STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES Unrevised and Unedited Not for Quotation or Duplication

THE SURGEON GENERAL'S VITAL MISSION:

CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE

Tuesday, July 10, 2007

House of Representatives,

Committee on Oversight and

Government Reform,

Washington, D.C.

"This is a preliminary transcript of a Committee Hearing. It has not yet been subject to a review process to ensure that the statements within are appropriately attributed to the witness or member of Congress who made them, to determine whether there are any inconsistencies between the statements within and what was actually said at the proceeding, or to make any other corrections to ensure the accuracy of the record."

Committee Hearings

of the

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



1 RPTS MERCHANT

2 DCMN HERZFELD

- 3 THE SURGEON GENERAL'S VITAL MISSION:
- 4 CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE
- 5 Tuesday, July 10, 2007
- 6 House of Representatives,
- 7 Committee on Oversight and
- 8 Government Reform,
- 9 Washington, D.C.

- The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
 Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Henry A.
- 12 Waxman [chairman of the committee] presiding.
- Present: Representatives Waxman, Watson, Yarmuth,
- 14 Norton, Sarbanes, Davis of Virginia and Issa.
- 15 Staff Present: Phil Barnett, Staff Director and Chief
- 16 Counsel; Karen Nelson, Health Policy Director; Karen
- 17 | Lightfoot, Communications Director and Senior Policy Advisor;
- 18 Andy Schneider, Chief Health Counsel; Naomi Seiler, Counsel;
- 19 Steve Cha, Professional Staff Member; Earley Green, Chief
- 20 | Clerk; Teresa Coufal, Deputy Clerk; Caren Auchman, Press

2

Assistant; Zhongrui "JR" Deng, Chief Information Officer;
Kerry Gutknecht, Staff Assistant; Art Kellermann, Fellow;
David Marin, Minority Staff Director; Keith Ausbrook,
Minority General Counsel; A. Brooke Bennett, Minority
Counsel; Susie Schulte, Minority Senior Professional Staff
Member; Patrick Lyden, Minority Parliamentarian and Member
Services Coordinator; and Benjamin Chance, Minority Clerk.

Chairman WAXMAN. The meeting of the committee will come to order.

Two months ago this committee began a series of hearings on how to make government effective again. These hearings ask why Federal agencies that were once admired as the finest in the world, like the Food and Drug Administration, are failing to meet the public's expectations. And they seek to understand how we can restore these troubled agencies to models of excellence that will help our Nation meet the challenges ahead.

Today's hearing will examine the Office of the Surgeon
General in the Department of Health and Human Services. The
Surgeon General is the doctor to the Nation, a uniquely
trusted figure who brings the best available science on
matters of public health directly to the American people.
This position is unique among government agencies not only in
the United States, but among health agencies worldwide.

The ability of the Surgeon General to improve the health of the Nation is vividly illustrated by the impact of the landmark 1964 report Smoking and Health. For the first time the American people had a credible science-based report from the government that spelled out the relationship, the causal relationship, between smoking and lung cancer.

Over the years the Office of the Surgeon General has produced highly influential reports and calls to action on

topics ranging from AIDS prevention to obesity to mental health. Like the 1964 smoking report, the Surgeon General's work has shaped the Nation's understanding of public health. But what we will learn today is that this essential part of our government is in crisis. Political interference is compromising the independence of the Office of the Surgeon General. On key public health issues the Surgeon General has been muzzled. The Surgeon General's greatest resource, his or her ability to speak honestly and credibly to the Nation about public health, is in grave jeopardy.

Dr. Richard Carmona, the most recent Surgeon General, will tell us that on issue after issue he was blocked from speaking out and prevented from using the best medical science to educate the American people. In his words, quote, the job of the Surgeon General is to be the doctor of a Nation, not the doctor of a political party. Yet Dr. Carmona will tell us that he was astounded by the degree of partisanship and political manipulation he experienced. And he will describe how, and I quote, anything that doesn't fit into the political appointee's ideological, theological or political agenda is ignored, marginalized or simply buried.

Politics and science will always intersect in government, and Dr. Carmona is not the only Surgeon General to face political interference. Dr. C. Everett Koop was the Surgeon General during the Reagan administration and was told

not to speak out on the subject of AIDS, which was regarded as a gay disease. He courageously resisted this pressure. Dr. David Satcher served as Surgeon General under President Clinton. He, too, faced political interference. His efforts to release a report on the benefits of needle exchange programs were blocked, an action that President Clinton called a mistake. And when he wanted to release a report promoting the use of condoms and other responsible sexual behaviors, he was told to submit his report for publication in a medical journal rather than release it as another Surgeon General's report.

But as we will hear this morning, political interference with the work of the Surgeon General appears to have reached a new level in this administration. We will hear how reports were blocked, speeches were censored and travel restricted. We will also hear how the Surgeon General had to resist repeated efforts to enlist his office to advance partisan political agendas. The public expects that a Surgeon General will be immune from political pressure and be allowed to express his or her professional views based on the best available science, but when the science-based views of the Surgeon General, like Dr. Carmona, are marginalized and ignored, that essential independence is lost.

The oversight should serve two purposes. It should expose problems in how our government operates, and it should

point the way to a reform. Today we will learn how political interference is undermining the Office of the Surgeon General, but we will also hear the recommendations of Drs. Koop, Satcher and Carmona for restoring the independence and the effectiveness of the Office of the Surgeon General. We need to pay as much attention to their prescription for reform as we do their diagnosis for ills.

The position of Surgeon General is a review post in our government. Fixing what is wrong and making the office work again should be a bipartisan priority. In 2 days the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions will take up the nomination of Dr. James Holsinger, Jr., to the position of Surgeon General. Today's hearing does not concern this nomination of Dr. Holsinger's credentials, but I am hopeful that today's testimony will be of value to Congress and the American people as we consider the challenges facing the next Surgeon General, whoever he or she may be.

[The information follows:]

***** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. We are fortunate to have a distinguished panel of three former Surgeon Generals with us today, and I look forward to their testimony. But before we hear from them, I will recognize the Ranking Member of the committee Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Thank you, Chairman Waxman, for convening this hearing on a common issue. The Surgeon General, often referred to as the Nation's doctor, has played a pivotal role over the years in educating Americans on important health matters. From our most visible health advocate we have learned about the dangers of using tobacco, the health effects of secondhand smoke, underaged drinking and the lethal pathway of HIV/AIDS.

Many of the issues highlighted by Surgeon Generals have never been addressed openly before. Some were considered taboo. But the medical and moral authority of the Surgeon General's voice broke through those barriers and stipulated a central public discourse and concrete actions to improve public health.

Operations of the Surgeon General's office are not a new topic of discussion for this committee. We held a hearing in 2003 to consider the proposal to make the U.S. Public Health Service Commissioned Corps a more readily deployable force in the Federal medical response to national disasters. As head of the committee, the Corps of the Surgeon General leads a

cadre of highly trained and mobile health professionals who can respond to the Nation's acute and chronic health needs. Surgeon Generals Koop and Carmona both testified at that hearing, and we welcome their insights again today as we discuss more broadly the role of the future of the office that they both held.

The committee also examined the Commissioned Corps' deployment to the gulf coast after Hurricane Katrina. The Surgeon General's Office was notified there was problem with a landfill and that their assistance would be necessary. Those offices provided much-needed care to evacuees and provided a critical complement to the Federal Government's overall medical response. In the wake of that historic storm, more than 1,000 Commissioned Corps officers were deployed in that region. That effort was led by former Surgeon General Carmona.

With the rich history and vital function, the Surgeon General and I look forward to continuing our discussion today on how to enhance the role of that office as our Nation confronts the next generation of public health threats. We need to discuss the importance of keeping the Surgeon General independent and free to communicate directly to the American people on disease prevention and health promotion.

As we all know, our doctors sometimes have to deliver bad news. Likewise, the Nation's doctor is often called upon

to make findings that might be controversial or politically inconvenient to the administration of the day, Republican or Democratic, but waiting or sugarcoating hard truths only allow public health problems to fester and grow worse. The voice of the Surgeon General can be a powerful antidote to societal health and should not be muted or filtered through layers of needless bureaucratic or political approvals.

The physicians on this distinguished panel of witnesses have already made invaluable contributions to American public health. We are grateful for the experience, the expertise and the insights they bring to today's discussion of the Surgeon General's vital role in protecting and improving the Nation's well-being. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Davis.

[The information follows:]

188 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. Ms. Norton, do you wish to make a statement?

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just a very brief statement.

First, a statement of gratitude that you are holding a hearing. The reason I express such gratitude is because the Surgeon General very often speaks on health to the American people and can have a remarkable effect simply by writing a report. So the lack of such reports in recent years, when one man can almost single-handedly, by speaking out, get people to think about smoking and to have a material effect, not by going to the doctor, not by being approached, just by issuing a report, when you have that kind of power it is important to use it.

Now, there had been a report on obesity. There needs to be another one, because we now have not only a childhood obesity epidemic before our very eyes that no amount of healthcare will solve when these children get to be adults, but we have a remarkable trend where in every age group, in every income group, in every race people are fat. And we see these fat people in our own constituencies, and we have nothing authoritative that speaks to them.

And if I may say one more thing, Mr. Chairman. There is an HIV/AIDS epidemic that has settled in the African American community, and shame on the Surgeon Generals of the United

States for not pointing out that 50 percent of the cases today are African American, and we are 12 percent of the population. How could that happen? Stereotyping this disease, as the Chairman said, initially as a gay disease can be controversial, and it was certainly wrong, but imagine allowing it to travel over into another community and not one word.

Finally, in the District of Columbia everybody should be tested in the United States to wipe away the stigma, to wipe away the superstition and the homophobia. If the Surgeon General is to recoup his major role in American history not by telling us what to do, but by speaking authoritatively to the American people, then he must begin by speaking to us about the issues we can do something about, and I have named two of them. Obesity and HIV/AIDS are all preventable. One word from the Surgeon General can do more than a multitude of hearings, as important as they are, from Congress.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Ms. Norton.

[The information follows:]

234 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Issa.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll put my entire opening statement in for the record, but I would just like to thank our distinguished panel for being here today.

I, like the Chairman, would like to take full advantage of the independence of our Surgeon Generals. I believe that today we are going to have an opportunity to delve into a number of areas. The area that I would like to spend the most time on is one that is near and dear to the Chairman, and that is private health care, why does it cost so much; public health care, why does it not meet the expectations of the American people; and can we mend it, either one of them, or do we need to end them? So I am going to very much take advantage of sort of the independence, and particularly in Dr. Koop's case the independence that comes from some time out of some of the public limelight.

