STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES Unrevised and Unedited Not for Quotation or Duplication

HEARING ON DOMESTIC ABSTINENCE-ONLY

PROGRAMS: ASSESSING THE EVIDENCE

Wednesday, April 23, 2008

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



OFFICE OF THE CLERK Office of Official Reporters

1 | Court Reporting Services, Inc.

2 HGO114000

- 3 | HEARING ON DOMESTIC ABSTINENCE-ONLY
- 4 PROGRAMS: ASSESSING THE EVIDENCE
- 5 | Wednesday, April 23, 2008
- 6 House of Representatives,
- 7 | Committee on Oversight and
- 8 Government Reform,
- 9 Washington, D.C.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m. in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Henry A.

Waxman [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Waxman, Cummings, Kucinich,
Watson, Yarmuth, Norton, McCollum, Hodes, Sarbanes, Welch,
Davis of Virginia, Burton, Shays, Souder, Duncan, Issa, Foxx,
Sali, and Jordan.

Staff Present: Phil Barnett, Staff Director and Chief Counsel; Kristin Amerling, General Counsel; Karen Nelson, Health Policy Director; Karen Lightfoot, Communications Director and Senior Policy Advisor; Naomi Seiler, Counsel;

Earley Green, Chief Clerk; Teresa Coufal, Deputy Clerk; 21 Jesseca Boyer, Investigator; Caren Auchman, Press Assistant; 22 Ella Hoffman, Press Assistant; Zhongrui ''JR'' Deng, Chief 23 Information Officer; Leneal Scott, Information Systems 24 Manager; Kerry Gutknecht, Staff Assistant; William Ragland, 25 Staff Assistant; Miriam Edelman, Staff Assistant; Larry 26 Halloran, Minority Staff Director; Jennifer Safavian, 27 28 Minority Chief Counsel for Oversight and Investigations; Keith Ausbrook, Minority General Counsel; Ashley Callen, 29 Minority Counsel; Jill Schmaltz, Minority Professional Staff 30 Member; Brian McNicoll, Minority Communications Director; 31 Benjamin Chance, Minority Professional Staff Member; and Ali 32 Ahmad, Minority Deputy Press Secretary. 33

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

We are all here today because we are concerned about the well-being of America's youth. We may not see eye-to-eye about policy, but we share the common goal of improving adolescence health.

The statistics are shocking. A few weeks ago the Centers for Disease Control released data showing that one in four teenage girls in the United States has a sexually transmitted infection. Of all American girls, 30 percent become pregnant before the age of 20. For African American and Latino girls, the rate is 50 percent. And thousands of teenagers and young adults in the United States become infected with HIV each year.

If we are serious about responding to these challenges, we must base our policy on the best available science and evidence, not ideology.

We are here today to discuss evidence on the effectiveness of abstinence-only programs. There is a broad consensus that the benefits of abstinence should be taught, but as part of any sex education effort. But abstinence-only programs teach only abstinence. In Federally funded abstinence-only programs, teenagers cannot receive information on other methods of disease prevention and contraception other than failure rates.

To date these programs have gotten over \$1.3 billion of Federal taxpayer money, along with hundreds of millions of dollars in State funds, to conduct programs in schools and communities throughout the Country. Meanwhile, we have no dedicated source of Federal funding specifically for comprehensive classroom sex education.

The purpose of this hearing is to examine whether the evidence on abstinence-only programs justifies this expenditure of \$1.3 billion in taxpayer funds.

I respect the commitment and intentions of people who run abstinence-only programs. They are doing it because they care about young people and want to counter the sexual messages that are all too pervasive. Young people who work in these programs demonstrate to their peers that not all teens are having sex, which is an important message. But we will hear today from multiple experts that, after more than a decade of huge Government spending, the weight of the evidence doesn't demonstrate abstinence-only programs to be effective. In fact, the Government's own study showed no effect for abstinence-only programs.

