick her, meet her and take the baby. REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: The other part of 8 9 your testimony that I didn't really understand is a suggestion of immunity from prosecution for private 10 agencies such as yours and what you're doing. What is the 11 risk, what is your liability, what is your concern, and why 12 would we need to consider that? 13 And what's in the back of my mind obviously is 14 not an entity like yours. But every once in a while, you 15 hear these horror stories about private adoptions out there 16 17 and baby stealing and private entities that are matching up unsuspecting adoptees who want healthy, young, usually 18 19 Caucasian babies which, you know, et cetera. And you have 20 this whole underground black market thing that's going on. 21 MS. WEAVER: The only reason I would want that 22 is in establishing this organization, we realized we need 23 to keep our, protect ourselves, too. And just knowing the -- my attorney friend said what usually happens is the 24

rule of thumb that they learn in law school is you sue

1 anything that moves. And we figure not being an attorney, 2 I --3 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You name all your 4 potential defendants so that at the risk of having left out the one who ends up being culpable, you have not damaged 5 the rights of your client. That's how we like to think 7 about it. 8 MS. WEAVER: All I know is we move, and we don't want to get sued, and we just don't want to get tied 9 up in it. And I just think if there's -- we're not doing 10 11 anything that's unethical. We're not doing anything that's -- we don't have gross negligence. But I don't want 12 to be vulnerable. 13 14 I don't want my organization to be vulnerable. I don't want the secret safe place in Harrisburg to be 15 caught up in some kind of lawsuit because there is a 16 mother, or there was some foul play along the way or there 17 is a mother who just decides to sue everyone. 18 19 And I think, too, being, having a husband who's a physician and knowing hospitals and physicians are 20 21 our targets. And we're partnering with hospitals and 22 physicians. And, you know, I just don't want to be in any kind of suit. 23 24 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And I quess -- and

I would just ask that we as a panel look at -- I'm not real

comfortable with that suggestion personally. I'm thinking through it a little bit more. But it kind of brings -- one of your other suggestions was not Children and Youth but some private entity like us.

And I think that's all the more reason arguing yes, some governmental entity to at least oversee the whole thing as compared to leaving it in the hand of one or a whole mishmash of private organizations. Not that they can't be part of the network.

But in terms of who has kind of ultimate responsibility for some of these very important legal rights that are going to follow afterwards, I really do think that does need to stay in our hands.

MS. WEAVER: Just in working with the hospitals, I know they all have their own, they've worked with placing children for adoption before mothers have given birth who don't want their children. They've used various agencies. And this is something that they kind of view as their right and their privilege.

And in working with them when we established our protocol, they said, We like to work with this agency. Can we work with this agency? We don't really want to -- we don't work with CYS. I've had one that said we love CYS. And so we've had all varying opinions. I think, You know what? They're our volunteers. We need to appease

them. 1 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I understand that. 2 3 But somewhere along the line, that adoption gets kind of a state stamp of approval, if we want to call it that. 4 MS. WEAVER: Right. 5 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I think we might be 6 7 on the same page then. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 9 10 Manderino. Are there any other questions? (No response.) I would like to see -- I'm sorry. 11 MS. MENDLOW: Hi. Ms. Weaver, I was wondering 12 when you said that -- I think in response to Representative 13 Manderino's questions, you said that one of the first 14 things you would advise a woman who was pregnant and near 15 16 delivery was that she go to a hospital to deliver the baby 17 if at all possible. 18 Now, one of the things that has been mentioned 19 in various studies and reports and articles consistently is 20 many of these women don't have any health insurance and 21 they're fearful. They feel that they can't afford to go to 22 the hospital. Do you have some insight on that point? 23 MS. WEAVER: With the bill the way it's written both in the Senate version and the House version, 24

it was providing for Medicaid payment to the hospital and

1 the physicians delivering the babies. 2 MS. MENDLOW: But that's if she abandoned the 3 baby. MS. WEAVER: If she abandons it. 4 MS. MENDLOW: I mean, your response about, you 5 know, if the woman calls, if she's kind of panicky, she's 6 7 not quite sure that she wants to give up her child for final adoption situation. She just knows she's going to 8 9 be --MS. WEAVER: Well, I know that no hospital is 10 allowed to refuse to provide service. So if she does go to 11 the hospital and she doesn't have, she doesn't have 12 insurance whatsoever, that hospital, separate from our 13 14 program, that hospital cannot refuse to deliver her baby. And although, you know, we'd like our 15 hospitals to be well-compensated, that is the way that 16 medical care is structured in the state of Pennsylvania. 17 18 No physician's allowed to refuse care. And quite frankly, 19 from a hospital standpoint, they would much rather have a healthy baby delivered than have someone bring in a baby. 20 21 that's going to spend 2 months in the neonatal intensive 22 care unit and require hundreds of thousands of dollars of 23 care. And the actual out-of-pocket cost for the 24 25 physician and for the hospital is relatively little.

it is -- they do have -- knowing my husband's a physician, 1 we write off a lot of, a lot of our fees because we have 2 3 people who don't have insurance and we see them anyway. 4 The hospitals provide the same services. So this is really nothing different than what they --5 I'm sorry. Go ahead. 6 MS. MENDLOW: MS. WEAVER: This is nothing different than 7 8 what they were doing before. In fact, I had one physician who said I don't think I like this. I asked if he would adopt it for his network of hospitals. And he said, I 10 11 don't know if I agree with this. Then he looked at it. He said, You know what? 12 You're asking us to do exactly what we do now. The only 13 difference is you're just saying don't ask the girl her 14 15 name. And we can do that. This is not a big deal. And he right now is trying to get the entire UPMC Health Network 16 17 sign on board. And it looks like, it looks promising at this 18 19 point that that very large network will join our 20 organization. 21 MS. MENDLOW: I just have one other question 22 quickly; and that is, Do you see yourself or your 23 organization as a quasi adoption-related counseling agency? 24 MS. WEAVER: No, not at all. We really don't

get into the adoption business whatsoever. What we're

trying to do is not reinvent the wheel in any way. We're trying to do things as simply as possible. And when we designed this, our goal was just to get out the message that if you want to drop off your baby, just do it at the hospitals.

And we see ourselves more as a strategic arm in terms of being able to organize a network that will work; and secondarily, a marketing arm that will get the message out and that will develop the educational program that will keep the name top of mind before the public.

With the cases that we've, that we've had, we really don't say, you know, we don't necessarily recommend one adoption agency over another. Our concern is, as I had said earlier, is that we lose no babies because there is no mechanism.

So if the hospitals want the, you know, whoever wants to place them, that's great. But what we believe will happen is we believe there will probably be more babies either found or born because there is this option.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you for your questions. Representative Gabig.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Representative

Manderino just asked a question. And I guess we've been here a long time, and I didn't have the answer for her.