I very much thank the Chairman for holding this hearing and would hope that this is a unique opportunity to ask the questions that are very hard to ask in a normal hearing where we either have the pharmaceutical industry or advocate industry or some group that has a financial bent, if you will, in answering the questions.

Mr. Chairman, I'll hold the rest of my questions, and I thank you for holding this hearing today.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Issa.

[The information follows:]

261 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Sarbanes, do you want to make any opening statement before we begin?

Mr. SARBANES. No, Mr. Chairman, just thank you for holding the hearing and looking forward to openings.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you.

We do have three very distinguished former Surgeon

Generals, individuals who have served our country with honor

and distinction during four Presidential administrations.

Dr. C. Everett Koop served as our 13th Surgeon General from

1981 to 1989. A pediatric surgeon by training, he is widely

credited for making the Office of the Surgeon General a

scientific and principled force in American life. More than

any of his predecessors, Dr. Koop made the office a bully

pulpit for public health. His standing in the eyes of the

American public allowed him to tackle many sensitive and

politically controversial issues, most notably the AIDS

epidemic, which emerged as a major threat to public health.

During his tenure as Surgeon General he spoke also forcefully

and repeatedly about the health consequences of smoking. And

I am very pleased to welcome Dr. Koop back with us today.

Dr. Koop, as you well know, I was initially very skeptical about your nomination when President Reagan put it forward. I was wrong, and I have come to know you as a professional dedicated to the public good and public health. You had the courage to speak truth to power and the good

sense to distinguish public health from politics. And I learned to admire you and to enjoy working with you over the years on tobacco and HIV and children's health. And I look forward from hearing your testimony today. But I wanted to pay a special tribute to you through the years that we have worked together.

Our second witness, Dr. David Satcher, served as the 16th Surgeon General from 1998 to 2001. A family physician with additional training in public health, Dr. Satcher served for 6 years as Director for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. During his tenure as Surgeon General, Dr. Satcher issued a number of important reports, most notably his 1999 Surgeon General's Report on Mental Health, which did much to remove the stigma from mental illness, and his 2001 Surgeon General's Call to Action to Promote Sexual Health and Responsible Sexual Behavior. He also released influential reports on oral health, youth violence and the prevention of tobacco use by young people.

Dr. Satcher, we are very pleased to have you with us here, and I enjoyed the time that we worked together as well.

Our third witness, Dr. Richard H. Carmona, served as the 17th Surgeon General from 2002 to 2006. A combat-decorated veteran of the Special Forces, Dr. Carmona brought a varied background in health care to the position. At different points in his career, he was a paramedic, registered nurse,

trauma surgeon and health care administrator. Although some criticize him for maintaining a low profile as Surgeon General, he released a number of important reports and calls to action during his tenure. These included the Surgeon General's Call to Action to improve the health and wellness of persons with disabilities issued in 2004, and his landmark Surgeon General's Report on the Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke, released shortly toward the end of his term of service.

And, Dr. Carmona, I am delighted that you are here as well.

It is the practice of this committee to do this for all witnesses. We do ask you to be sworn in, and I would like to ask you if you would raise your right hands. Stand and raise your right hands, if you are able to do that.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Chairman WAXMAN. The record will indicate that each of the witnesses answered in the affirmative.

I am going to call on Dr. Koop first, then call on Mr. Satcher and then Dr. Carmona.

Dr. Koop, there is a button on the base of the mike.

333 | STATEMENTS OF C. EVERETT KOOP, M.D., Sc.D., 13TH SURGEON

- 334 GENERAL, 1981-1989; DAVID SATCHER, M.D., Ph.D., 16TH SURGEON
- 335 GENERAL, 1998-2001; AND RICHARD CARMONA, M.D., M.P.H,
- 336 F.A.C.S., 17TH SURGEON GENERAL, 2002-2006

337 STATEMENT OF C. EVERETT KOOP

Dr. KOOP. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am C. Everett Koop, Surgeon General for 7 years when Ronald Reagan was President and 1 year with George Bush, Sr. My remarks come from the vantage point of 26 years of close observation of the office and of its mission.

I strongly believe that the Surgeon General must be independent and free to advise the Nation on how it can prevent disease and promote good health. He or she should be the health educator for Americans par excellence. At the same time the Surgeon General should be an important cog in the machinery that directs public health in the United States, and I acted in these capacities. In addition to working within the United States, I served for 8 years as our Nation's representative to the World Health Organization. The consensus of the representatives of other nations for my role was something like this: What a wonderfully appropriate

position. I wish we had such an office and such a person.

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

The personalities of two individuals have much to do with the success of the Surgeon General; first, the President of the United States. Mr. Reagan was pressed to fire me every day, largely because of my work on AIDS, but he would not interfere. If he had not been the kind of person he was, I would not be here today.

Second, the Secretary of HHS. On a day-to-day basis, the Secretary is the most influential person in determining the effectiveness of the Surgeon General. I served under The last one was Dr. Otis Bowen, a three-time Governor of Indiana, a medical doctor and a fine gentleman. was writing the Surgeon General's Report on AIDS and the later mailing sent to every household in America, he was a constantly supportive gentleman. It was Otis Bowen who insisted that I sign the documents in question myself. asked Otis Bowen to keep the contents of these two reports close to his chest. I promised to do the same. to the two of us, only two staffers were privy to the contents. We maintained strict secrecy from the day we began to write until we presented the finished product, 17 drafts later, and released them to the press. If we had followed the protocol and every word was scrutinized, these reports, because of their nature and plain speaking, I am sure would not have seen the light of day.

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

The Secretary of Health and Human Services can use the talents of the Surgeon General or ignore them. In that regard my successors were less fortunate than I. Over the years since I left office, I have observed a worrisome trend of less than ideal treatment of the Surgeon General, including undermining his authority at times when his role and function seemed abundantly clear.

If I had been impeded in my duties as some of my successors were, here are some of the things that would never have happened. Eight reports to Congress on smoking and health might not have been published. The knowledge of the addiction of tobacco because of its nicotine content might have been suppressed. We might have still had smoking on airplanes. Changes in Title V of the Social Security Act entitling special needs children to comprehensive, family-centered, community-based care might not have happened Assurance during the Tylenol scare would have been missing, leading to panic and possibly market upheaval. Revision of the health care agreements with the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union and Kuwait might not have occurred. The only Federal Government report on nutrition might not have been published, and many, many more that time does not permit to tell.

Clearly the Surgeon General must be free to serve the American people without political interference. It is also

vital that future Surgeon Generals have the necessary support and resources to do their job. How can we ensure that this happens? First I believe that the Surgeon General should not be a political appointment. In my opinion, the Surgeon General should be named by the President from a panel selected by the Promotions Committee of the Commissioned Corps of the United States Public Health Service. This was once the protocol, and it served our country well for nearly 100 years. It remains today the protocol used to appoint the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy and the Air Force.

Second, the Surgeon General must have secure funding to do his work. The security of a 4-year appointment doesn't mean much if you can be easily denied the resources you need to do your job. Therefore, I recommend that Congress annually appropriate funding on a line-item basis to the Office of the Surgeon General.

In closing, I may say, Mr. Chairman, as you already mentioned, you were from the beginning one of my severest critics to become one of my trusted supporters, and I thank you for that and the excellent job, sir, that you have done in improving the health of the American people. Please continue to exercise oversight of the Office of the Surgeon General and the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service so that they can continue to do their vital work. Thank you, sir.

429 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Koop.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Koop follows:]

431 ******* INSERT 1-1 ******

Chairman WAXMAN. Dr. Satcher.

STATEMENT OF DAVID SATCHER

Dr. SATCHER. Thank you, Chairman Waxman and members of the committee, for holding this hearing and for your attention to the importance of the Office of the Surgeon General. I had the opportunity to serve for almost 9 years in government, 5 years as Director of the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, and 4 years as Surgeon General, 3 of which I also served as Assistant Secretary for Health. Also I had the opportunity to represent the United States as a delegate to the World Health Assembly for 9 years and to interact with colleagues from throughout the world, and I share the experience of what Surgeon General Koop had in terms of their admiration for the unique role which the Surgeon General plays in the health of the American people.

It is my opinion that we critically maintain a role of the Surgeon General. The Surgeon General is responsible for communicating directly with the American people based on the best available science, not politics, not religion, not even personal opinion. The Surgeon General does this, as you have heard, through speeches, writings, press conferences and especially the Surgeon General's reports. These Surgeon

General reports are vetted with the relevant scientists at the CDC and other appropriate agencies.

During my 4-year tenure as Surgeon General, I had the opportunity to release reports on mental health, suicide prevention, youth violence, smoking and health, oral health, overweight and obesity, and the Surgeon General's Call for Action for Responsible Sexual Behavior. The reports on mental health, oral health, suicide prevention, youth violence and sexual health were the first from the Office of the Surgeon General. The overweight and obesity report were also the first to follow a report on nutrition that had been done in the 1980s.

The Surgeon General's Office has evolved over the years since 1873 with changes in level and magnitude of responsibility. Today the Surgeon General oversees the Commission for our health professionals who are on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to respond to emergencies.

What has not changed about the Surgeon General's Office is its direct responsibility for communicating with the American people based on the best available science and its responsibility for responding to public health emergencies that threaten the health of the American people regardless of where those emergencies occur.

There have always been challenges to the role of the Surgeon General. Sometimes these challenges are based on the

political nature of issues or the religious implications of issues. However, the Surgeon General's Office has a remarkable record of credibility and trust in communicating with the American people based on the best available science.

The Surgeon General's Office would benefit tremendously from being more independent with well-defined resources for carrying out the duties of that office. It is clear that the American people value the Office of the Surgeon General, and that the global community has tremendous respect and appreciation for the office.

After I released the Surgeon General's Report on Mental Health in the United States, I had an opportunity to present that report to Director Gro Brundtland of the World Health Organization in May of 2000. That resulted in the World Health Organization later issuing a world mental health report which all the ministers of health around the world valued very highly. During that tenure I was able to release some very valuable reports with lasting impact. However, certain areas of health, especially areas that are politically sensitive, such as drugs and sex, despite their great significance in dealing with issues such as HIV/AIDS, were often hampered by politics and/or religious implication.