In 2007, the Bush Administration released the result of a longitudinal, randomized, controlled study of four Federally funded programs. The investigators found that, compared to the control group, the abstinence-only programs had no impact on whether or not participants abstained from

sex, they had no impact on the age when teens started having sex, they had no impact on the number of partners, and they had no impact on rates of pregnancy or sexually transmitted diseases.

There is a lot of talk about the failure rates of condoms. It is time we face the facts about the failure rate of abstinence-only programs.

There are also serious concerns about the content of some of these programs. A report I released in 2004 found false or misleading medical information in the majority of the abstinence-only curricula most frequently used by Federal grantees.

While some of these errors have been corrected, recent reviews have continued to find misinformation. Some programs are still teaching stereotypes about gender, like the idea that men judge themselves based on their accomplishments and women judge themselves based on their relationships, and the exclusive focus on abstinence until marriage ignores the needs and sometimes even the existence of gay and lesbian youth.

Meanwhile, more and more research shows that many well-designed, comprehensive programs that teach about abstinence and contraception are effective. Comprehensive, age-appropriate programs have yielded results including increasing contraceptive use, delaying sex, and reducing the

number of sexual partners. In other words, the evidence demonstrates that, not only do good, comprehensive programs not encourage teen sexual activity, they actually decrease it.

This shouldn't be too surprising, because in effective, comprehensive programs young people are taught that abstinence is the safest choice, the healthiest choice, the choice that they should never feel pressured to abandon.

Americans want taxpayers' dollars to be watched for carefully by the Congress. They want us to fund programs that produce results; yet, we are showering funds on abstinence-only programs that don't appear to work, while ignoring proven, comprehensive sex education programs that can delay sex, protect teens from disease, and result in fewer teen pregnancies.

This triumph of ideology over science is bad economics and even worse health policy.

Today we are going to hear from experts at the American Public Health Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics. They will tell us that, based on their professional assessments, the weight of the evidence does not support the continuation of current abstinence-only policy. Instead, both organizations support comprehensive education that includes both abstinence and information on contraception.

The Society for Adolescence Medicine has submitted a statement that says, 'Efforts to promote abstinence should be provided within health education programs that provide adolescents with complete and accurate information about sexual health.''

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists have a similar view. They submitted a statement that states, "Careful and objective scholarly research during the last two decades has shown that sexuality education does not increase rates of sexual activity among teenagers; rather, sexuality education increases knowledge about sexual behavior and its consequences and increases prevention behaviors among those who are sexually active."

The American Psychological Association submitted a statement recommending that, "Public funding for the implementation of comprehensive sexuality education programs be given priority over public funding for the implementation of abstinence-only and abstinence-until-marriage programs until such programs are proven to be effective."

And the American Medical Association has an official policy stating that it "supports Federal funding of comprehensive sex education programs that stress the importance of abstinence in preventing unwanted teenage pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections and also teach about contraceptive choices and safer sex."

All of these professional societies have reached the conclusion that abstinence-only programs are not supported by the weight of the evidence and that the Government should support more comprehensive programs for youth.

States are also reaching that conclusion. Today 17
States, including California and Virginia, decline to accept these abstinence-only funds. Many of these States cite the lack of evidence supporting abstinence-only programs and the restrictive program guidelines as a basis for their decisions.

We will hear testimony from witnesses who believe that abstinence-only education does have positive effects. I respect the depth of their commitment, but ultimately we need to focus on the full body of evidence on what works to achieve our shared goals of keeping teenagers safe and reducing teen pregnancies.

We have already spent over \$1.3 billion on abstinence-only programs. The question we must ask today is whether we can justify pouring millions more into these programs when the weight of the evidence points elsewhere.

I look forward to our witnesses' testimony today.

[Prepared statement of Chairman Waxman follows:]

******* INSERT *******

Chairman WAXMAN. I want to recognize our Ranking Member, Mr. Davis, for his opening statement.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I know I have to go to the Floor to manage our side of some of the Committee's bills, so I will not be here for the full hearing, but I want to thank you for convening this hearing to review the performance of Federally funded education programs on sexual abstinence.