Did you say how many babies have been -- what's the 1 term? -- dropped off or --2 3 MS. WEAVER: I didn't go into detail. is in my testimony. I just wanted to keep things down to 4 15 minutes in my discussion. But we have had a few 5 different instances, and I provided detail in the 7 testimony. But we've had a mother who called the 900, 911, which I mentioned. 8 We've had someone call and say, that said that 9 she was going to give birth. I'm sorry. Number 2, she 10 had, a mother gave birth in a nonparticipating hospital and 11 wanted to give her baby to us. So our message is getting 12 out, but they aren't necessarily hearing what hospitals are 13 14 participating. 15 But someone did go to the hospital, and she changed her mind. There was another mother who called and 16 said she was in her third trimester, what should she do. 17 And she was referred to a hospital for prenatal care. 18 There was another mother who went to -- let me see. 19 Another mother who gave birth at a nonparticipating 20 hospital. And then 4 hours after delivering her baby, she 21 said, I don't want my baby. You keep it. I'm out of here. 22 23 Don't call me. And she was a teenager. And the hospital wasn't in our program. 24

didn't really know our protocol. They did call her back,

but she didn't want it. We aren't sure if she heard about 1 our program or not. And this is what she did. The 2 hospital said they never had a case like that in 13 years; 3 it was the first. 5 And we've got to believe that it was related to what we are doing because we have been covered by the 6 7 media for the past year. And probably the other instance was I did receive a call from an adoption attorney. 8 she told me that interestingly, there were 2 babies that she had placed for adoption, for private adoption, from 10 hospitals in her area. 11 And she said, I think it's unusual. 12 they may be hearing your message. So the message is 13 14 getting out. And that's really what our focus has been. My background is in marketing. And I think that the 15 message is everything. 16 If you can get it out -- you will receive 17 18 babies if you get the message out. 19 MS. MESTON: And so far this year, we have 20 lost 2 babies in the Pittsburgh area. MS. WEAVER: It's in the counties outside of 21 22 Allegheny County. 23 MS. MESTON: In Aliquippa, which is Beaver 24 County, we lost a baby, and in Lawrence County. And we

just got Lawrence County on board with us because of that

death.

MS. WEAVER: In the Beaver County one, the baby was -- well, Lawrence County, too. They were near hospitals. They could have just walked in and just dropped off the baby. And the unfortunate thing is these mothers who abandon their babies in unsafe places, they don't want anyone to find out.

Yet with the mother who abandoned her dead baby in one of the counties, everybody knows her name and her face and her story now. So it's -- the tables are turned on her, whereas all she would have had to do was go, you know, another mile literally and drop off her baby at a safe place.

So we just, we want to just make sure that we have the mechanisms that make sense that, or will be palatable. And once again, going back to the foundling home and the orphanages, make it as simple as possible and maybe consider the psyche of the mother, the intentions of the mothers then, and assume that they really haven't changed. Mother is the same, I think, now as then.

MS. MESTON: I'd like to add, I really do believe that you have the right idea on advertising is the biggest key. And we have just started on August 1st to start our PSA. And we've had people call us indicating that they're seeing it on the television, which is great.

We have it on commercials right now. And we 1 have at least 5 different radio stations that are airing it 2 on their PSA times. We are -- as soon as this law is 3 passed hopefully, we will be constructing an educational video, which that's a captive audience. We're talking 5 about children from the age of 12 to 24. 6 So we're talking about pre-high school kids to 7 And these are the girls that are doing it. These 8 college. are our daughters; these are our sisters; these are our 9 aunts; these are people that we know. This is not 10 something that is, that just only hits a certain part of 11 the world. It's hitting us all. It just doesn't, it 12 doesn't eliminate anybody. Okay. 13 And if you think that you're out of that loop, 14 It's hitting all of our families. 15 you're not. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you, Mr. 16

Chairman. 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Representative CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Gabig. Two points I'd like to make. I'm very thankful for your recommendation on the rural areas that lack health care providers. And I think we'll have to take a look at that. And any contract language you can provide us on how to get out on the mothering, getting them back, if you have contract language that you use in your program, if you can get that to our Task Force, we'd be happy to review that.

MS. WEAVER: Returning the babies to the mothers?

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Exactly. Or any other contract language your program uses and your policies and procedures, we'd take a look at that as well. Thank you very much.

MS. WEAVER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Our next presenter is Carmen Schulze, the Regional Public Policy Associate of Child Welfare League of America. I would like to take a moment just to thank all of our presenters for coming across the country to make their presentations today.

Ms. Williams-Mbengue came from Denver,

Colorado with her 2 children. We appreciate that. And I

understand Carmen came to us via Missouri, as well as

Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and everywhere in between. So

thank you for your diligence in getting to our hearing

today. Carmen.

MS. SCHULZE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. It is my pleasure to appear on behalf of the Child Welfare League of America. We are a Washington, D.C. based organization with staff around the country, have 1,200 members who are both public and private agencies serving children who are vulnerable, their families, and the everyday challenges that they face.

Currently, 60 Pennsylvania agencies, again both public and private, are members of CWLA. I'm going to shorten my testimony significantly because it does, or has already been reflected in the conversations I've heard today.

But I do have 3 brief questions to help you think about as you make that broad informed decision to perhaps construct the model statute that other states will want to look at as they revise or initiate their work in their states.

And these questions are: Whether

Pennsylvania's current child welfare system has the
ability, capacity, and authority within its existing
statutory framework to address this issue and if it
doesn't, why isn't it; whether existing federal laws, both
the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, which we know
as CAPTA, and the Adoption and Safe Families Act, which we
call ASFA, contains provisions that, if not conflict with,
may need to be looked at as far as your draft, particularly
the definitions of infant abandonment; and also, how the
state will then be expected to meet the outcomes that are
prescribed, and those are specific federal legislations;
and then what strategies and programs can be identified, or
what are the next steps for this area of infant abandonment
safe havens?

As we look at the first question, whether
Pennsylvania's child welfare system has the current
authority within its existing statutory framework to
address this issue without new legislation or with enhanced
legislation, I believe I heard Assistant Secretary
Stevenson this morning talking about how to build upon the
current child welfare system in the state.

And though I'm not familiar with those specific statutes that you have in place, certainly CWLA feels that that is an appropriate place to begin the discussion. And how do you use that infrastructure without duplicating not only new systems but current, adding extra costs on top of that to provide those basic services to that vulnerable child?

I've been sitting here today thinking about there's nothing more joyous than celebrating the first birthday of a child. And that is, I think, the focus of your committee's work, is to see that Pennsylvania's children get to celebrate that first birthday and get birthday cake all over their face and those happy pictures that we take at those events.

As we look at what the League has done in the area of child abandonment, we did host a symposium on October 12th and 13th of 2000. And one of the symposium's findings at that time was that the laws are being

implemented based on personal values and beliefs without data or knowledge of the scope of the problem.

Certainly, this committee has been focused today on gathering that information so that you can craft a law and not have it conflict with the current agency's responsibility for public child welfare and child protection but also not conflict with those federal laws.

One suggestion that I think you've undertaken and begun is a review of what the current Pennsylvania system might look like. And I've had a reaction today as I've heard about when a child is turned into a hospital, a safe haven, a secret safe haven, whether you should both report to the public child welfare agency and to the police or not.

And from the information that I've been able to distill, it sounds like reporting to the police is based on getting that public awareness campaign started. And really, my concern for a vulnerable mother at the time when she is coming to the secret safe haven is if I knew police were going to be notified, would I also feel concerned that that might lead to a criminal investigation?