I have in my written report to you described my experience with the needle exchange program. Recently, as the Director of the CDC, I oversaw the funding of research

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

programs evaluating the impact of needle exchange programs in reducing the spread of HIV/AIDS and showing that there was no increase in drug use. I submitted that report to the Department, and soon after I became Surgeon General, we planned to have a press conference to release that report to the American people, and we were hoping it would lead to Federal funding for the needle exchange program. because of the political environment and the almost certain defeat of the needle exchange program with Congress, the White House made a decision the day before the press conference not to support it, and that left me in a very difficult position as both Assistant Secretary for Health and Surgeon General. As Assistant Secretary For Health, I was expected to support the position of the White House and the Department, but as Surgeon General my responsibility was to speak to the American people based on the best available public health science.

I did the latter. I went throughout the country speaking about the value of needle exchange programs. Many localities funded those programs, and, as you know, the Congress has not yet supported the funding of needle exchange programs. But it is an example of why it is so important the Surgeon General should be able to speak on this or the best available science and not politics and not religion.

Later I completed a report, the Surgeon General's Call

behavior, and that report was actually completed during the Clinton administration, and, as you know, I served my last year in the new Bush administration. I was hampered from releasing that report during the Clinton administration, but also the new Bush administration. I was able to finally release it without the support of the Department. It is the only report I released that was not signed off on by the Secretary. I released that report in 2001 during my last year as Surgeon General. The President and the Secretary did not support that report, and they did not support it because of obviously both its political and religious implication.

I think it is okay for the White House or the Congress to disagree with the Surgeon General on issues, because the American people look to the Surgeon General for the best available science. I don't think it is okay for the White House or the Congress to dictate the messages of the Surgeon General, and that is our concern, that the Surgeon General's Office be independent enough to speak directly to the American people based on the best available science. So I join Surgeon General Koop in asking that Congress take those steps to make this office independent enough to communicate directly with the American people based on the best available public health science, and that it be adequately funded by an independent source of funding for Congress so that it can

carry out those responsibilities.

I'll end my comments with one story, when I released the Surgeon General's Report on Mental Health. I received letters from people all over the country expressing their appreciation because they had members in their families who suffered from mental illness, and there had been so much stigma surrounding it until they just felt embarrassed to even talk about it. One young man wrote that when he was 8 years old, his mother died, and he didn't learn until he was 20 that she had committed suicide. And he explained how he heard people whispering about her death, but nobody would talk about the condition that led to it. She had suffered from severe depression. And, again, he thanked the Office of the Surgeon General for bringing mental health out of the closet, helping to remove the stigma.

We have much more to do, but I hope that we will be able to rely upon your Office of the Surgeon General to provide that kind of leadership. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Satcher.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Satcher follows:]

****** INSERT 1-2 *****

Chairman WAXMAN. Dr. Carmona.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD CARMONA

Dr. CARMONA. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the committee. My name is Richard Carmona. I am the 17th Surgeon General of the United States, and I am profoundly grateful for your invitation to me and my Surgeon General colleagues to testify before you today. I want to thank you for your interest and commitment to these very important national public health issues.

I had the privilege of working with many of you during the 4 years I served as United States Surgeon General, and I stand ready to continue to partner with you to improve the health and well-being of our great Nation and the world.

Being nominated and confirmed as Surgeon General is still a surreal event for me. I will never forget the extraordinary privilege that the President of the United States and the Senate extended to me allowing me to serve my country once again in uniform.

As grateful as I am to my country for the opportunities that I have been afforded, that sense of appreciation will never allow me to become complacent in my commitment to continue to improve the health, safety and security of our

Nation and the world. As members of a very small and unique fraternity of Surgeons General of the United States, we all believe that once a Surgeon General, always a Surgeon General.

I came to Washington, D.C., having served as a United States Army Special Forces medic and weapons specialist, a registered nurse, police officer, SWAT team leader, trauma surgeon and CEO of a public health and hospital system and a university professor. I also came to the Office of the Surgeon General knowing what it feels like to be a poor Hispanic child growing up in New York City, a high school dropout whose family often had to stand in line at public hospitals waiting for health care and not knowing how he would pay for the doctor's bill, and sometimes not even knowing where our next meal would come from.

I came to our Nation's Capital waiting to serve all people and prepared to carry on what I believed was a tradition of implementing nonpartisan, evidence-based solutions to public health challenges. My fellow U.S. Surgeons General warned me that partisan political agendas often undermined the public health and well-being of the Nation.

During my first year as Surgeon General, I was still quite politically naive in the ways of the Beltway. As I witnessed partisanship and political manipulation, I was

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

astounded, but also unsure of what I was witnessing for I had no reference point. I asked myself whether this was just happening to me as a new Surgeon General, or whether this was a norm for all Surgeons General.

I turned to my fellow Surgeons General, the men and women who came before me and made tremendous positive contributions to the science and practice of public health, who had saved and improved millions of lives through their work and dedication. They became my mentors. They said that they had all been challenged and had to fight political battles in order to do their job as the doctor of the Nation. But each agreed that never had they seen Washington, D.C., so partisan or a new Surgeon General so politically challenged and marginalized as during my tenure. They told me that although most Americans believe that the Surgeon General has the ability to impact the course of public health as the Nation's doctor, the reality is that the Nation's doctor has been marginalized and relegated to a position with no independent budget and with supervisors who are political appointees with partisan agendas. Anything that doesn't fit into the political appointee's ideological, theological or political agenda is often ignored, marginalized or simply buried.

The problem with this approach is that in public health, as in a democracy, there is nothing worse than ignoring

science or marginalizing the voice of science for reasons driven by changing political winds. The job of the Surgeon General is to be the doctor of the Nation, not the doctor of a political party.

The good news is that there is a straightforward remedy to the problem of partisan politics undermining the health and well-being of our Nation. That solution is to empower the Office of the Surgeon General and the United States

Public Health Service Commissioned Corps. This would not be a radical new approach. It would simply be reinstating the roles and responsibilities of the Office of the Surgeon

General that had been slowly eroded since politicians decided in the late 1960s that the Office of the Surgeon General should be disempowered and its authorities placed within the offices of the Department of Health and Human Services political appointees.

Historically the Surgeons General had occupied increasingly embattled positions where each has had to fight to scientifically address the contemporary health issues of the Nation and the world within an increasingly partisan agenda that is often devoid of open discussion of scientific evidence or data. To address these problems we must empower, fund and support the Office of the Surgeon General and United States Public Health Service Commissioned Corps to serve the people and the world and not a political party. The

Commissioned Corps delivers arguably the best evidence-based health care in the world. With unparalleled passion and dignity they are a precious resource that can be used much more efficiently and effectively to serve the public health needs of our Nation and the world.

Require a uniformed, physically fit professional

Commissioned Corps with continuity of operations between

administrations and Surgeons General, as is the basic

protocol among all of our fellow uniformed services.

End the practice of the political discretionary awarding of a four-star admiral rank to HHS Assistant Secretary for Health, who may be a civilian political appointee with no uniformed service experience.

Ensure that all future Surgeons General are nominated by the President of the United States from the ranks of career United States Public Health Service Commissioned Corps officers based on merit and without political, ideological or theological filters. This is just as the United States Army, Navy and Air Force Surgeon Generals are selected and how the United States Surgeon General was selected until the position became increasingly politicized.

In addition, we should consider going back to the nonpolitical U.S. Public Health Service Commissioned Corps officers ascending the ranks based on merit in order to command our Public Health Service agencies again, just as our

sister uniformed services do and have done for centuries.

In closing, I hope that you will hear me and my fellow Surgeon Generals today and make the decisions and changes that only you can make so that future Surgeon Generals do not have to struggle against impossible odds to ensure that public health is free of political manipulation. I hope that you will agree with us that the citizens of the United States deserve a Surgeon General as a doctor of our Nation and leader of the United States Public Health Service

Commissioned Corps who is empowered and supported by the United States Government to address our national and global health issues transparently, openly and apolitically, with the best science, in order to improve the health, safety and security of our Nation and the world.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Carmona.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Carmona follows:]

714 ******* INSERT 1-3 ******

Chairman WAXMAN. We are now going to proceed to questions. I will have 10 minutes, Mr. Davis will have 10 minutes, then we will go to 5-minute rounds.

Dr. Carmona, that is a very strong statement. It appears that both Dr. Koop and Dr. Satcher both had the ability to be the Surgeon General, to use science, to use the position as a bully pulpit, interfered with. But it seems to me what you are saying is that even though you consulted with them, the experience you had was even worse, and it is now a new magnitude of involvement and interference. Is that the message I should get?

Dr. CARMONA. Mr. Chairman, I believe that's correct.

As I said in my statement, my first year of being somewhat politically naive, and as much education as I had, nothing can prepare you for what you finally come to witness in Washington. And being devoid of a reference point, I sought their good counsel to say, what's going on here, did you have these problems? And it was Surgeon General Koop who pointed out, and still does today, he said to me, Richard, we all have fought these battles, as have our predecessors going back over a century, but we have never seen it as partisan, as malicious, as vindictive, as mean-spirited as it is today, and you clearly have it worse than any of us had.

Chairman WAXMAN. But you tried to fill the role and did a responsible job of trying to provide accurate science-based

information. But you indicate that at times you were marginalized or simply had your reports or ideas buried.

You came in as Surgeon General in 2002, and at that time there was a great national debate about the role of stem cells in medical research. I understand you thought the Surgeon General could play a constructive role in explaining this issue, just the science of it, to the American public. Could you tell us what you tried to do and what the result was?

Dr. CARMONA. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to.

I recognize that notwithstanding stem cell issues, the Nation suffers from health illiteracy. The literature is clear, about a third of the Nation really doesn't understand the science we have to deal with every day, it doesn't understand the relationship that their behavior is the ultimate health outcomes. And I saw this debate going around not only as a Surgeon General, but I witnessed it as a professor, and I saw that much of the discussion was being moved forward devoid of science.

And so I approached leadership to say the Surgeon General should be leaning forward on this; we should be, in fact, in debate on this issue so that we make sure the American public, our elected officials, our appointed officials are all knowledgeable of the science.

Much of the discussion was being driven by theology,

ideology, preconceived beliefs that were scientifically incorrect. So I thought this is a perfect example of the Surgeon General being able to step forward, educate the American public as well as elected appointed officials so that we can have, if you will, informed consent on an issue to the American public to make better decisions.

I was blocked at every turn. I was told the decision had already been made, stand down, don't talk about it. That information was put in speeches, it was removed from my speeches.

Chairman WAXMAN. Who would remove a portion of your speech?

Dr. CARMONA. There were people who were actually assigned in the Department to vet my speeches to speechwriters who were helping me put together talking points and things like that. Unfortunately I was naive enough during my first year that I didn't recognize this was happening. Many of the staff, in trying to protect me, didn't tell me the embattled problems and positions that they were in in trying to help me bring the best science forward, but constantly being vetted, and politically vetted, I should say, not scientifically vetted. And it was a while before I figured out that this was happening behind the scenes.