Not surprisingly, we can expect strong feelings and views to be expressed on all sides today, because we are talking an issue of fundamental importance to public health and to the healthy development and well-being of our children. But disagreements need not turn disagreeable. To be constructive, mutual respect and understand of divergent perspectives should drive our discussion.

We proceed from the premise that everyone here today speaks and acts only out of a sincere and well-informed interest in a healthy future for young people throughout our Nation. Despite differences over how to best reach it, the goal of delaying sexual activity among teenagers is widely--almost universally--shared. The benefits of abstinence are as absolute and obvious as they are difficult to convey through the inconsistent surge of teenage hormones, cultural stereotypes, and peer pressure.

In the public health realm, scientific certainties are

rare, but we know without question not having sex absolutely protects young people from the physical and emotional perils that can and do befall those who engage in high-risk and age-inappropriate behaviors. High school is a difficult enough time without the added pressures of complex sexual relationships that too often result in pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, and emotional trauma.

Young people should be spending that time of their lives focusing on school, extra-curricular activities, friends, and their futures, not succumbing to the risks of early age sex. And those risks are substantial. A third of American young people will become pregnant before the age of 20. A third of those between the ages of 15 and 17 reportedly already feel pressure to have sex. One in four teenage girls is infected with STDs. And, tragically, STDs are found at almost twice that rate in African American young women. And half of all new HIV infections occur in people under the age of 25.

As dire as these numbers may seem, progress has been made since the early 1990s. Between 1990 and 2004, the teen pregnancy rate fell 38 percent. The percentage of high school students who have had sexual intercourse also declined over the same decade. Today it is estimated less than half of American high school students have ever had sex.

Despite these important gains, the United States compares unfavorably in these measures with other developed

nations. Particularly among racial minorities, troubling disparities persist.

So we appropriately ask today how well Federal programs support abstinence education. It is a fair question, but it is not the only question that bears on how to protect public health and the welfare of precious young lives.

In this discussion we should abstain from an urge to take an all-or-nothing approach or make false choices between abstinence-only programs and more clinical--some might say permissive--sex education. Particularly today, against cultural trends that glamorize the immediate gratification of physical and material wants while minimizing personal responsibility, we need to use every means available to reach young people to help them make responsible decisions.

Focusing only on the performance of abstinence-only programs also risks leaving the impression the Federal Government funds only those courses, or that just those efforts need oversight. In fact, the Federal Government funds the full spectrum of sex education, as it must under our Constitutional system. Decisions about the nature and content of sex education in schools are made at the State and local district levels, with strong input from parents. Different communities have different mores and traditions. What works in Utah may not be what is needed or wanted in rural Mississippi or inner city Los Angeles.

The Federal Government's role is to empower States and localities to make those choices, not supplant the judgment of parents, teachers, and school boards. So we permit States, school districts, and community organizations to seek Federal funds for the types of sex education they judge best to meet the needs of their students. We should not deny them the option of abstinence education programs because some perform better than others. Each life saved is of immeasurable value.

Data on the impact of abstinence education programs may be difficult to capture or slow to be recognized, but problems with how abstinence is taught cannot be allowed to undermine its indispensability as a core element of what is taught. It is inaccurate and unfair to claim all abstinence education programs are the same or that all such programs fail, therefore none should be funded.

To bring a more nuanced view to the evaluation, we asked that Dr. Stan Weed be invited to testify. His work in this field should shed a needed light on the elements of an effective abstinence education program. I thank Chairman Waxman to agreeing to our request for this witness.

Identifying what works and what doesn't can help focus Federal funding on the best practices and the most efficient programs.

We welcome all of our witnesses this morning and look

286 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Davis.

First of all, by unanimous consent, without objection, all Members will be permitted to enter opening statements in the record.