What does that imply to me? Does it imply perhaps that this is the start of the public awareness campaign? And how do you get that rolling? You've had discussions on that. But as I've noted in my written

testimony, nothing's for free.

Results do cost. Even creating new parallel systems cost. And passing the law without ensuring an adequate level of funding, not only for public awareness but for services for these children and perhaps a mother if she chooses to self-identify, is the key.

Let's go -- if you choose to look at the current system, there are some excellent resources out in the, in this area to use. Our agency publishes the Standards of Excellence. These are best practice standards and could help guide the discussion.

The Council of Accreditation for children and family services is a way of measuring an organization's compliance with national standards of best practice that have achieved, have been achieved by professional and consumer consensus.

And all states, all 50 states will undergo what is known as the Federal Child and Family Service Review that will look at and examine the framework within your organization's work in the states. And all of these can be used as guidelines to looking at the overall snapshot of Pennsylvania's child welfare system.

Secondly, do existing federal laws conflict with the intent of S.B. 654 as we read it; and how have they been integrated into other safe haven legislation? As

you've heard from NCSL this morning, there has been some, some of the legislation has specifically addressed abandonment.

Two pieces of the federal legislation I think that are key to state agencies are in the Child Abuse and Prevention Treatment Act and the Adoption and Safe Families Act. The latter was enacted in 1997, overarching principles of the best interest of the child.

So that sounds to me to be very congruent with safe haven legislation. And there the focus is the safety of the child is the paramount concern along with that foster care is a temporary setting and not a place for a child to grow up.

The legislations both have specific definitions of abandonment. Those have been identified in your written legislation. I urge you to look at those and think about what kind of ethical dilemma could be created if your legislation on safe haven poses a new and different abandonment definition compared with what is in the federal legislation.

And we must always keep the eye on what I think ASFA does. And that is the child, thinking about does this help facilitate adoption of the child; what happens if there is not medical history; will that be a deterrent; what other information could be shared with an

adoptive parent that in this instance is critical to gain at that time?

And certainly, the whole debate over the ID bracelets, I know that internally, even at the League, we're talking about how does that play out for that mother and could those be transferred to someone else for a price? You know, what are the, again, the ethical dilemmas that could be faced with the challenge now that we do have emerging scientific capabilities to look at parentage?

And last but not least, I think that we've heard this over and over again, is that we really don't know what works. We really don't have research what works for prevention. We really don't -- we are starting to know what works for intervention.

Your last testimony is a great example of what is an intervention that does work to save kids. We don't have data. We don't have data organized in one place. Some states don't even ask for data to be collected in their state.

And I think that those are all important as you look at what programs do work. We know that for young parents, home visitation is key. And is there a way to offer that service to a parent in crisis with a newborn immediately? What avenues can be provided to provide that family support that is obviously lacking for a child and

their mother at this time in crisis?

Certainly, the League is, again, focused on a vision for making communities a safe place with their child in a safe family. And we are committed to working with our members and providing them with any technical and consultation assistance advocacy on Capitol Hill in D.C., research to practice in another initiative so that not only Pennsylvania's children but all children get to blow out their first birthday candle. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you very much for your presentation. Can I entertain some questions?

Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. Just a quick question. And actually, maybe it's more of a comment. But I was glad to hear you mention kind of home visitation and things like that. And I'm just sitting here thinking, I mean, I'm struggling with this whole thing.

And I have yet to hear any real harm that this kind of legislation brings. I'm just not quite sure I'm confident that it brings good. I mean, at the most, it doesn't hurt. I don't know how much it helps. But wouldn't it be nicer that once I call that 800 number and I say I had a baby yesterday and I don't want this baby and, you know, instead of saying, Well, take it to X, Y, Z hospital and leave it there and they won't ask you any

questions, wouldn't it be nice if we could say, Well, you can take it to X, Y, Z hospital and leave it if you're sure that that's what you want to do or we have a visiting nurse that we can send out to you this afternoon, and maybe you want to try that first?

MS. SCHULZE: One of the conversation points that I have not heard a lot of discussion today is on funding. And certainly, duplicate systems cost money. So if you're not looking at duplicating but building on your current system, there may be resources.

But we really haven't talked about that we could offer funding for that visiting nurse to come out as a prevention strategy from abandonment and, again, give them the option of here's a safe haven for your child or if you feel that you would like somebody to come out today within X hours, we would be glad to contact that organization.

That still doesn't preclude you from getting to use the other option that was presented. But I really have not heard a discussion of funding, and that's why I felt that I needed to bring it up because it really is not a neutral-cost bill.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You mentioned a couple -- and I'm sure that our very competent staff will look at those laws. But I think you raised a good flag in

terms of looking at both our state laws and federal laws. 1 From what you have heard today -- because I know that you 2 sat here and listened to all of the testimony -- and your 3 4 familiarity with the federal laws that you cited, do you have any red flags that have raised? 5 I mean, does it sound like anything that we've 6 7 talked about so far is in conflict or is going to put us in 8 a conflict? MS. SCHULZE: The one area that I've heard as 9 far as discussion today has been on notification and do 10 11 you publish what is sufficient notification, do they sign -- I've heard in one instance they've signed some 12 voluntary termination at the time that they dropped off 13 the child. 14 15 You know, I really don't have that sense in my mind clear about due process rights for the parent along, 16 not only the parent or -- what is it called? -- legal 17 18 custodian that drops -- or lawful custodian I believe it says -- the lawful custodian that drops that child off. 19 20 But then if that isn't the other parent, I mean, I'm also worried about the putative father and would 21 22 caution you to look at their due process rights as far as 23 adoption, notification of termination of parental rights 24 would fall into play.

Thank you.

Thank

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative Manderino. Representative Gabig.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. And I guess that that issue that you were just responding to is the issue that I, I guess I'm missing.

When you get down to -- let's just refer to page 6 on your

8 testimony. And you specifically refer to some of those 9 rights of the father.

In the paragraph where you say we got to focus on the child, we agree that we don't want a child discarded in the dumpster but the child is given rights to know their medical or personal history and this is shared with the adoptive parents.

I guess as I understand the intent of this legislation, if that child is put in the dumpster and if we could have a rescuer come and pull that child out, we never know who the person was that dumped him in there, well, we can't get there. I mean, that doesn't happen.

But this is an alternative. This safe haven I think is the approach to it. And obviously, you're going to lose that medical history and you're going to lose the, knowing who your biological parents were, et cetera. But the alternative of saving a life, I think, is what overcomes that, is more important than that.