Chairman WAXMAN. Did you have any of your other speeches vetted and censored?

Dr. CARMONA. Repeatedly.

791 Chairman WAXMAN. Repeatedly.

792 Dr. CARMONA. Yes.

Chairman WAXMAN. And were these scientists or physicians that were doing it or political people?

Dr. CARMONA. No. In fact, I welcome input from my colleagues on science. I often called my NIH colleagues and CDC, my officers in other departments, to say, what do you think about this, give me the best science. And I would bring groups together to achieve consensus on a scientific issue.

The vetting was done by political appointees who were specifically there to be able to spin, if you will, my words in such a way that would be preferable to a political or ideologically preconceived notion that had nothing to do with science.

Chairman WAXMAN. Were you allowed to speak freely to reporters?

Dr. CARMONA. No. I was often instructed what to say or what not to say. I did the best I could to speak out on issues honestly. I never lied, I never covered the truth. But it was a fine line that I walked all the time, because often the particular issue already had a preconceived political solution, and I had nothing to do with it. And what I found in my first year was that I would see policy

moving forward, and I would scratch my head and think, shouldn't the Surgeon General have been involved in this discussion? Yet I had nothing to do with it, but yet be expected to support these notions that were released to the press, through policy, legislation and such, yet I had no input into them prospectively.

Chairman WAXMAN. The President made a decision on stopping the research using embryonic stem cells. He claimed he had a certain number of lines of cells that were already in existence, and he would allow that research to go forward. It may not have been the decision you agreed with, but it was his decision. What do you think your role should be after the President decides for the administration what that administration's policy would be?

Dr. CARMONA. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think clearly the President of the United States as the senior elected official has the authority to do what he sees fit, as does Congress as the elected officials representing our citizens. However, I think as part of the due diligence the Surgeon General should be at the table representing our colleagues in science as it relates to the issue.

Make no mistake, I think I speak with my fellow Surgeon Generals on this as well, we recognize that ultimately the authority rests with those elected officials. The danger is when the science is not heard, when the policy, when the

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

ideas are promulgated forward in front of the American public devoid of scientific discussion, where the Surgeon General is marginalized, that is the danger.

Chairman WAXMAN. Were you going to advance a particular point of view on research, or were you going to simply discuss the science and what it would mean if embryonic stem cells or any other stem cells were used?

Dr. CARMONA. Mr. Chairman, I think the Surgeon General walks a fine line. Certainly if asked by senior officials to discuss an opinion as to what an appropriate course of action should be, I think that is a perfectly good role for the Surgeon General, but also recognizing that it is ultimately the elected official and officials who have the authority to make the final decision. So that had I been asked, my discussion would have been more about the science of stem cells devoid of the political ideological banter that was going on so that the American public could understand, if you will, the risks, the benefits, the cost of going in a certain direction and understand the science of stem cells, because that, I felt, was devoid within these discussions that were mostly being driven politically, ideologically or theologically.

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, is this a unique issue? Did you have experience with the administration, other political appointees in the administration, interfering with other

HG0191.000 PAGE 41

discussions on public health?

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

Well, in speaking with some of my Dr. CARMONA. colleagues in other departments, and not only in HHS, but in others, there were those complaints from others.

Chairman WAXMAN. I am talking about you.

Dr. CARMONA. Only me specifically.

Chairman WAXMAN. A Plan B--

Dr. CARMONA. Yes, sir.

Chairman WAXMAN. --emergency contraceptive drug, comprehensive or abstinence-only sex education. Those are all matters the public needs to know more about in terms of just the basic science. Were those issues that you tried to speak out about and stopped from discussing as well?

Dr. CARMONA. Yes, sir, that is true. On many of those issues I felt at the end that the Surgeon General should be taking the lead on discussions with the American public on what the science is behind those issues to help the public come to some conclusions as to what course of action they might support, as well as our elected and appointed officials, that they should be aware of the science.

Chairman WAXMAN. What was the interference? Did they tell you you can't talk about it, did they review your speeches, did they edit speeches and remarks to the press, What was the way in which you were interfered? edit reports?

Dr. CARMONA. All of the above, sir, all of the above.

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

And, for instance, on abstinence education, when that came up, a lot of my colleagues, my colleague Surgeon Generals, have said, this position of the U.S. Surgeon General really has morphed into a global position. I would regularly speak with health ministers and leaders from other countries who would call for information and would ask us questions. on the abstinence issue, right away I started getting a lot of calls from our colleagues in the United States and even overseas who would say, well, how can you only support abstinence only; that flies in the face of public health I said, I don't. I said, if you look at any one of my presentations, it was always about a comprehensive approach to sexual education largely based on my predecessor David Satcher's work, who had brought that information forward before I came, and I built on that platform. However, there was already a policy in place that did not want to hear the science, but wanted to just, if you will, quote/unquote, preach abstinence, which I felt was scientifically incorrect. Chairman WAXMAN. Well, I thank you for your comments

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, I thank you for your comments and responses to these questions. I know many of my colleagues will have further questions of you. But I do think that the Surgeon General has to be independent if the Surgeon General is going to have any credibility. And the credibility of that position is what is the key to the

success of the Surgeon Generals that we have had over the years.

If my colleagues will just indulge me. I was in the Soviet Union, and I was with some dissidents, and they were smoking cigarettes like crazy. And I asked one of them, don't you have any warnings on your cigarette packs that tell you how dangerous it is? And I was told by one of the dissidents, this is a warning put on by the government. How can you believe anything the government tells you? Well, if it is the government telling you that political point of view, you start not believing anything the government has to say, unless there is some credible, independent scientific statement which supersedes the politics.

Dr. CARMONA. Mr. Chairman, may I just make a comment on that to echo what my colleagues have said? After I got over my political naivet and I started traveling, I had the same experience that Surgeon Generals Koop and Satcher had. As I met with my colleagues in the World Health Organization, they looked at the Surgeon General position as one of a beacon of hope, one that really represents the best of America as giving truthful information. And I think one of the more perfect examples of that would be we fought for years to get out that report on secondhand smoke. When it finally got out, because of all the political manipulations and marginalization, it slipped out. Within 2 weeks I had calls

from six continents, hundreds of cities in our own country. I had small restaurateurs in Texas, in El Paso, calling and saying, we have the information now, we are going smoke-free in all of my restaurants. I had government's calling me saying, we have information now from the United States Surgeon General that will help us make our city, our country smoke-free. The ramifications were rippling because of the credibility that your Surgeon General of the United States had for the health of not only the Nation, but of the world.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Carmona.

Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. First of all, let me thank all of you for your public service. This is a serious job that all three of you have taken seriously. I have a great respect for the job that all of you have done. I am not sure what the boundaries are for appointed political officials who sometimes have opinions different from the elected administration. It is tough trying to define where you would be a team player and where you feel strong enough to speak out with your positions. I think you try to balance that every day. Even as independently elected members of Congress, we try to balance those issues out.

So we are talking, I guess, in some of your practical experiences trying to get a better understanding. My friend Henry Waxman, makes a good point that at the end of the day

the job deserves credibility with the American people. But we have politicians who run the government, not scientists, and for better or for worse.

But, you know, I happen, Mr. Carmona, to agree with stem cell. I was a cosponsor of Federal funding of stem cell to override the veto. But the administration is also entitled to make their horrible determination over where the boundaries should be, notwithstanding what the scientific data is. It is very difficult, I understand, as part of an appointed team to be part of that and get facts out, and now you are free to say whatever you want.

Dr. Satcher, you went through something similar on your report on sexual health and sexual behavior. Could you tell us a little bit about that? I think in your testimony you alluded to that. But that was also something you felt very strongly about and ran into some problems with the administration.

Dr. SATCHER. First, let me respond to something you said which I think is important. I think when the Surgeon General is speaking only based on his or her opinion, without having the science behind it, I think it deserves no more credibility than anything else. But when the Surgeon General speaks on the basis of the best available public health science, I think the American people deserve to hear that independently.

And the Surgeon General does not make policy. You are right, we don't make policy. We were not elected to make policy. We were elected to communicate directly with the American people. That should not be interfered with. I think that is our concern. I think when the Surgeon General is not able to communicate, to write his or her speech and say what I want to say to the American people, I think you crossed the line significantly.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Is that even when you are contradicting the policy of the administration?

Dr. SATCHER. I don't think the Surgeon General necessarily should speak about the policy, but the Surgeon General should speak about the science. For me to not say that needle exchange programs were able to decrease the severity of HIV/AIDS, and there was no evidence of increased drug use, I think that would have been unfaithful to the science. Congress would ask Secretary Shalala for an updated report, and what she did was ask me to write a letter giving me the most recent information. When I did it, she would say, I just received this letter from the Surgeon General, and this is what he said. But I think you are right, it has got to be based on the best available public health science, not personal opinion.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Before you get to that, we just had a vote last week on needle exchange programs in the

District of Columbia. My feeling was it is their own money, let them spend it the way they want to. There is a ban on Federal funding for that. And the reason for that is the policy--although you are saying that science is very clear on that, I am not going to take issue with you on that in terms of stopping the spread of HIV. The policy then becomes if you are a citizen and you go into a hospital and you need a needle for IV, if you are on Medicare or you are a veteran, you pay for it. But if you are using illegal drugs, the government pays for it. And so there are contradictions policywise.

Dr. SATCHER. I think you make a very important point. You also pay to treat people when they get AIDS. And you really pay dearly and society pays dearly because people will infect, spread the disease to other people. So you have to make a decision. So the Surgeon General is trying to advise based on the best available science.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. No, I understand. But I think there are some contradictions. The argument is with the health side. I know we will talk in a little bit about this sexual health and responsible sexual behavior. You wanted to get this out, and you felt this was important to get out to the public.

Dr. SATCHER. Well, it started off by informing the American people about the magnitude of the public health

problems surrounding sexual health; HIV/AIDS, the growing of STDs, including the reemergence of syphilis and others. So it really talked about the magnitude of—it also talked about sexual violence. In fact, 22 percent of women report having been assaulted sexually sometime during their life and about 4 percent of men. So it really put the data out there about the magnitude of the sexual health problem. This area, while we are not willing to talk, is wreaking all kinds of havoc in families and individuals. Many people who have been infected with AIDS end up infected because they were abused sexually as children. So there are a lot of things in the report about that.