We are pleased to have two of our colleagues with us today to present their position on this issue. We have Congresswoman Lois Capps, representing the 23rd District of California, where she serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee. She is the founder and co-chair of the House Nursing Caucus and is the Democratic Chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues.

We are pleased to have you with us.

Senator Sam Brownback is the senior Senator for Kansas.

He serves on the Appropriations, Judiciary, and Joint

Economic Committees and is the Ranking Member on the Joint

Economic Committee.

We are pleased to have you here, as well.

I guess before we do that, I should inform you and all the witnesses that it is the practice of this Committee that everyone who testifies before us testifies under oath, so even though you are Members of Congress I think we ought to apply the same rules to you, as well.

[Witnesses sworn.]

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

PAGE 15

HGO114.000

311

312

313

314

Ms. Capps, why don't we start with you. Your prepared statements will be in the record in full. We would like to ask, if you would, to keep your oral presentation to around five minutes.

315 STATEMENTS OF THE HONORABLE LOIS CAPPS, A UNITED STATES
316 REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA; AND THE
317 HONORABLE SAM BROWNBACK, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE
318 STATE OF KANSAS

STATEMENT OF LOIS CAPPS

Ms. CAPPS. Thank you, Chairman Waxman, for inviting me to participate today. It is an honor for me to appear with my esteemed colleague from the Senate.

I sit before you today both as a colleague in the House and as a registered nurse. Long before I entered the halls of Congress I worked as a school nurse and health educator for the Santa Barbara Public School Districts. My responsibilities then were to make decisions that best meet the needs of my students and school district, much as they are now to make decisions that best represent the needs of my constituents and the American people.

As a public health nurse, it was natural for me to reinforce that prevention is a most important component of health education. Teaching young people about healthy behaviors, including the risks associated with unprotected sex and teen pregnancy, are important messages that need to

be conveyed, always in alliance with the parents involved.

I know from my first-hand experience what does and doesn't work with youth. That is why I promoted comprehensive health education for all students, including age-appropriate information about reproduction and decision-making associated with sex, always with the parents' permission.

Knowing about mitigating the risk of sexually transmitted disease and ways to prevent pregnancy are important life skills needed in today's world. Withholding this information from teens does a great and perhaps dangerous disservice to them, and one that runs contrary to my training and education as a public health nurse.

In my work as a school nurse I have been part of many curriculum review panels regarding sex education at both the school site and the local school district level. These panels are always centered around parents and include teachers, administrators, board members, and often community health professionals such as pediatricians.

As a school nurse I also had the privilege of directing a program for pregnant and parenting teens, which allowed them to stay in regular high school with their peers. Part of this program was, of course, to provide care for their children while they were studying and in class, but, more importantly, this teen parenting program provided education

on life skills with an emphasis on parenting, as well as an education on how to prevent or delay further teen pregnancies. After all, teen parents are all too likely to have a second birth relatively soon. About one-fourth of teenage mothers have a second child within 24 months of that first early birth.

Mr. Chairman, according to a 2005 CDC study, 46.8 percent of all high school students reported having had sexual intercourse. For high school seniors, this figure reaches 63.1 percent. The bottom line is, as much as parents and teachers and all of us alike stress abstinence among teens, sexual activity is a reality for many young people. So what can we do to confront that reality?

Some say that abstinence-only education is the answer, but claiming that the only proper information with teens, even teens who are already parents, is abstinence only and nothing else means withholding scientifically based medical information. This is completely unrealistic, in my view.

Of course, abstinence is at the core of any comprehensive sexual education curriculum. Practicing 100 percent complete abstinence is 100 percent effective in preventing pregnancy, and that is a primary message. For many young people, this message reinforces positive behaviors, but it is not realistic to expect such behavior from all teens, so the best thing we can do to protect young

people from the negative consequences of unsafe sex is to give them the information they need. We know this works.

anecdotal survey of them.

sex.