1 So I don't, I don't see that as the issue. 2 But I certainly appreciate your -- I don't see that as an issue that would prevent us from moving forward with this 3 legislation or be in conflict with the federal law. But I 4 certainly appreciated your testimony regarding the federal 5 6 law. 7 I think you're the only one that was able to give us some of those, or at least give me some of that 8 background. And I appreciate that. Thank you. Thank you. 10 Mr. Chairman. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 11 Gabiq. Are there any further questions? (No response.) 12 Seeing none, thank you very much --13 14 MS. SCHULZE: Thank you very much. 15 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: -- for your testimony. 16 Our next presenter is Melissa N. Speck, Policy and Regulatory Analyst for the Hospital and Healthsystem **17** 18 Association of Pennsylvania. Good afternoon, Melissa. MS. SPECK: Good afternoon. 19 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: And thanks for your 20 patience and everyone else's patience. We've had a very 21 good day of testimony. And it's taking a little longer 22 23 than we had originally planned, but it's been very good. Welcome. 24 25 MS. SPECK: Thank you. Chairman and members

of the Judiciary Committee, I'm Melissa Speck, Director of Policy Development of the Hospital and Healthsystem

Association. HAP represents and advocates for over 250 acute and specialty hospitals and health systems in the Commonwealth and the patients that they serve.

on Senate Bill 654 providing for infant protection. HAP supports the intentions behind Senate Bill 654. However, we feel it's important to note that the coordination of the legal system and the health care system have to complement one another in order to avoid burdensome administrative processes and ensure that the full intent of the bill is not defeated; therefore, we're requesting that the following issues receive additional consideration.

And I've kind of divided them into 2 different areas: Terminology, which is more technical type things as the legislation's been drafted; and then some process-oriented issues. The first under terminology is newborn/infant. We've had a lot of discussion. And I've heard several things today with regards to the definition of newborn and infant.

The health care community defines infants and newborns separately. Infancy is defined as the stage of life from one month to one year of age, while neonate or newborn is the stage of life from birth to one month of

age. We recommend that Senate Bill 654 use the term newborn to mean an infant less than 28 days.

The 28 days I think has been the discussion of issue today. But -- and that's not as much of a concern for us as it is that we want to make sure we're talking about newborns; we're not talking about infants; and we have consistency across, across the legislation because they are used interchangeably throughout.

The definition of hospital: Currently, in the legislation that's drafted, that the definition be taken from the Emergency Medical Services Act. And as that stands, that definition includes rehabilitation and acute long-term care facilities.

There's also been discussion today about why hospitals had been designated as the safe haven. And there was concerns -- I believe Pinnacle had cited that there were concerns with regards to ensuring that there was appropriate mechanisms in place in services being able to be provided to that newborn.

We would like to see that definition amended to include what is already included in the Emergency Medical Services Act but add that "has an organized emergency department." That will then, in essence, exclude those facilities such as long-term care and rehabilitation facilities that truly don't have an organized emergency

department and would not have the ability to care for that newborn.

All hospitals in the state of Pennsylvania and across the country, as was referred to before, are required to treat any patient that walks in their door. And that means to stabilize them and get them transferred then to a facility that can meet their needs. That's under EMTALA.

However, if we're looking at legislation and being able to define and designate specific places, it would benefit to have that definition expanded to define that it's only those hospitals that have organized emergency departments.

Thirdly, under the technical or the terminology areas is the whole issue around transfer.

Again, in the legislation, there needs to be some consistency as it relates to whether the infant is transferred to a health care provider at the hospital or transferred to the hospital. There's a difference.

The legislation stipulates that the transfer is made to the health care provider at the hospital in Section 6402(b) and then again in Section 6404(a)(2). However, when we talk about the identification bracelets further in the legislation, we actually then say that the transfer needed to be taken to the hospital rather than the individual. So again, we're recommending this is a

technical correction that can easily be accommodated and changed.

Now, as it relates to process and procedures, the identification bracelet I believe has come up several times today. We feel that given the intent of the bill is to provide protection to those who voluntarily are relinquishing a newborn, requiring a hospital to issue an identification bracelet actually may subvert that intent.

Again, the whole anonymity issue. The bracelet, I think, was provided as a mechanism for persons wishing to be reunited with that newborn and in a standing court procedure. We question whether the lack of issuing a bracelet would prohibit that said person from actually participating in those court proceedings.

We're asking you to consider that more likely than not, there's not going to be a sufficient amount of time for that exchange of information and an actual bracelet, identification bracelet. And additionally, we don't feel that the bracelet presumes maternity, paternity, or custody; and therefore, we're asking that that actually be deleted from the legislation.

Next, under transfer of custody, designating a hospital as a place in which an unwanted newborn may be relinquished gives the hospital the authority to take protective/physical custody of the child. However,

physical protective custody does not equate to legal custody; and therefore, the hospital would not be able to make medical decisions of a nonurgent need.

Again, we recognize and fully are responsible for making and treating anybody that walks in under EMTALA. However, when you have a healthy newborn that is presented as an abandoned infant, those are nonurgent decisions that would have to be made.

And therefore, we have the following questions in terms of who would have that responsibility, who makes decisions regarding the medically necessary care of the nonurgent nature for a newborn, where is the newborn to be cared for if there are no medical reasons for the newborn to be maintained as an inpatient within the hospital, who will assume financial responsibility for care provided to the newborn?

We're recommending that legal custody actually be immediately transferred over to the county agency. That again has come up several times today in terms of the time period for notification and then the subsequent hearings that take place.

HAP's requesting that the following language be added so that we can ensure that that custody is immediate and will enable hospitals to treat the newborn as an inpatient if necessary but subsequently be paid for the

services:

"Transfer of a newborn to a health care provider at a hospital shall be construed as immediate consent for the county agency of the county in which the newborn is delivered to assume legal custody, direct medical care and treatment, and the newborn be considered immediately eligible for medical assistance to ensure payment of medical services provided."

We further recommend that the county agency be required to make placements, immediate placement arrangements for that newborn that would not need inpatient care within the hospital. We feel that home placement for these newborns is the most appropriate setting rather than continued hospitalization while the court determines the status of that dependent child.

Because this would be a voluntary surrender, there shouldn't be any objection to the county agency assuming immediate legal custody of the newborn and thus giving them the authority to make those medical decisions on behalf of the newborn, assume financial responsibility related to the care and, finally, make appropriate placement.

On behalf of Pennsylvania Hospitals and Healthsystem, I thank you for the opportunity to present testimony and would welcome any questions.

1 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you for your testimony. I would like to allow Representative James to 2 introduce himself and his legislative district. 3 4 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr. 5 Chairman. I'm Representative Harold James from Philadelphia. 7 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative James, for coming to our Task Force meeting. We kept it 8 going. Are there any questions of Melissa? Representative 9 10 Gabiq. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: I would like to 11 explore, Mr. Chairman, if I could, this difference between, 12 I think you called it emergency care and nonurgent medical 13 14 care. What would be the difference in sort of a practical sense? What are you talking about there? If you have this 15 newborn, it seems like all care would be pretty urgent. Or 16 am I missing something there? 17 18 MS. SPECK: I think it's probably a fine line. The difference in my mind that I see is you've got a 19 healthy newborn that's dropped off, abandoned from the 20 mother who chose, is choosing not to keep the infant. 21 22 infant doesn't need any type of extraordinary medical care. 23 It's stable. Everything is fine. 24 Nonurgent care would equate to things like 25 ensuring the hepatitis shot's given, the drops are given,

those kinds of things versus you have an infant that was just born, had complications during delivery and is abandoned at the doorstep, may need life saving measures.

There's a difference between those types of things. And again, the hospital gets into a predicament in terms of who can make those decisions. If it's truly emergent, they will have to, by law, take and deal with any emergent situations that they're presented with.