I think the most sensitive issue--let us go back to those three which I think got the report in trouble. We did talk about sexual orientation. We said that based on the science, sexual orientation is determined by adolescence, and there was no scientific evidence that it could be changed. So that was a very sensitive issue about sexual orientation. We said that regardless of how we felt about people and their sexual orientation, they deserve to be respected; not just tolerated, but respected as people.

We talk about a comprehensive basis versus abstinence-only sexual health education, and we looked at all of the studies that had been done. And we said based on the studies available to us, there was no evidence that

abstinence-only sexual health education was effective--now, this was 2001--and that, in fact, a comprehensive sexual health education was the most reasonable approach based on all of the available science.

And then we talked about sexual health education. We recommended that children be educated about their sexuality beginning at home. Parents were the first sexual health education. It needs to be age appropriate, but it also needs to be in schools. I mean, what should happen should be-regardless of the age of the children, they should learn about their sexuality and how to protect themselves and make the right decisions about it based on the best available science. So those were the three things.

1078	RPTS DEAN
1079	DCMN BURRELL
1080	[11:03 a.m.]
1081	Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. When this came up originally
1082	though the White House was undergoing some political
1083	problems; is that right.
1084	Dr. SATCHER. Well, I think it is fair to say even
1085	though the support had been vetted by the CDC and NIH it was
1086	not, in my opinion, it had gone to all of those scientists.
1087	I think it was the political environment that carried the
1088	day
1089	Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. In the Lewinsky scandal?
1090	Dr. SATCHER. Exactly. There was a political
1091	environment that carried the day, but I think it is critical
1092	when it comes to a Surgeon General's report the Surgeon
1093	General would be independent in its ability to release them.
1094	In the Bush administration, I think as Secretary Thompson
1095	certainly pointed out to me, you know, the politics of sex in
1096	Washington, you know that evenhe made it very clear that
1097	support was important, but also made it very clear that
1098	politically it would be very difficult. So I finally
1099	Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Ms. Elders took a lot of heat
1100	also, didn't she, on those issues?
1101	Dr. SATCHER. Oh, Jocelyn Elders was fired because of
1102	the things she said.

1103 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. She took a lot of heat. 1104 Dr. SATCHER. I want to make it very clear that Dr. 1105 Elders' firing was not about a report--1106 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. It was about her speaking out. 1107 Dr. SATCHER. It was about her speaking out about issues 1108 of sexuality. So the report was finally released in the Bush administration, and then they made it very clear to me that I 1109 1110 was on my own. 1111 I think of course you probably are not aware of some of the things that have happened since. Last year after 1112 1113 bringing together a group of people who met for 18 months, 1114 some of the most conservative groups in the country, some of 1115 the most liberal, some of the most moderate, including 1116 Medical and Educational Association, we released a report that all of those people were able to agree on after having 1117 1118 met together for a year and a half, but a very important 1119 I would not have been able to do that if I had not received foundation funding after I left government to 1120 continue this effort. 1121 1122 So as Surgeon General Carmona says, we never stop being

So as Surgeon General Carmona says, we never stop being Surgeon General. I mean once you are Surgeon General as far as we are concerned we are always responsible.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. They still call you General, right?

Dr. SATCHER. Exactly.

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I will have you say, Dr. Koop, I 1129 really respect the work that you did talking about smoking. 1130 The effects of secondhand smoke has had a huge effect on 1131 policy makers on both sides of the aisle. 1132 So I yield back. 1133 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Davis. 1134 Ms. Norton. 1135 Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to 1136 thank all three of you, Dr. Koop, Dr. Carmona, Dr. Satcher. 1137 Dr. KOOP. Can't quite hear you, ma'am. 1138 I would like to thank all three of you for Ms. NORTON. 1139 the courage and the independence you asserted with 1140 considerable courage, the three of you have had, for your 1141 courage tested, and it is impressive to see how you have 1142 I do thank you, Dr. Satcher, for being way ahead responded. 1143 of your time during the Clinton administration who for all of 1144 its progressive stance would not in fact support needle 1145 exchanges despite knowing full well what the consequences 1146 were. 1147 Dr. Carmona, I must say one would have to congratulate 1148 the President on his appointment of you a year or so following 9/11. Here he reaches out and he finds an 1149 1150 especially qualified Surgeon General because you had been in 1151 the Special Forces, you were a trauma surgeon, you were an 1152 expert in emergency medical services, there is a laundry list

1153 of appointments.

serious in this area.

I want to ask you about that work particularly, since I represent the District of Columbia and because I served on the Homeland Security Committee, because this is where the anthrax attacks took place, right here at Congress as a matter of fact, where we lost two postal workers and you know the rest.

We have had a hearing in this committee, an astounding hearing recently, on how hospital emergency services, particularly emergency rooms, are now being stretched to the breaking point. As I understand it, you did use your background in emergency services and sought permission to prepare a report on emergency preparedness; is that so?

Dr. CARMONA. Yes, ma'am, that is correct.

Ms. NORTON. That was before a report was written, sir?

Dr. CARMONA. Well, I can give you a general time line.

What happened was I came in shortly after 9/11 and the anthrax challenges to our Nation, and as I looked at the gaps in our system and where I could assist, especially after being appointed by the President and confirmed by Senate, that reading about my background and that I was selected because I had this background in emergency management and preparedness pretty much my whole life and being quite

I said, well, there are a couple of issues I see before

us. One, we are a nation that on a good day has inadequate mental health care. One in five people can't get mental health care on a daily basis in the good times. Now we have war, 9/11, anthrax attack, we have people feeling very uncertain about their futures. What are we doing to sharpen our mental health issues, why is that important?

When you look at what terrorism does, we often do very well at preparing the physical rules, but the psychological rules are lifelong and lasting and can devastate a population. So I thought we need to move forward on an emergency preparedness report, as well as a report on preparedness that would bring our Nation forward so that all citizens would understand the threats and challenges before us and what their individual responsibility is. Just like we had civil defense in the 50s, we were talking about the new civil defense of the new world, the new world order. So I moved forward with those ideas and tried to move those reports out. Unfortunately, it never got out---

Ms. NORTON. Just a moment, this is almost a neutral sounding request, emergency preparedness, mental health, where did you take your request for permission and what reason was given to you for denying permission?

Dr. CARMONA. Let me tell you, I will go--each of them were slightly different, so I will start with the mental health one. I had made a commitment to my mental health

colleagues nationally as well that we needed to move to mental health as an agenda item.

As you know, my colleague, David Satcher, first identified some of the systems and as I took the baton from him I knew I needed to continue moving in the direction based on some of the information he had already generated, mental health was one. Mental health preparedness was extraordinarily important because of--

Ms. NORTON. I am trying to find out, you don't go to the President and say I want to do a mental health and emergency preparedness. Who do you go to?

Dr. CARMONA. Yes, ma'am. What I did was independently I looked at the science, and the first call I made was to my colleagues at the National Institutes of Health to say, guys, let's have a meeting, I walk to talk to you about the mental health needs of the country, specifically as it relates to the new threats and challenges of mental health preparedness as a working title.

I got the best scientists in the world together. We had the discussion, everybody agreed that this was a huge void in our society and needed to move this forward. I generated the evidence base to move such a report to the American public.

I went to other agencies, I brought in one of our sister agencies who had a political appointee who basically went to HHS, went to the White House, and complained vehemently that

this was not my responsibility, that he was in charge of mental health.

In fact, I was admonished by this gentleman because he said, you don't get it. He said, you don't write anything unless we approve it and that this information--

Ms. NORTON. On the mental health not only were you refused, you were admonished. Before my time is up--

Dr. CARMONA. Yes.

Ms. NORTON. Would you tell me about the emergency preparedness?

Dr. CARMONA. Emergency preparedness, from what I have seen and based on a report I brought my colleagues in to achieve consensus, I mean government and people who have national reputations, credibility, nonpartisan to achieve consensus, everybody had agreed this was absolutely essential to move forward.

I then ran it up the flag pole and went to domestic policies at the White House, spoke to HHS officials, I was given lots of different reasons. This might scare the people, you should think about it. The new Homeland Security would be responsible and why would the Surgeon General do this? I had a lot of reasons, from the cost to everything else, to move this forward.

Ms. NORTON. Who at the White House was responsible that told you that the emergency preparedness should not move

1253	forwa	rd?
------	-------	-----

Dr. CARMONA. I was speaking to the Domestic Policy
Council just then. I mean if you want those names in the
future I would be happy to do it. Since some of these people
still work in the government, I ask that we do this through
private communication or a closed hearing because I don't
want to put anyone in jeopardy.

Ms. NORTON. I respect this request, but this is a public hearing, it is going to become public in any case, because we believe in transparency, and I leave it up to the chairman as to how to handle that.

Dr. CARMONA. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. We will take it under advisement and hear from Mr. Issa.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Carmona, I feel that perhaps what you are telling us here today is that we need to cut by 75 percent the number of political appointees we authorized the President so that a few people have more things to do than have turf battles. We will take that under advisement.

Dr. Koop, during your administration how large was your budget and how large was your direct report staff, the people you could count on directly that were allocated to you?

Dr. KOOP. I had no budget. As far as my staff was concerned I had the privilege and ability to call upon 6,000

in the Commission Corps, all of whom occupy special niches and very special kind of training, and this is one the gems of our government because I don't know any place where there are that many experts that can be called upon by the government in reference to health as we have here.

Mr. ISSA. General Koop, if I hear you directly, what you are saying is because you were appointed by the President uniquely, not because you have been up through a system, you felt it appropriate enough that you could call on just about anybody and they would return your calls.

Dr. KOOP. In general.

Mr. ISSA. So this position is to a great extent what you make of it, isn't it?

Dr. KOOP. Well, I tried to point out who the President is and who the Secretary of HHS is makes a real difference. The third person that makes a difference is the Surgeon General himself. I was accused of not being a team player, I was denied the position I wanted very much by senior George Bush. I felt after 8 years as Surgeon General I could hit the ground running as Secretary of HHS, but I was considered not to be a team player and therefore not suitable to this.

I would like to step a little bit wider than your question and please tell you what I hear going on here. I would think you committee members would think these three Surgeon Generals have a touch of paranoia. It sounds like--

Mr. ISSA. That is common in Washington.

Dr. KOOP. Yeah, but the thing is I thought of writing a book one time, the title of which would have been They and Them, because I don't know who all these people are who interfere with the Surgeon General. I really don't know who they are, we call them "they" and we call them "them," but I never know who they are, but think do step in.

