



Newborn Screening Party Pros / Cons & Concerns

Newborn screening tests nearly all babies born in the United States shortly after birth to detect serious rare diseases early, allowing treatment to begin before symptoms appear and improving health outcomes.

Party	Pros (Arguments Supporting Newborn Screening Expansion)	Cons / Concerns (Arguments Raising Caution for Rare Disease Patients)
Democrats	<p>Expanded newborn screening (NBS) enables earlier diagnosis of rare diseases, improving outcomes and reducing long-term health inequities.</p> <p>Supports federal funding and modernization to help states add new rare conditions and adopt genomic technologies.</p> <p>Views NBS as a public health investment that benefits underserved communities.</p>	<p>Strong concerns around genetic privacy, data use, and long-term storage of newborn DNA.</p> <p>Worries that adding conditions without funding strains state labs and causes delays in follow-up care.</p> <p>Concern that uneven state implementation may widen disparities in access to rare disease diagnosis.</p>
Republicans	<p>Early detection aligns with pro-family and prevention-focused policies, helping children receive treatment before symptoms progress.</p> <p>Supports state leadership and flexibility in deciding which rare diseases to add to screening panels.</p> <p>Early diagnosis can reduce long-term health expenditures and improve efficiency in care.</p>	<p>Concern about federal mandates that require states to expand panels without providing resources.</p> <p>Skepticism toward government-held genetic information and lack of explicit parental consent for some testing or storage practices.</p> <p>Worried about increased costs for state labs and public health systems without funding offsets.</p>