A national campaign to prevent teen pregnancy study revealed that over 40 percent of the comprehensive education programs that were evaluated delayed the initiation of sex, and more than 60 percent reduced unprotected sex.

Furthermore, no comprehensive program hastened the initiation of sex, according to the study, or increased the frequency of

Conversely, just last year a Federally funded evaluation of the Title V abstinence-only programs conducted by Mathmatica Policy Research, Inc. found no evidence that these programs--that is abstinence-only--increased rates of sexual abstinence. Scientific study after scientific study has shown that these programs are ineffective and often contain false information, something that bears out in my own

I urge us not to add to the \$1.3 billion in Federal dollars that have been invested over the past decade in programs that are ineffective and many of them downright false.

I am proud that my own State of California has rejected these dollars from day one. In fact, California is the only State that has never applied for and never received Title V abstinence-only-until-marriage funding. California would

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

have been eligible for over \$7 million in Title V abstinence-only-until-marriage funding in fiscal year 2007, but the State chose not to apply for these funds due to the extraordinary restrictions upon how the money must be spent. This was based on the State's previous experience in the 1990s with a State-funded abstinence-only education program that proved to be ineffective. Evaluation of the program proved that youth who were given abstinence-only education were not less likely than youth in the control groups to report a pregnancy or a sexually transmitted infection. California isn't the only State to draw these conclusions. The Kansas Department of Health and Environment conducted a 2004 evaluation of abstinence-only-until-marriage programs, and this evaluation found that there were no changes noted for participants' actual or intended by, such as whether they planned to wait until marriage the have sexual. The evaluation also revealed negative changes in attitudes. After participating in abstinence-only-until-marriage programs, students surveyed were less likely to respond that the teachers and staff cared about them, and significantly fewer students felt that they had a right to refuse to have sex with someone. Researchers

therefore concluded that, rather than focusing on

abstinence-only-until-marriage, data suggests that including

information on contraceptive use may be more effective at decreasing teen pregnancy. This evaluation is, unfortunately, all too typical of the result of the abstinence-only education programs.

Mr. Chairman, as of 2008, January, 17 States have rejected Title V abstinence-only funding based on so understood public health concerns and because governors have deemed the program to be inconsistent with their State's values or public health mandates.

I commend these States for making smart decisions regarding the health of their young people and listening to parents who want more comprehensive education for their children. Recent polling reveals that a vast majority of adults support a comprehensive approach to sexuality education. According to a study conducted by the National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy, 78 percent of California residents support programs that teach about abstinence as well as how to obtain and use contraceptives.

Furthermore, residents believe that the Federal

Government should pay for this instruction. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of legislation such as the Responsible Education About Life, or REAL, Act, and the Prevention First Act. It is in the best interest, I believe, of public health of our entire society to ensure that all students are receiving scientifically and medically accurate

information that will enable them to make the healthiest lifestyle decisions for them.

Furthermore, I believe that we must discontinue any funding that is Federal for abstinence-only education programs. I believe they have been a waste of taxpayer dollars and have produced no positive results. As a Member of Congress, again, as a registered nurse, this is a position I encourage my colleagues to adopt as we have a responsibility, I believe, to protect the public health. We should follow the recommendations of the Institutes of Medicine: ''Congress, as well as other Federal, State, and local policy-makers, eliminate the requirements that public funds be used for abstinence-only education and that States and local school districts implement and continue to support age-appropriate, comprehensive sex education and condom availability.''

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to testify today.

[Prepared statement of Ms. Capps follows:]

479 ******** INSERT *******

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

Mr. Brownback?

482 | STATEMENT OF SAM BROWNBACK

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for allowing me to be here and to testify. I am glad to join Ms. Capps. I have worked with her on a number of different issues over the years, and it is always a pleasure to join her. I think we have a bit of a different opinion on this one. I look forward to the discussion on it.

I come here because I am in the U.S. Senate, but I have five children and I have got a fair amount of practical experience dealing with this. Our oldest is 21, youngest two are 10. I think I identify with most parents. I want the best for my kids and there is hardly anything I wouldn't do for them to see that they do have the best.