You notice that I went to the extent in my prepared remarks of telling you how Otis Bowen and I kept the record on AIDS essentially secret. The reason for that is there is such a thing called a Secretariat of the HHS Department and if you were to-thank you--if you were to put the report such as I wrote on AIDS, which is very plain speaking, it wouldn't have been out of there yet in those 12 years and I don't know who they were. I don't think you could find out who they were, but they and them are the people that my colleagues are talking about and it is not paranoia.

If I could go back to what Dr. Carmona was saying about the stem cells or take the thing that is in the papers this morning about insurance for children's health, the sciences, of the need of children in this country for health plans because of the poverty level at which they live, that science is absolutely irrefutable. Anybody who knows anything about children thinks it is a marvelous idea. No matter how you have to pay for it, our children deserve that.

HG0191.000 60 PAGE

1328

1329

1330

1331

1332

1333

1334

1335

1336

1337

1338

1339

1340

1341

1342

1343

1344

1345

1346

1347

1348

1349

1350

1351

1352

And then today the newspapers carry word that the President has decided he would not support that. Well, what is the Surgeon General's role in that particular picture? Here is what I think it should be. I don't think he should have made a statement about whether he is going to support it or not until he had met with the people in government who know the most about children health needs and their poverty status, and that would include the Surgeon General. And it is not asking the Surgeon General to make policy, but asking that the Surgeon General from a big bunch of expertise and the contacts that you said, everybody would call on the phone, answers you. They do, they support the Surgeon Then at least the White House or the people who make decisions about what bills are going to go through and what are not have the advantage of that kind of expertise. And they and them are sort of overridden in the process. then all the way down the chain until that bill comes before Congress and is voted upon or is turned down by the President or is vetoed. The Surgeon General should be, as I call it, a cog in the machinery that decides about the health and the well-being of the American people. It is part of what he

knows, it is part of what he does best, and it is not changing policy. But--

Mr. ISSA. Thank you.

Dr. KOOP. Hmm?

1353

1354

1355

1356

1357

1358

1359

1360

1361

1362

1363

1364

1365

1366

1367

1368

1369

1370

1371

1372

1373

1374

1375

1376

1377

Mr. ISSA. I apologize. I know the answer and I would like to get one more question in. I promise, I know the chairman's indulgence has to be limited to hear a lot of other people.

In my opening statement I said that I wanted to take advantage of the opportunity of the three of you here to deal with one thing I haven't seen come out of your offices over your time, and that is an overall statement on why America spends per capita 50 percent more in health, public and private, insurance and noninsurance, emergency room and nonemergency room and in fact we don't have the highest life expectancy, we don't have the lowest infant mortality, we don't have a people who are nearly as satisfied or feel comfortable sleeping that they are not going to have their homes taken away because of the high cost of an emergency event. Can you--I know there is a limited amount of time for what you all can look at during your tenures, but why is it that that is not something that we would hear Surgeon Generals talking about, taking on, if you will, all the large amount of health care costs that ultimately make America be first in cost and nowhere close to first in performance? Dr. KOOP. I don't want to sound disrespectful, but you are not reading the right stuff and you are not listening to

the right people because I have been talking about that since

I was a Surgeon General. And on the Internet right now I have 970 lectures on the profiles and science Web site of the National Library of Medicine, about half of which address all of the questions you have asked. It is a huge problem and it has taken us years to get into this mess, and it is going to take us years to get out of this mess unless some big surprise comes along or a catastrophe, and either one of those could very well be in the offing. I could go on and talk to you about these individual things, but it would take hours.

Dr. SATCHER. I understand your question. I spoke about and continue to speak about this issue and published about it extensively. Your point is interesting because the Surgeon General is not a policy maker. When President Truman introduced the national health insurance they wanted Surgeon General Shiley, I believe, to debate it on TV, and he refused. He said, this was not an appropriate role for the Surgeon General. Once the Surgeon General gets involved in policy making I think you are interfering with the role of Congress and the President.

I do think it is important for the Surgeon General, as Dr. Koop said, to make sure the people understand what is happening in the health care system, the fact that it is inefficient, and I participated in the WHO report showing the inefficiency of our health system. And when the program was

first passed we had done a lot of background work in terms of the plight of children in this country. Ultimately when it comes to introducing policy and discussing policy, beyond the science-behind it I think we are limited.

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, we have got other members who have questions. We will have to allow those to stand as a response to a question that I know could be at least another five hearings.

Mr. Sarbanes?

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to get a better sense of the political interference issue that Carmona, that you have referred to and we have had some questions about already, because we have had other testimony in this committee recently with regard to other agencies where there appears to be this kind of political interference. In particular, we had two hearings about how the General Services Administration, a very high level of people, and including, it appears to us, the head of GSA, Lurito Doan, was involved in meetings that were really political meetings that were arranged by the White House and others to advance the fortunes of Republican candidates. I am trying to get a sense if that sort of activity exists other places, and I would like to get any input from you.

So the question is were there any meetings that you were asked to participate in or other source of political

activities that you would characterize as political and, if so, what were they?

Dr. CARMONA. I recall during my tenure that from time to time we would receive invitations, sometimes they were called mandatory meetings of, quote/unquote, political appointees. This was sometimes at HHS, sometimes they were at EOB, every once in a while someplace else at some type of an event. I went to a couple of those initially, but I recall early on that I recognized that these were really more political pep rallies, high level political appointees in the government who were trying to rally the troops.

Mr. SARBANES. Who was housing these, where were the invitations to these meetings--

Dr. CARMONA. They were e-mails. There would be a brown bag lunch at this location, and maybe a senior political official officiating. I went to a couple of those, as I said, and I found most of the time that the discussions were about political issues of which the Surgeon General really had nothing to do with. So I stopped going to them, to be honest with you, because I was not really feeling I was representing the office well in that.

There were times when I was invited to political events to speak and I felt that was an ethical violation. I am an Admiral and shouldn't be at a political event supporting any political party because I am in uniform, and so I took a

pretty firm line with my colleagues that our job is not to engage in political rhetoric supporting any party or any candidate. The Surgeon General's job is not political. And as soon as you start attending meetings like that, start supporting political policies, candidates, you become less effective as a Surgeon General, you are looked at as being partisan.

It has never happened, the beauty of what you see here. You have three Surgeon Generals who have served in the most liberal and most conservative administrations, and we are all telling you the same thing of what needs to be done, the partisanship and the problems we have all experienced.

Mr. SARBANES. The few meetings that you did attend, who were some of the senior officials that were presiding at those meetings?

Dr. CARMONA. As a matter of common courtesy, I have spoken to the staff and said I am happy to provide you with the information but I am very sensitive to the fact that one, some of these people are still working; two, retribution does occur in government; three, I don't want this to become a "he said, she said" issue.

The three of us are up here because there are systematic infrastructure problems. The name game and finger pointing goes back and forth all the time. We feel we need to get above that. This is about fixing an infrastructure.

Mr. SARBANES. The description of the Surgeon General as America's doctor I think is a very admirable one. To carry an analogy, if I go to my doctor and the doctor comes in the room and has a report in front of him from the lab and they want to tell me the contents of that report but somebody's muzzling them so that I am not getting the real story, I am going to be outraged and America ought to be outraged about that when it goes to its doctor. The Surgeon General is not able to give them the truth about the health status of the nation.

Dr. CARMONA. Mr. Sarbanes--yes.

Mr. SARBANES. I am curious whether ideology is driving the suppression of science or is it politics. Because if it is ideology, as troubling as that could be, someone could have the attitude well, we elected this President, he has a certain belief system and that flows down through government. I say that would be troubling. One can understand it at a certain level. But much of what I describe is that politics is almost as if there is a campaign underway that at no point somebody decided now that we are elected we have to actually govern and sacrifice the health of children, the health of HIV victims, et cetera, we are willing to sacrifice all of that for political ends.

I am out of time. If you could touch on the relative weight in this suppression campaign, as I will call it, of

ideology versus politics or political agenda.

Dr. CARMONA. Thanks for your question. I believe it is all of the above. In my opinion, there is a political driver, there is preconceived political agendas already there that fly in the face of good science and they don't want these three to speak out on the science because it will complicate their life in trying to move a certain agenda.

There are also ideological and theological agendas, abortions, Plan B, stem cells that drive a particular theological construct that leads somebody to a policy, yet the science hasn't been heard.

As Surgeon General Satcher said, what we are hearing here is that we should never, ever--our citizens should be outraged that three Surgeon Generals were marginalized and had to fight to get the information to them. I used to use that analogy with people. I said when you go to a doctor, do you pick your doctor based on what political party that he belongs to? They say no. You don't want Republican or Democratic information; you want real information and that is our job to bring it forward. I would say it was all of those barriers that we faced.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Sarbanes.

Dr. Carmona, we heard that the Office of Political
Affairs, or Public Affairs, headed by Karl Rove, gave the

political briefing. We heard about this Office of Public
Affairs headed by Karl Rove giving the briefings, staff of
the office giving the briefing?

Dr. CARMONA. There were communications from his office and his staff during my tenure, and at times his staff from his offices were giving briefings.

Chairman WAXMAN. Ms. Watson.

Ms. WATSON. I just have to make this statement. This is probably the finest collection of integrity around scientific knowledge sitting in front of us that I have heard since I have been on this committee, and I want to thank you three gentleman.

I also want to thank the Chair, who I served with in the California legislature, and I remember him standing alone here in Congress with the executives of tobacco companies having them raise their hands and asking them the key question whether they thought that tobacco was harmful to one's health and could cause cancer. And he stayed on that issue until finally the world is recognizing his work.

But Dr. Koop, you were the Surgeon General when I was chairing Health and Human Services in the California Senate. I admired you for speaking out about AIDS, and I thought wow, what a risk you were taking under that current administration at that time, but you stood strong and because of that I worked on needle exchange. It took me 8 years. I was taken

on by the clergy and everyone else because they thought I was promoting drug use.

Dr. Satcher, thank you for the years that we worked together and you produced the report on the diversity in health care, and we still use that today in trying to improve the health care delivery system in the State of California.

I hope as a result of this hearing we can start addressing the real needs of public health.

Dr. Carmona, I admire you, I look at the three of you. You represent the fabric of the United States, each ethic group and the majority group, and I thanks you for your service.

We will quickly, as you are trying to present to this country and the world the global report on health care, the emergence of avian flu source and the extremely drug resistant TB, and you have illustrated public health threats respect no international borders and it should never get political, health is not a political issue. We have got to understand and I don't care if you are sitting on this side or you are sitting on that side.

And in trying to get that word out in your report on public health, some way it was stymied, I respect the fact you are not going to point fingers, but do you know where the report is today?