Of course, no hospital's not going to treat a child if there's scratches or any types of other things that may have been physically present. But routine types of care are things that are nonurgent and thus have to be looked at in a different vein in terms of who has permission and the authority to grant that care be given.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: You know, having had some young children fairly recently, you know, they go -- the term infant versus newborn, I guess we're talking about newborns, right?

MS. SPECK: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Almost everything they're doing in their -- aren't they -- the first 72 hours you're going to have them, isn't it all going to be routine care of a child that needs everything just to stay alive, needs all that treatment just to live? Am I wrong? Do you see what I'm saying?

1 So there should be a period of time, I quess, that you want to cut off to let's get this child 2 3 transferred. But for at least the first initial whatever, 72 hours or whatever this initial time that the hospital's going to be in custody, 48 hours, whatever that time period you might suggest, they should be getting all the care that any infant would get. Am I -- not just emergency 7 8 treatment. Am I right about that? 9 MS. SPECK: Right. I think what you're probably referring to is treatment versus care. Treatment 10 implies some medical types of things. And when I had my 11 child, I had to sign that I wanted those shots given, I 12 wanted this done and this done. I had to give that 13 permission. I also had the right to say no, I didn't want 14 15 those shots administered. Those are the types of things that I'm 16 referring to. That actually putting the hospital in that 17 18 position for that 72 hours or whatever the defined amount 19 of time would be, the hospital's not the one nor the health care provider should be the one to make that decision. 20 21 should be whoever has legal custody. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Okay. 22 So you think -- how soon do you think -- you say immediately that 23 24 the custody should be transferred to Children and Youth?

MS. SPECK: Yes, that's what we're

recommending. As it's drafted now, I believe notification 1 is required within 24 hours. And in the legislation, it's 2 not clear. And I believe it falls under then the Juvenile Act and the Child Protective Services Act as far as the 4 proceedings that take place after that fact. 5 6 During that time then, though, you've got that window of 3 days or even over 72 hours if it's granted 7 8 through the courts. But again, we become more, it may be 9 more of care for the newborn, meeting their basic needs, feeding, changing, burping, those types of things versus 10 11 the medical care that would be received as an inpatient. Newborns that are born and mom takes the baby 12 home happens generally within 48 hours unless it's a 13 cesarean section. They care for the baby during that time 14 while they're in the inpatient stay, and then they go home. 15 If you're past that phase, then who's taking care of that 16 child? **17** 18 Are we asking the hospital to continue and take care of that child as the custodian or as the 19 surrogate parent during that time, or is it the Children 20 and Youth services county agency that takes custody and 21 then finds the placement at a more immediate pace? 22 23 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 24

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative

Gabiq. Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thanks. I think, following up on Will's question, that this issue, this technical issue would become more of a problem not so much in the routine care but in the, a scenario whereby a baby's dropped off, it was immediately in distress, you acted under emergency procedures, you didn't have to ask, you get the baby stabilized and then all of a sudden, you know, still within some short period of time, 24 hours, or something, you realize that, you know, this is a baby that you have on a respirator that isn't going to be able to maintain life after respirator or something and we don't want the hospitals and the doctors being in a decision to decide that a do-not-resuscitate order is appropriate in this instance.

MS. SPECK: That would be a scenario, correct.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. I understand
that part. One of the prior testifiers -- I think it was
the women from A Hand to Hold -- had talked about us not
making Children and Youth the legal custodian but giving
hospitals a choice for some other entity to be a legal
custodian.

Now, part of my question might be not understanding exactly what she was suggesting. I had an immediate concern about what she was suggesting, and it was

particularly in this kind of case. In a case where part of who is taking the legal custody, well, 2 things follow.

One that follows is an assurance that payment is going to happen. But another one that comes is who then has the responsibility for making those kind of legal decisions that could be medical decisions that could potentially be life and death decisions? And do we want a lot of other kinds of entities being vested in that, or do we really want it to be the governmental entity that's in charge?

I think your testimony was suggesting the governmental entity because that's where the legislation originally took us. But if she's saying, Hey, you know, we have all these hospitals in Western Pennsylvania that are already part of our network and are working with us and some of them don't want it to be Children and Youth, is there anything complicating that decision about who it gets vested with from a hospital perspective?

MS. SPECK: As I listened, as I listened to that testimony, the first thing that came to my mind is I think we're walking a fine line between adoption versus the abandoned infant. I think that hospitals across the state have networks for that mother who was in the hospital and after 4 hours has not seen that baby, doesn't want to see that baby, and decides that she wants to sign away her

1 parental rights. That is a mechanism that's allowed in the 2 hospital and is done, and then an adoption agency may have 3 formed a relationship that can take over. It's different when the baby's left in the bassinet on the back step. 5 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So if we leave 6 things kind of the status quo as it comes to this, it would 7 be as it is now. When we're getting to the adoption phase of things, we could leave it the way it happens now. it could be Children and Youth, or it could be some 10 11 adoption, or it could be whatever. 12 But when we get to the abandonment issue, what 13 happens now, whether it's a safe haven or not -- we don't have safe havens per se under state law -- but right now, 14 the decision-making with regard to that child who is 15 abandoned, not that child who is going to be adopted, is 16 now vested with Children and Youth. 17 MS. SPECK: That's what we would recommend, 18 that it be --19 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Is that how it is 20 21 now? MS. SPECK: Right now if an infant is there, 22 23 you have to wait until the custody hearings take place. 24 Again, I don't know that there's been many hospitals. The

number of cases here in Pennsylvania is not such that

there's been a record to show how it takes place. It falls under the Juvenile Act.

But again, I think it's a fine line and that we need to make sure we're distinguishing the difference between true abandoned infants versus those infants, or newborns -- excuse me -- those newborns that are up for adoption or the mother that wants to relinquish, voluntarily relinquish their parental rights.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you.

Manderino. Do we have any further questions? (No response.) Just a hypothetical for you. What if A Hand to Hold and a Secret Safe Place were a very successful at every single hospital in this state, would we need legislation? What areas do we really need legislation on for this bill?

MS. SPECK: Again, I believe it comes down to who has the legal custody during those times because A Hand to Hold is providing that network as is a Safe Place. But the issue truly becomes, when that infant is left on the doorstep, who's making those decisions and who's paying for that care during that time until an appropriate placement is found?