I am like most parents in this Country: I want them to abstain from sexual activity until they are married. That doesn't happen to be just in the Brownback household. There is a Zogby poll in my testimony. Eight in ten parents want that for their children.

I think also I am like most parents in that I feel often that the current culture pushes against what we try to teach in the Brownback family, that you have respect for other people, that everybody is a dignified human, that we think this is something that should be retained for marriage, and

505 that that is the best place.

It is something that we would hope our Government would back us up on. That, I think, is at the crux of what the debate is here, and it is about desire of parents and best for their kids, high expectations, not low expectations, high expectations for our children and a desire to cull them towards that.

We have a crisis in the Country today. It is striking--I thought stunning--when I read this number, that one in four teenager girls in the United States has a sexually transmitted disease. One in four, according to CDC. That is a truly shocking number.

Clearly, where we have put the bulk of our money in sex education, which is the comprehensive programs, have not worked. We have a culture that pushes another way that rarely shows consequences of early sexual activity but really just says let's just go ahead and do it.

The end of this debate has been an entered the push against abstinence education, which I think probably surveyed most Members here toward their own children they would say no, that is what I would hope my kids would do, and that is what I encourage them to do. I would just say then why wouldn't we have the Government do similarly.

I have followed a number of the studies that have been coming out looking at this. I don't think all of them have

been followed, though. The Heritage Foundation just recently released a report looking at 15 studies that have examined abstinence based programs only. They didn't do the study on the programs, they just pulled 15 programs out, and they found 11 of these programs on abstinence reported positive findings, many of them quite extraordinary positive findings.

It seems to me that the route we should do, in listening to parents and listening to our own hearts here, would be to say, okay, what of these abstinence programs are not working, and let's not fund the areas that are not working rather than throwing the whole idea out, which is supported by most parents.

I am most familiar with one here in Washington, D.C., that I have worked with over a number of years. I am the Ranking Member on the Appropriations Committee for D.C., have been the authorizing chairman for D.C. I have been very concerned about what is happening here in the District. The best one I am familiar with is Best Friends program in Washington, D.C. They had a 2005 study evaluation of the impact of the program. They found this about their program: teenage girls in the six middle schools that participated in the program were substantially less likely to engage in sexual activity than similar teenager girls in the District who did not participate in Best Friends.

And they found collateral support, as well, or

collateral positive things. Best Friends girls were also significantly less likely to use illegal drugs, smoke or drink, compared to their peers. And the program worked.

You have got Dr. Stan Weed that has done a more thorough investigation on the impact of the programs. I would hope that his testimony would be seriously considered.

I think there is a way forward on this, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is to examine the abstinence programs, because not all of them are created equal. Clearly we have got a huge problem. Clearly comprehensive sex education has not worked with the level of STDs that we have in this Country.

I would hope what we would do is look at what in these programs and which ones and what design of it has worked, and let's replicate and let's support and let's push that. And let's be very supportive of it rather than this constant public debate of attack that I think reads out to most of the public, Well, we just don't like this approach. Then the public goes, Well, I guess you are going to attack my parental ideas again. They get very frustrated. I know I can speak as one.

I would hope we could work together on this. I don't think this needs to be a partisan divide on it. I think it is one that we can work with parents and work with these programs and help design them to work better. It would be my hope, my pledge to you and to others to work to make them

I want to start off by telling you I agree with you. We ought to see what works. I don't think we ought to junk the idea of trying to emphasize abstinence. I think we ought to have that emphasis, because the culture does push our young

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Brownback.

people to become much more sexually active, and it is

contrary to what many of us as parents and grandparents want

591 for our children.

But the Federal Government only funds abstinence education programs. We don't fund comprehensive sex education programs for teenagers. That is done at the State and local level. I don't think we ought to fund abstinence-only programs that won't talk about other alternatives, talk about a comprehensive approach, encouraging abstinence but also at the same time explaining some public health realities to young people.