And Mr. Chairman, we need to obtain this report and in

some way we need to make it public so that the general public and those who watch everything we do here in the United States can change behavior. We talk about Homeland Security, this is not about the land, it is about the people who live on the land. When attorney Speaker left the United States to get married and was carrying a virus we thought could contaminate the rest of the world, it got top publicity across all networks, in the newspapers and so on. We need to know threats to our health.

To you, Dr. Carmona, I just want to say how proud we are of the work you did under adverse circumstances, and can you comment about that report, where it is and, Mr. Chairman I hope we can obtain it.

Dr. CARMONA. Madam Congresswoman, thank you. That was a report that was very near to my heart. We spent over a year working on this global health report; Surgeon General's call to action on global health is what we were doing. To do that I assembled the best minds in the world on health, NIH, CDC and many other agencies and nongovernmental professors from around the country who were preeminent in the field to get the best science to give to the public because we recognize our village is now global. With the threats and challenges we have, we have to start thinking bigger, whether it is AIDS or SARS or any of the other challenges that people read about.

1603

1604

1605

1606

1607

1608

1609

1610

1611

1612

1613

1614

1615

1616

1617

1618

1619

1620

1621

1622

1623

1624

1625

1626

1627

We are very proud of this draft report. Unfortunately when we began the political drafting I was called in and admonished for this report by a senior official that said you don't get it. He said to me, this report has to reflect American policy. What he meant was they actually counted how many times I did not have the President's name and other people's name in the report. I said that is not my job. said I will help you write a compendium report on policy for the U.S. Government. This is on science and global health. We spoke of all the topics and it was blocked repeatedly from getting into the vetting process because of a senior official telling me this will be a political document or it will not be released. I said it can't be a political document because the Surgeon General never releases political documents. release scientific documents that help our elected officials and citizens to understand the complex world we live in and what their responsibilities are.

I fought for my last year to get it out and couldn't get it past the initial vetting. They were clear, this will be a political document or you will not release it, and I refused to release it. I would not put the political rhetoric into that document that they wanted. It would tarnish the Office of the Surgeon General to take a political stand, so I refused.

The document is still in draft form. My colleagues are

encouraging me to still release it. I just entered into the
private sector and am looking at ways to do that, but there
is a great deal of concern and empowerment to me to move
ahead with this report. It still needs a little bit of work,
mind you, it is still in a draft form, but the essence of the
report is there.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the time. Could we obtain that report under the auspices of this committee?

Chairman WAXMAN. We will see if we can obtain that report from Dr. Carmona.

Mr. Yarmuth?

Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentleman for his testimony.

I might suggest I certainly respect everyone's desire and I agree with everyone's desire for independence for the Surgeon General. Since we learned over the past few weeks apparently Mr. Cheney considers himself a separate branch of government, maybe we can create our own independent branch for Surgeon Generals.

I do want to talk about accountability. I think all of us believe that nobody in government, most of us do anyway, is unaccountable. What do you think the appropriate accountability system should be for the Surgeon General's position? I know the current nominee, Dr. Holsinger, some 15

years ago wrote a paper suggesting that gays could be cured.

I suspect that if a Surgeon General took that position there would be those who would take issue with that.

Where do you think the Surgeon General's accountability should be placed? Anyone can answer.

Dr. SATCHER. I would say when it comes to reports or positions taken by the Surgeon General, the Surgeon General is accountable to the best available science. That is why the reports need to be vetted by the scientists, the appropriate scientists at NIH and CDC.

I said before the Surgeon General speaking based on his own opinion without the science, then I don't think the Surgeon General deserves any more recognition for that than anybody else. I think the Surgeon General speaks to the American people based on the best available public health science.

I issued this Surgeon General's prescription in 1999. I actually issued it at an international meeting of ministers of health from 189 countries. It is a prescription that talks about physical activity on a regular basis, eating five servings of fruits and vegetables, responsible sexual behavior, daily participation in a relaxing act.

Every one of these statements were based on research done at CDC and NIH. We could point to the literature as to why we knew that regular physical activity could reduce

cardiovascular disease in adults by 50 percent, reducing type II diabetes by more than 60 percent.

So as long as the Surgeon General is speaking on the best available science, I think that is accountable to the best available science.

Mr. YARMUTH. We have heard a number of instances in which you and the other Surgeons General have been prohibited from speaking out on things you thought were important. Are there instances in which you were actually asked to do something you did not want to do in terms of pursuing a political agenda on behalf of the White House?

Dr. CARMONA. There were times when I was invited to meetings or had discussions where I guess people were testing the waters. On abstinence, abstinence only, I remember in all of my presentations I never wavered based on the best science that Surgeon Koop had spoke about, and it was clear we needed a more comprehensive program of sexual education in the U.S. that would include abstinence. People weren't happy about that. I think they saw that I was going to be true to the science and that was challenging.

When global warming came up, it was my first year and I was naive enough listening to the discussion at this office with senior officials where they were heralding global warming nothing to be more than a liberal cause and had no merit and they were kind of dismissing it. And I remember

thinking oh, I understand why they want me here, they want me to excuse the science, obviously they didn't understand the science. Of course I had the discussion for half an hour and I was never invited back to the meeting.

There were a number of anecdotes like that over the years where the water was tested and I was asked certain things at meeting, things were put into my speeches. I had two speechwriters quit because they were so browbeaten by the officials. We would play this game the day before. I told the staff, let them put in whatever they want, I will not say it anyway. The people left the employ there because they were really in an embattled position in people trying to get to the Surgeon General through them.

Mr. YARMUTH. Were you ever told to mention a President a certain number of times, were you promoting him specifically?

Dr. CARMONA. In my first year clearly I was told a number of times that the President's name was not mentioned in a speech. I was told it should be mentioned three times on every page. I said I am not going to do that. I said I will mention any politician when appropriate if they are involved in a scientific endeavor, but my job is not to sell politics.

They fought that battle every day, I would tell them what they wanted in the speech--and I didn't know this was

happening and they were being admonished for not putting certain politicians' names in or political phrases in that I took out because I said this has nothing do with public health science and I will not say those things.

Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you very much.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Yarmuth. For our second round I want to recognize Representative Norton.

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate the opportunity to ask this question at this time. This is based on Dr. Carmona's testimony and my own interest in structure of government, and I have been trying to rack my brain to come up with a way to have a truly independent Surgeon General. I think it is difficult to come up with a way. The only truly independent people I know sit on the Supreme Court, and the President can't get them.

I noticed you took a stab at this, Dr. Carmona. You indicated that what turned out to be quite something of a pretense, you don't use those words of a four-star admiral. It looks like you go back to kind of a militarized example. I understand where it came from and that it could be militarized.

But you say on page 7 of your testimony I think in an attempt to get independence so that the Surgeon General could be nominated by the President from the ranks of career public health officers based on merit, without political ideology or

theological filters. Then you say just as the U.S. Army, they are selected that way.

Again, let me indicate, I wonder if that would do it.

What impresses us, we have very distinguished physicians. I
don't mean to imply they don't come out of the Public Health
Service as well, but if an eminent physician from practice or
academia becomes Surgeon General, doesn't that bring to the
office such value added that we wouldn't want to exclude such
eminent candidates for the office?

I would like your opinions on how to make it more independent and whether or not going to a narrower group of physicians would really serve the larger purposes of the Office of Surgeon General?

Dr. SATCHER. This is one issue we don't totally agree, the idea of excluding a whole group of people based on the fact they are not in the Commission Corps. I like the process of a group getting nominated based on Commission Corps, but saying if you are not in the Commission Corps, then Surgeon General Koop would never have been Surgeon General.

So I have some difficulty with that. I think ultimately the President should name a person and recognize, as you do with the Supreme Court justices, how that profession feels about that person's capabilities and qualifications, but I basically agree with the process being as Dr. Koop described

1778 it, but not necessarily with the limitations.

Dr. CARMONA. I think we all agree with the process.

The reason that I looked at the model of a U.S. Public Health
Service Commission Corps officers that would come up through
the ranks was if you look at these officers right here these
are the finest doctors, nurses, scientists in the world right
here. They are professional officers who come up the ranks.

Ms. NORTON. They are not practicing medicine as Surgeon General, they have only themselves, their word, their eminence and, again casting no aspersion on this extraordinary corps, the other way to accomplish this is the narrowed pool. Dr. Koop, I would like your review on this as well?

Dr. CARMONA. Ma'am, may I finish?

Ms. NORTON. Yes.

Dr. CARMONA. We all agree as to the process. The reason I am looking to stay in the Commission Corps is you have professional uniformed officers, and I am open to the discussion. I brought forth an idea that says I think this would work to deplete the size of the process. The President of the United States nominates the Army, Navy and Air Force Surgeon Generals from the ranks and--

Ms. NORTON. One wonders if that depoliticizes.

Dr. CARMONA. Well, granted--

Ms. NORTON. Are all depoliticized, whether the Supreme

Court justices are depoliticized. So I understand, I am simply trying to say of the ways of doing it, wouldn't we want to sacrifice something that is important since this man doesn't do anything but speak and whether he has credibility?

Dr. CARMONA. Thank you.

Dr. KOOP. Even if you have concerns about the manner in which I outlined it, if you look at the people who were in the Commission Corps at the time I was appointed, there were already 55 Assistant Surgeon Generals. If you look at some of those people they have turned out to be the best public health voices we have had in the country, in the private sector and some in government.

I don't think even though my plan would eliminate me as a candidate for Surgeon General. I think you would always get good people. But there are is one other thing, if it were known that you could enter the Commission Corps of the United States Public Health Service with the eventual possibility of working as a Surgeon General you would attract better and better and better people to the corps.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

Ms. Watson.

Ms. WATSON. Thank you so much. I am just going to throw out these questions to the panel and after I do that, I would like Dr. Satcher to talk about your oral health report, and I have a bill right now in the process to remove the

dental amalgams that have mercury. And I see the mercury as the basis for poor dental health and poor systemic health, so I would like you at the end to comment on that.

I would like to ask all three of you how can we improve the Surgeon General's position, should we lengthen the term time that you serve? How do we make you independent? And what--I think all of you have hit on it a bit in your presentations, but I would like you to outline what you would do to improve that position, starting with you, Dr. Koop, please. Dr. Koop.

Dr. KOOP. Well, I have outlined the manner in which the person is chosen, I think that is essential, I have talked about end suspense, I have talked about being apolitical.

And then I have also suggested that the expertise of the Surgeon General be used in an advisory capacity at every level of discussion of an issue that eventually will become a legislative problem and acted upon by the Congress of the United States. That is the way that I think the Surgeon General can be in on what is being discussed. It keeps them out of policy making, but it gives the President and the White House and it give the Secretary of HHS and that Department the benefit of his expertise.