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Because this is obviously happening right now. There are babies that are abandoned

1 in hospitals. MS. SPECK: And each hospital has a different 2 mechanism for, I believe, taking and saying to an adoption 3 4 agency that they've got a relationship with or to the county agency. I think you'll see a variety of scenarios 5 across the state. So the legislation would provide a 6 7 uniform approach to that. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: And do we want to 8 interfere, though, with the hospital's current network that 9 10 they've developed over the years? MS. SPECK: Not all hospitals have that 11 network. So this would again -- and I think the 12 13 legislation also allows for the publicity and ability to 14 raise the awareness in the public so that you can, can provide that mechanism in place and have a mechanism for 15 16 them to be dropped off safely. **17** CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Do you know the legal 18 standard for the medical assistance that needs to be 19 established? MS. SPECK: I am not familiar with the details 20 21 behind that, no. 22 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Okay. Well, we'll work on 23 our committee with that. Representative Manderino. REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Today, whether a 24

baby is abandoned at a hospital or a baby is found on a

street corner and brought to the closest emergency room so 1 now that baby, if it's still living, ends up in a hospital 2 institution, who pays for the care that's been provided 3 now? Is that something that you're, is 5 uncompensated care? It's not something that you can apply 6 7 currently under the State Medical Assistance --MS. SPECK: That's correct. They're not 8 eligible. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Any further follow-up 11 (No response.) Seeing none, thank you very 12 13 much for your presentation. And if you have anything you'd like to supply afterwards, that would be great, too. 14 you. And last but not least, our final presenter today is 15 Laura L. Bauer, the Legislative Chair for the Delaware 16 Valley Adoption Council. Good afternoon, Laura. Thank you **17** very much for your patience today. 18 MS. BAUER: 19 Sure. 20 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: And you may proceed. 21 MS. BAUER: Thank you for this opportunity to be with you today to provide testimony on Senate Bill 654. 22 I am here representing the Delaware Valley Adoption 23 Council. We are a consortium of 50 members of the adoption 24 community in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, with 25

the greatest number of our membership from the southeast region of Pennsylvania.

We are a diverse group. We represent public child welfare agencies, private adoption agencies, independent adoption attorneys, adoptive parent groups, adoptee and birth parent groups, and other professionals with an interest in adoption.

The primary purpose of the Council is to promote the concepts of best practice in adoptions and to facilitate permanency for children. We are proud of our 25-year history and our accomplishments. The Delaware Valley Adoption Council applauds all efforts to prevent harm and keep our most vulnerable children safe.

We support decriminalizing abandonment when a parent delivers an unharmed newborn to a safe place.

However, we stand strongly opposed to Senate Bill 654 because of the potential harm that it may unintentionally create in the name of saving babies.

The proposed bill aims to effectively address the problem of infant abandonment in public places and infanticide. This is a public concern that triggers an emotional cry for a solution. Senate Bill 654 aims to provide that solution but fails on multiple levels.

First and foremost, we must recognize that our state law already allows women to voluntarily relinquish

custody of infants in a safe, nonthreatening manner that protects the privacy of the parents and allows the infant to be adopted.

The question then that really must be asked is what prevents some women from utilizing the existing services when confronted with an unplanned and unwanted pregnancy, not how can we make abandonment safer.

Thousands of infants are abandoned in hospitals across the nation every year. Many of the parents are drug addicted and impoverished. Senate Bill 654 does not attempt to address the plight of these children and families.

It does seek to impact on what is no more than a handful of individuals who are either unaware of services or are too scared, misinformed, or in such denial of their pregnancies that they deliver their child in unsafe places and simply walk away or try to conceal the birth.

There is very little known about these individuals who show so little regard to human life and apparently are unable to consider the consequences of their actions. Therefore, legislation aimed to address the problem is unlikely to meet success without further study and careful consideration.

Today, there is no evidence that indicates that these traumatized individuals are any more likely to

walk their child into a designated hospital or other safe haven given the promise of anonymity and legal protections. We heard a lot of that today.

However, removing the threat of prosecution when an infant is delivered to a safe place does have some merit. Let me provide you with an example of why DVAC members would support such action. Several years ago, there was a highly publicized case in one of the counties in Pennsylvania when an individual abandoned a baby in the stairwell of a small-town hotel on Easter Sunday.

The story hit the papers immediately, and the baby was dubbed Baby Bunny Doe. Luckily, the infant was examined at the local hospital and deemed to be in good health and unharmed. The local Children and Youth agency was contacted. And per all the usual CPS law, the baby was declared a dependent child.

She was placed into a home with a couple who were approved as both a foster and adoptive family. For 3 months, the police investigated and papers ran articles. The media made it clear that the police were hoping to find the parent and would use the full extent of the law to prosecute the person who had abandoned the helpless infant.

Meanwhile, CYS was mandated to do everything within its power to locate the birth family members so that family service planning could be provided. No family

members came forward, and the individual responsible for
abandoning the baby was never found. No surprise when one
considers the shame, public humiliation, and criminal
prosecution she would have faced.

Today, the adoptive family struggles to find a way to explain their child's early beginnings to her without inflicting emotional turmoil and pain. After all, it is painful to learn that you were so insignificant that you were left or dropped off, a much different scenario than that in which a woman makes a careful, unselfish, well-considered adoption plan.

For the family, every routine doctor's visit is a reminder of how little they know regarding their child's health risks. Is it possible that the same person who left that baby in a stairwell would have walked her into a hospital given knowledge that it would have been safe to do so?

Might well-trained personnel equipped to intervene on behalf of the individual in crisis assist the birth parent in understanding the consequences of legal abandonment for her, other birth family members, and the child?

Could informational counseling be offered and, in so doing, likely reduce the potential number of abandonment? Could critical child and family medical and

Adoption Council believe it can be done with thoughtful consideration for all these issues. We challenge the legislators to develop law that will be fair and just and give protections to children, birth parents, and adoptive parents alike.

So what is wrong with the proposed bill as it reads now? First, we know that total anonymity is dangerous and unworkable. There is no way of knowing if the person leaving the child actually has lawful custody since he or she may be anonymous.

The potential for fraud and legal challenges leave those of us in the adoption community who have worked so hard to ensure every individual's right to due process terrified of the potential ramifications. For example, anonymity will make it virtually impossible for the child welfare agency to make diligent efforts to notify parent, quardian, or other family members of the whereabouts of the infant, which is a provision of the bill.

As a result, the possibility that there might be a family member who is able and willing to provide care and protection to the child will not matter. Such disregard for kinship ties is in direct conflict with all existing child welfare laws.

Next, we are concerned with the language in

the bill that states a person accepting possession of the infant may request the infant's medical history. The language implies that the information is of little significance and assumes that a person transferring possession of the infant will be unwilling to provide medical history. The language emphasizes the person's right to not disclose any information.

The Delaware Valley Adoption Council strongly opposes these ideas. Decades of experience working with women in crisis, facing unplanned pregnancies and other hardships have taught us that these women can be assisted in making responsible plans for their unborn or newly born child.

We are confident that with well-trained and skilled workers, women in desperate crisis willing to legally abandon their infant may be assisted in providing not only the infant's medical background but family medical and social background as well.

Over and over again, the adoption community
has been reminded of how important medical and personal
identity information is to the physical and emotional
well-being of adoptees and the adults who parent them. In
the past 10 years, the adoption community and the
legislators who have mandated a central registry have made
tremendous strides to ensure that adoptees and adoptive

families are provided with as much nonidentifying background information on biological family as possible.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We find no reason for these retro laws that will set back the progresses gained in the past 25 years of adoption practice. We again challenge the lawmakers to include language that will set much higher expectations for 7 hospital personnel who will be responsible to accept possession of infants and to provide provisions for the funding that will be needed to train and hire these skilled counselors.

Finally, what may be our most troubling concern is that if this bill passes into law in its current form, will such legislation encourage parental irresponsibility? After all, there is a provision -- and we've heard a lot of testimony -- about the importance of promoting public awareness and publicity about legal abandonment, while it remains mute on publicizing free and confidential counseling.