Some States, as Ms. Capps pointed out, Representative
Capps said some States have looked at the Federal requirement
and it is like the Federal Government telling them they had
to do it only one way, and the States didn't like that.

I think we ought to let the States, if we are going to put Federal dollars into it, make a decision. I would hope that all of them would emphasize abstinence, and then I hope all of them would inform people about basic health information.

Ms. Capps, is that the point that you were making?

Ms. CAPPS. I appreciate the chance to respond. I want
to also agree with the Senator. There is so much that we
have in common in what we desire for our young people. We
want them to grow up to be healthy. I will confess my strong
bias, which is on behalf of health education, period. When
you think about the diseases that are so costly to us
today--obesity, heart disease, and sexually transmitted
diseases and unwanted pregnancies--so much of it relates to
healthy behaviors, which can be taught starting at a very
young age.

I have always been in favor of comprehensive health information so that young people know about their bodies, know how their emotions work, and at age-appropriate times, with the permission of parents, that this can be done, including sexuality and reproductive matters.

Now, I am in favor of local decision-making about this. That is how important I think it is. It is always the prerogative of parents to have a say on sensitive issues of what their children learn and don't learn. That is why I believe that abstinence-only education really directs something that should be decided at a more local level.

We do have legislation that is in the process of being addressed in the House that undergirds the importance of prevention, and that is something I would champion.

Chairman WAXMAN. Senator Brownback, do you think we ought to look at these programs in a cool way, cold-hearted way to see whether they are working or not, and if they are not working say that we ought to adjust them? And, secondly, do you think that we ought to bar at the Federal level any funds for these sex education efforts to talk about anything other than abstinence? Do you think it ought to be possible for the local areas to decide to use the funds, as well, for a more comprehensive approach that talks about ways to stop the sexually transmitted diseases and unintended pregnancies assuming young people decide to be sexually active.

Senator BROWNBACK. Well, the answer to your first question, absolutely. But I think you have to also then look at the whole gamut, and not just say, okay, we are going after abstinence education, which, Mr. Chairman, that is what this appears to be. And if you say okay, let's look at the whole gamut because we have a crisis here, and STDs, one in four girls, and I think in certain segmented communities it is one in two, and the current approach has not worked.

I believe you have testimony later on five to one on comprehensive. Nationwide, the dollars have been five to one on comprehensive. So, I mean, if I were you as chairman and you are saying let's look at this realistically, then apparently the broad breadth of these dollars, it is not working. I would submit to you that if you are just going to

PAGE 32 HGO114.000

peg in on the abstinence piece of this, okay, that is fair 659 enough, but then I can show you programs in the abstinence field where it is working. I can show you places where it is The idea there would be to target more appropriately not. how you get the abstinence programs to work. But then you should also back up and say obviously the overall approach has not worked. We have got to look at all of it. We can't just tag in on the abstinence piece of this because of whatever agenda.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you.

669 Mr. Souder?

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As you know, we have debated this subject before. held a hearing when I was chairman of the Subcommittee and we issued a report, Abstinence and its Critics. I would ask that this would be inserted in the Committee report of this hearing.

Chairman WAXMAN. Without objection.

[The referenced information follows:]

678 ******** INSERT *******

Mr. SOUDER. I also would like to make a brief statement because of my involvement. I would like to use some of my time for that at this point.

I share some of Senator Brownback's concerns that we are not addressing the fact here that two-thirds of the money that goes for education on this issue is not abstinence-only. This hearing seems to be stacked against abstinence-only. If your intent was truly to assess the evidence on abstinence education, then why are we hearing from only one single proponent of the important public health approach? Where are the physicians who diagnose young girls, despite having used condoms, who now have the cancer-causing virus HPV? Where is the official who will talk about twice the amount of funding being used on things other than abstinence education?