And as I think all of us have said either directly or indirectly he respect in which the Surgeon General is held by our people that we have been talking about, our colleagues

abroad or in the private sector, there is almost nothing that a Surgeon General asks that he can't get in the way of advice and help.

Ms. WATSON. Thank you so much.

Dr. Carmona.

Dr. CARMONA. Thank you. I would like to echo what Surgeon General Koop has said and I state in my remarks about the independence. I think our government should not only fund and empower and support, but I think it should demand transparency and honesty in all scientific communications because this is the doctor of the Nation, and in fact, as you have heard from the three of us, the rest of the world looks to the Surgeon General for honest governmental, scientific communication, which is distinctly different from many of the other countries.

One thing I think is important to consider, they often publicly shy away from hot button scientific issues. For whatever reason, it really doesn't make a difference. I think that we would all agree that allowing the Surgeon General to be the lightning rod on these issues and move forward in a nonpartisan way, and based on science, actually helps to insulate politicians who don't want to talk about abortions or stem cells or Plan B, which tends to polarize people.

The Surgeon General is bringing forward the best

science. I think the Surgeon General, driving some of these discussions based on the best science, would actually help in a nonpartisan way all political persons because they don't have to take the heat. It is the Surgeon General who said this.

Ultimately though, with a better informed public, we can improve health literacy, and better policy moves forward I think less painfully for some politicians because it is the Surgeon General out there who is speaking as the doctor of the Nation just as they would speak to you individually about very importantly issues that could also be polarizing.

I think that is another added advantage, to add on to what Surgeon Koop said and listening to what General Satcher is going to say. I think the beauty of what we are saying here is three Surgeon Generals over conservative administrations all came to the same conclusion about the dignity of the office and the importance of representing the American people and not a political party and how we hope to make it easier for those who walk in our footsteps in the future to better represent the American public.

Dr. SATCHER. I want to begin by briefly saying what I say to students all over the country in commencement addresses, and I would trade nothing for the opportunity which I had to serve in government, I would trade nothing as Director of the CDC. I came from the cotton fields of

Alabama. Neither of my parents finished elementary school. The fact you can rise in this country and become a Surgeon General says a lot about the strength of our Nation.

I believe the Surgeon General's office is too important to allow it to be politicized. I think the World Health Organization, while I was serving, ranked the United States 37 in the world in terms of our health system. Despite the fact that we spend money as the next level of expenditures and we have 40 million people uninsured, we still rank number 37.

The only one that I think in the world who would rank us number one would be the Office of Surgeon General. I believe it is important to maintain the integrity of the Office of the Surgeon General. I would say two things, number one, the budget, I believe Congress ought to insist that the Surgeon General's office has its own budget—and I say this as one Assistant Secretary of Health and the Surgeon General, so I have reported to myself as Surgeon General and if I hadn't of course I wouldn't have gotten any money. That is where I got the money, that should not be the case. The Surgeon General should be independent and have their own budget and be independent to speak to the American people.

You asked me about oral health. I will be very brief.

In a report of oral health in the year 2000, we tried to do a
few things, to point out the magnitude of the oral health

problem in this country. The fact that still 30 percent of people over 65 in this country are in dentures, that children missed 57 hours of school every year because of tooth decays, 146 million Americans are uninsured or who don't have dental insurance. We talked about how oral health is an overall part of health and well-being and needs to be treated that way. Or the health problems that can be associated with cardiovascular disease and diabetes, we put that all out based on the current research and we talked about the importance of fluoridation in water.

We didn't talk about America, we didn't feel that science at that point was adequatefor the Surgeon General to take a position. We don't take positions on issues that are not clear. If they are not clear, we say they are not clear. And that is why you did not see a stronger statement in that report about mercury.

I must say of all the reports that I have issued, I am very pleased with what happened with the results of that report. I think the Johnson Foundation funded 19 dental schools to revive health care to poor children, boys clubs or things like that. So many children are now getting dental care because of that report and what has happened afterwards. It is a very important report, like so many of the reports we have issued.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Ms. Watson.

Let me conclude the questioning. Dr. Carmona, you talked about the areas where you have had interference, but one of the jobs of the Surgeon General is to go out and talk to groups, communicate at the State level, talk to different groups who are like minded or suffering from diseases. Were you prevented from traveling to speak to groups that you thought you wanted to visit and talk to?

Dr. CARMONA. Yes, that occurred several, many times actually over the years, and it was because people were politically vetting decisions I made to go before groups and based it on science and the needs of the citizens, political need. As Surgeon General Satcher has said, he might have had it easier—we both come to the same conclusion, it is hard to do both jobs because the government expects you as Assistant Secretary to be a politician and they are constantly switching houses. Dave and I did the same thing. We said we are doctors first, we are Surgeon General, which often doesn't make politicians happy. It gave David more budget discretion because he can control his own office.

There were a couple of issues, I can give you some examples. As you know, I issued a Surgeon General's call to action on the health of people with disabilities. I was looking at the GAAP analysis around the country to see where I could add to the great body of evidence. I saw the issue of disability in children's health and we started to have

some discussions with Special Olympics and Best Buddies. And the Special Olympics was coming up. I was asked if I would come to Japan and give the opening keynote address and discuss the health of disabled athletes which had been marginalized. I thought this was a perfect forum. I was told I couldn't do it. There was no reason given other than it was kind of expensive to go over there. There were times I was asked to speak at groups I wasn't sure I should be at where budget was not an issue.

Chairman WAXMAN. Give me an example of that.

Dr. CARMONA. Group, political gatherings where they wanted to have the Surgeon General there to say some things about programs that parties were moving forward and--

Chairman WAXMAN. Were these districts of vulnerable Republicans.

Dr. CARMONA. Sometimes that was the case, sometimes that was the case to talk about a program or a particular issue for the benefit of an elected official. Yes, that happened.

Chairman WAXMAN. You were told you couldn't make a decision to go speak to the Special Olympics but were not given a reason why you couldn't, but then you were told there was money to speak at somewhat politicalized--

Dr. CARMONA. The Special Olympics one was an egregious one. Another group, the Best Buddies, deals with physical

2003 activities for intellectually disabled children. 2004 that was some place we should speak out on and health disparities. I put in my paperwork for the meeting hoping to 2005 bring some light to this problem in our Nation. 2006 2007 admonished for doing that. The reason I was admonished for doing that, 2008 2009 unfortunately, I was told that I would be helping a 2010 politically prominent family who this is one of their 2011 endeavors. Why would I want to help those people? And I said I don't even know--I am not going it mention names. I 2012 2013 remember responding, this is about sick kids. It has nothing 2014 do with who is moving the project. In effect I was told I 2015 cannot travel, my travel orders were not -- I took a weekend vacation and made it myself because I committed to the group. 2016 2017 Chairman WAXMAN. At what level were you told you 2018 couldn't go to the Special Olympics? Dr. CARMONA. In the Department, highly elected 2019 officials? 2020 Chairman WAXMAN. You were told that they wanted you to 2021 2022 act as a surrogate to speak in districts where you could act on behalf of the Republican cause; is that correct? 2023 2024 Dr. CARMONA. That happened at times, yes. 2025 Chairman WAXMAN. There they didn't have a problem with 2026 money? 2027 Dr. CARMONA. It didn't seem so.

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, I find the political affairs with you doing your job--it is difficult enough for Dr. Koop and Dr. Satcher, but it is really distressing that you had such more interference in what you were trying to do. You testified you were prevented from speaking on stem cells, abstinence education, and Plan B emergency contraception; is that correct?

Dr. CARMONA. That is correct.

Chairman WAXMAN. You were prohibited from preparing reports on health preparedness and emergency preparedness; is that correct?

Dr. CARMONA. And global health.

Chairman WAXMAN. You testified you couldn't release the report on global health.

Dr. CARMONA. Correct.

Chairman WAXMAN. You testified that your report on the dangers of secondhand smoke was delayed for years while there were attempts to weaken your science-based findings; is that correct?

Dr. CARMONA. That is correct. I was not aware of it at the time. I did not find out about the scientific assaults until later on because the staff was trying to protect me and it wasn't until late in the game that they were fighting the rewording of paragraphs and things like that, fighting their own battles for scientific integrity.

2053 Chairman WAXMAN. You were directed to attend White 2054 House political briefings about the best interests of the 2055 Republican Party and its candidates, is that right? 2056 Dr. CARMONA. Let me clarify. I can't say there were 2057 memos from senior political officials at the White House who 2058 brought people together to discuss leaks. The couple I went 2059 to, clearly they were discussing elections and getting people 2060 out. Pep rallies I would call them. 2061 Chairman WAXMAN. This wasn't from the Department, it 2062 was beyond the Department? 2063 Dr. CARMONA. Yes, yes. Sometimes the meetings took 2064 place at the Department, sometimes they were off in our 2065 buildings. 2066 Chairman WAXMAN. And people would come and talk about, 2067 give a list of the key races for the Republicans? 2068 Dr. CARMONA. I can't say key races, but getting our 2069 word out, political agendas, things like that, which really 2070 the Surgeon General should have nothing to do with. 2071 undermines the credibility of the office. The Surgeon 2072 General is not involved in day-to-day politics. That is not our job. 2073 2074 Chairman WAXMAN. Did Karl Rove attend any of those 2075 meetings? 2076 Dr. CARMONA. I can only remember one where I saw him. 2077 There were other staffers up and down, different levels of

government, at brown bag lunches, and meetings. I didn't pay
too much attention. After the first few I recognized it was
really something the Surgeon General shouldn't be at or

90

PAGE

HGO191.000

involved in.

2081

2082 RPTS MERCHANT 2083 DCMN HERZFELD 2084 [12 p.m.] Chairman WAXMAN. And you didn't take any grief and not 2085 2086 go to any future meetings, did you. 2087 Dr. CARMONA. Not grief. In fact, I made sure I was 2088 busy during those times. 2089 Chairman WAXMAN. Well, I thank you for your being 2090 forthright and talking to our committee and the American 2091 public about this issue. I hope the testimony of you, Dr. 2092 Koop and Dr. Satcher will help us clarify that this is an 2093 important position that we shouldn't allow to be 2094 marginalized. We shouldn't allow the Surgeon General to be 2095 politicized as a doctor to the Nation. That person needs to 2096 have credibility, independence and to speak about science. I 2097 think that is so important. 2098 I thank you all very much for your testimony today. That concludes our hearing, and the committee stands 2099 2100 adjourned. 2101 [Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]