The State of New Jersey has allocated a half million dollars to promote their safe haven law. Busses and billboards advertise the slogan, "No shame, no blame, no name." If you have been an adoption professional long enough, you have probably worked with at least one woman who wishes to bypass the legal formalities or argue that a birth father should have no rights.

The members of the Delaware Valley Adoption

Council foresee a high risk that women who would otherwise

plan responsibly for an unwanted pregnancy may determine

that legal anonymous abandonment as an easy and preferable

alternative in light of the no questions asked policy.

All safeguards provided in the Pennsylvania Adoption Act would be effectively sidestepped. For the child, the result of legal abandonment means placement in the child welfare system, delay in termination of parental rights versus a voluntarily relinquishment and a complete lack of medical history and personal identity information such as race, ethnicity, and even in most of these cases the child's date of birth. Though we are certain that this was not the intent of the legislators, we argue that it will be the effect.

In conclusion, we would like to offer some suggestions for legislators to consider. Decriminalizing the act of abandoning infants in designated safe places is not harmful in and of itself. It is possible that it may encourage individuals who are contemplating leaving a child in a public place to do otherwise.

We remain doubtful that it will have impact on individuals who abandon infants in very risky places like toilets and dumpsters. Decriminalization alone is a Band-Aid approach to dealing with the problem of infant

abandonment and infanticide.

It does nothing to address the issues that put these women in crisis. A more comprehensive and preventive approach will include fiscal allocation for increased public awareness regarding free and confidential options counseling, not only information about legal abandonment.

Public information will need to include where and how to access counseling services. The stigma surrounding adoptions and the public misperceptions regarding its process will need to be challenged.

Initiatives to educate and train school personnel such as teachers, guidance counselors, and nurses on the ways to establish dialogue with children about reproductive health and to provide students with information regarding all of their options should they find themselves pregnant, feeling alone and scared will need to be implemented.

These are just a few suggestions that we believe will have a positive effect on protecting infants. The Delaware Valley Adoption Council wishes to extend its thanks to each of you for consideration of this testimony.

CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you very much for your presentation. At this time, I'll entertain questions. Representative Gabig, we've been starting with you.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you. Thank you,

Ms. Bauer, for your testimony, which if I'm following the

testimony that we heard earlier, it sounds a little bit 1 different than most of the stuff we heard today on many 2 issues. Although, if I'm following your line of argument 3 or your testimony -- I'm sorry -- you do think the intent of the bill is sound; is that right? 5 MS. BAUER: We do. We do think that 6 7 decriminalizing abandonment has its merits. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: And if I also -- I was 8 listening to you and also trying to read along in your 9 prepared testimony. I think you mentioned a handful of 10 cases, some of which we heard today. This might be a good 11 thing for those either young girls or young women that are 12 in this panic situation, panic pregnancy, and unreported 13 14 pregnancy. You also, if I'm following your testimony in 15 listening to you, think that the bill might be able to 16 address some of those cases. If 1 or 2 of those panicked 17 18 young girls or women would take advantage of the safe 19 haven, it would be worthwhile, I quess is my question. Do you agree with that? 20 I do agree. We do feel that it 21 MS. BAUER: 22 may reach the individual who wraps the child in a blanket

and leaves the child in a stairwell of a hotel or other

public place. We have a lot of doubt whether or not this

will truly aim at those individuals who are panicked, who

23

24

are in such crisis and fear and just total overwhelmness
that they will in fact think enough to take the baby to a
safe haven.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: With the public awareness campaign that apparently would go along with this, why do you have those doubts? I mean, won't you think it would reach some people? We heard about some of the examples in Allegheny County and the surrounding areas where perhaps they hadn't quite reached that but because of the intervention and prevention, they seemed to make different decisions that might have otherwise occurred which led to better results than the stairwells.

MS. BAUER: What I heard, though, is that through public awareness campaign, there are women who are hearing about this other option and that they are using it. It doesn't necessarily say to me that these are the same women who are leaving the babies in public toilets and dumpsters and things like that.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: I guess that's a good point. And I guess that goes back to some of the comments that I heard earlier, primarily from Representative Manderino, about this bill, the Senate Bill seems to do no harm at least and if it is an opportunity for at least some of these young girls or women that find themselves in this situation to have that alternative, it certainly would be a

good thing.

And I guess I didn't hear from you. Do you just want to pitch this bill and not go forward with this, or do you think there's some way to improve it and make it stronger?

MS. BAUER: I think that there's ways to improve it. I think we have a lot of concern. I hear, you know, this at the very least will not do any harm. But I think that the Delaware Valley Adoption Council would argue that. It may do some harm in the event that we're encouraging more women to abandon babies rather than place them for adoption or other options.

What this means to -- as I had already said, that what this will mean to children is that they weren't thought of enough. There has been a lot of evidence through years of practice in the adoption field that children fare much better emotionally and also physically in some cases when they know their medical history, when they know that their birth parents have made, made an informed decision, a planned decision for them to be cared for by another person.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: I understand that. And I think you made that clear. But the child that's in the dumpster and has died, he or she doesn't have any benefit of the medical history or any of those quality of life

1 issues. They're dead. So I think that the purpose of the bill is to prevent that from happening. 2 Other children that are adopted that have the 3 4 benefit of those medical, this is not going to affect them This would only affect the children that, that 5 would otherwise be, you know, the mother would not take the 6 7 child to the safe haven. 8 MS. BAUER: I think that is part of our 9 argument, that we do not know that it will reach those people who will leave them for dead in a dumpster. But it 10 11 may encourage more women who would not make those choices to abandon a child versus making other informed decisions. 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Well, I want to thank 14 you for your testimony. And you raised some interesting issues, a couple of which I had earlier concerns about. 15 But at least we agree that I think the intent is a good 16 idea. And if you had any suggestions for strengthening the 17 18 bill, I would certainly be interested. And I'm sure the committee would be 19 interested, or the Task Force, I quess, would be interested 20 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 in hearing them. 22 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 23 Gabig. Representative Manderino. 24 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you.

thank you for your testimony. Sometimes it's hard to be

the last one coming up saying something different than

everything than went before you. But I think in many ways,

you really aren't saying something totally different, at

least not from where my head is.

And I think that -- and that was -- early on when the prosecutors were here, I just talked about, like, how are the crimes classified and can we decriminalize some classes of cases. I think you make a very good point there because the reality of it is if we get the safe, or if we get the healthy baby with no malicious intent to kill or harm them, I mean, it seems to me as a societal goal in value, we ought to celebrate that and figure out a way to get that baby in a safe and healthy atmosphere and to get that mother the psychological and other help that she needs without fear of prosecution.

And as much as I'm not at all questioning the intent of the prosecutors who were here earlier. But I just, you know, as the one person said, Well, if there was no harm to the baby, we wouldn't, we would use our discretion to not prosecute. And I think that many will.

But I think this Bunny Doe case is a classic example of -- I mean, who knows what happens. Sometimes the publicity just gets to be too much. It's an election year. And you just got to show that you took action. And I'm not quite sure that I feel confident that the best

discretion and the best interests of the child and the mother will always be exercised under all circumstances.

And I think from our Task Force point of view, if there is some way to look at the classifications of the crimes and decriminalize abandonment where no end result harm happened and no malicious intent could be established would probably be a more comfortable way for me to go.

Having said that, I guess the one harm, if I'm reading in between the lines and also hearing your testimony, the real concrete harm that you seem to point us to is if all of a sudden we start seeing ads that emphasize not come see so and so ABC Counseling and make a plan for your pregnancy or come to ABC Counseling and we can help you understand the adoption process but all of a sudden we start seeing ads that say drop your baby off at the hospital door and we won't ask you any questions, it is a little bit of a different message.

But the adoption process, what happens after the abandonment -- and you gave a little bit of a testimony about what you called sidestepping the adoption procedure. I don't understand that process enough. Is it so cumbersome that there are lots of people that don't want to go through it but they go through it because that's the only alternative?

And that seems to be your real bottom line

I don't want to reduce it to one. But if I'm concern. hearing you correctly, you're almost saying that what you 2 fear is not that the intent of what we're calling the 3 abandoned baby in the dumpster but that whole transition 4 that happened that a number of the agencies have testified 5 before us kind of not confused but mixed together in our mind the whole thing that went from, from deciding to give 7 your baby up for adoption as separated from abandonment. 8 9 What's going on in that process that you're afraid if we kind of emphasize this abandonment end, that 10 we're going to have some really negative big impact on the 11 12 legal adoption end, that's the part I don't understand. MS. BAUER: Well, I think one of the, one of 13 the things that the adoption law in Pennsylvania does and 14 15 does well is it makes sure that relinquishing parents are given due process; that they're notified; that they 16 understand what they are doing; that there's even a 17 18 provision in the bill that the court needs to determine 19 that the parent was given opportunity for counseling. Abandonment is very different from the things that --20 21 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. But if I can just -- all that -- those due process rights protect the 22 parent relinquishing their parental rights. 23 24 MS. BAUER: Parental rights, right. Very 25 different from abandonment.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: In abandonment, I 1 may not have had that counseling. But aren't, aren't the 2 3 rights that we're concerned about, whether or not they're being protected, still the rights of the parent relinquishing them and not some right that goes to either 5 adoptee parent or to the child? Am I missing something? 6 MS. BAUER: Can you repeat that question? 7 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Well, I'm looking 8 9 at the child. And I'm saying, What harm am I inflicting 10 on -- never mind. I can talk myself right back into your 11 answer. Just to -- I don't know if this is MS. BAUER: 12 going to answer your question or not. But we have heard a 13 lot of sort of mix between what is abandonment versus 14 adoption planning. And we need to be very clear today that 15 abandonment -- there are laws for abandonment. 16 17 There are existing laws for what happens when 18 a child is abandoned. And we should not go to developing 19 something that would be another track in the case of a safe haven abandonment. If a child is abandoned, Children and 20 21 Youth agencies are required to be notified to petition the 22 courts for custody; and the courts determine if that child 23 is a dependent child. Then there is a 3-month minimum requirement 24

where a diligent search is conducted -- and that's often

with collaboration with the police force -- to find the 1 birth parents or family members. It's not until that 2 3-month period is completed that we can proceed with 3 4 involuntary termination of parental rights. 5 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And that's a good thing, I think. 6 7 That's a very good thing. MS. BAUER: 8 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And I didn't understand that this bill was changing that. I 9 understood that this bill was, instead of doing what maybe 10 11 you and I are suggesting -- and maybe because it's not 12 possible -- instead of us saying this particular crime and this particular crime and this particular crime, we're to 13 14 take them off the crime list, okay, what we're saying is 15 all these crimes still stay here. But in the weighing of the facts and whether 16 or not to charge, we're going to say that you took 17 18 advantage of abandoning the child so therefore, you know, 19 section 18, section lah, lah, lah, lah of Title 18, endangerment of child welfare, we're not going to charge 20 21 you with that because you chose to abandon them at a place 22 where we, the government, had designated a safe haven. If that's all we're doing in the law and we're 23 still keeping in place all of the other avenues with regard 24

to the Children and Youth coming in, the due diligence

to identify the parents and everyone who might have 1 rights before they're terminated, before they go to 2 adoption -- I'm not asking you are you endorsing this 3 because I understand your position -- are you more comfortable if all that stays in place than you are if we 5 would attempt, through this law, to shorten those time 7 periods or, or cut off the obligation to try to find the 8 putative father or something like that? 9 MS. BAUER: Yes. Yes. The answer is yes. 10 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. Thank vou. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Thank you, Representative 11 I quess I have to follow up on a question that 12 Manderino. I think that Representative Gabiq and Manderino were kind 13 14 of getting to, is how do you believe we reach the dumpster case? I think that's the whole purpose of the legislation, 15 but I don't really hear that addressed. 16 I'm not sure that we have a 17 MS. BAUER: definitive answer. And that goes back to we really need 18 more research on why women are dumping their infants into, 19 you know, these toilets and other things. We do believe, 20 21 though, that by doing more public awareness on options counseling -- free and confidential counseling is 22 23 available. We have existing services that are out there. 24 25 But, you know, there is a reason, some reason that we don't

really know why women are not utilizing these services. 1 But one thing that we believe in is that maybe there needs 2 to be more public awareness campaigns that there is free 3 and confidential counseling, that there are family planning centers in every community, that there are adoption agencies that are willing to discuss, in confidence, 6 options for that individual. 7 CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Okav. I'm just -- I mean, 8 the dumpster case I think is what we're here for today. 9 10 MS. BAUER: And again, I say that we believe that with more publicity about what already is out there, 11 we may reach those people. We may. We don't know that 12 yet. We do believe also and support any further studies on 13 who these women are and why they're leaving their children 14 15 in dumpsters. CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: Okay. Well, thank you. 16 **17** And I definitely like how you expand upon the dangers perhaps of expanding the adoption abandonment versus trying 18 to get to the dumpster case because I think that's really 19 20 definitive language we have to better develop because we 21 certainly don't want to make it so easy and have busses

MS. BAUER: I don't think that's what the

driving around Pennsylvania publicizing how it's so easy to

abandon babies. I don't think that's the goal of anyone

22

23

24

25

here today.

1	government's in business for.
2	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: We want to promote strong
3	families, et cetera. Thank you very much for your
4	testimony.
5	MS. BAUER: Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON LEWIS: I'd like to also, for
7	the record, we have received 3 written submissions: One
8	from the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania;
9	one from the Bundles of Joy, Inc.; and a submission from
10	the Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth. I accept
11	their written testimony for today's Task Force hearing.
12	And we also will leave the record open for
13	additional submissions to the Task Force. They can present
14	it to myself, to Representative Manderino, or to the
15	Judiciary Committee itself, Karen, attention Karen Dalton.
16	Thank you very much for your time. And have a good day.
17	(Whereupon, at 2:38 p.m., the hearing adjourned.)
18	
19	* * *
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	I hereby certify that the proceedings and
2	evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes
3	taken by me during the hearing of the within cause and that
4	this is a true and correct transcript of the same.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	ſ
10	Jennifu P. McCount
11	JENNIFER P. McGRATH
12	Registered Professional Reporter
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	My Commission Expires:
18	April 30, 2005
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	JENNIFER P. McGRATH, RPR
24	P.O. Box 1383 2nd & W. Norwegian Streets
25	Pottsville, Pennsylvania 17901