Extreme interests groups believing in sexual freedom and sexual justice have denigrated the debate over abstinence education by turning it into a vehicle to promote their own ideological agenda of radical sexual autonomy. We ought not to be persuaded by these groups who, although adopting the language of science and reason, are really just evangelists of a competing though tragically incorrect moral vision. This debate is not between those who on one side are trying to impose their values on others and those who on the other are proclaiming a purely disinterested and amoral rationality. Indeed, despite protests to the contrary, the

other side, too, makes more arguments tethered to a particular ideology.

While this hearing has been convened to assess the evidence, we must also realize that this debate involves deep disagreements between competing values. Abstinence education is a medically accurate, age-appropriate method that promotes character, healthy relationship building skills, and self worth to young people. It is far more than a just say no approach to public health.

The name of this hearing, for example, wrongly suggests that teens who receive abstinence-only education are only taught to say no to sex. Mr. Chairman, this simply is not true. Abstinence education is a holistic approach to preventing the physical and emotional distress that premarital sex can bring, especially to teenagers.

Abstinence education does, in fact, teach teens about contraceptives. It does teach teens about HIV/AIDS. It does teach teens about how to prevent pregnancy and disease. It encourages teens who are already sexually active to get tested for STDs, unlike the so-called comprehensive sex education curriculum, which often tells teachers specifically not to raise the failures of condoms or STDs.

What abstinence education does not do, unlike contraception-based programs, is suggest to teens that they should 'wear shades as a disguise' when buying condoms so

adults don't recognize them, or encourage teens to ''fantasize'' about using a condom.

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

The Department of Health and Human Services reports that most popular so-called comprehensive programs spend less than 10 percent of their class time promoting important health message of abstaining. The curriculum does, however, instruct girls on how to help their partner maintain an erection and other graphic behaviors too explicit to submit to the record.

We can parade as many critics of abstinence education before this Committee as we want, and nothing will change the fact that the only fully reliable way for young people to protect themselves from pregnancy or STDs is by abstaining from sex until a committed, faithful relationship with a partner who is also free of STDs. To withhold this evidence from our young people and the members of this Committee is not only wrong but inexcusable and unjust. I would like to ask our two witnesses -- and I find some of these questions, quite frankly, shocking, but since it is used in schools down to age nine--do you believe this is appropriate to ask kids these questions which are: do you think a person is abstinent if he or she does the behaviors below: cuddle with someone with no clothes on, give oral sex, masturbate with a partner, receive oral sex, touch a partner's genitals? you believe those are appropriate for kids in school as an

754 alternative to abstinence, or whether it should be defined as 755 abstinence? Ms. Capps?

Ms. CAPPS. Do I think this is appropriate personally?

Not at all. I have been a part of many, many sex education

classes, and I have never had this or been a witness to any

discussion anything like this, particularly at the age that

you are talking about.

761 Mr. SOUDER. My time is on yellow. Let me ask Senator 762 Brownback.

Ms. CAPPS. Surely.

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

Mr. SOUDER. This is a 2005 plan, Making Sense of abstinence Lessons for Comprehensive Sex Education for New Jersey.

Senator BROWNBACK. No. I don't think that is appropriate. And as a parent, if that were being taught to my kids I would find it very offensive. I think it is why most parents really get upset about a lot of these things, is that there are things being put forward that a lot of times are just really trying to encourage our kids, Look, let's be responsible. We don't do these sort of things. It goes against what the parents are trying to teach.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Souder.

Mr. Sarbanes, I want to recognize you if you have any questions.

778 Mr. SARBANES. Not at this time.

Chairman WAXMAN. Ms. McCollum?

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am wondering, Senator Brownback, I think there is great agreement. As parents we all tell our children that they should delay sexual activity for many reasons--emotional, health, our family values, and that. knowing what the statistics are from the CDC for the number of young adults that do engage in sexual activity, do you believe that we have a responsibility when Federal dollars are being used, especially in abstinence-only programs, that if they do refer to condoms--and there are examples in here that the GAO cites in its report where inaccurate statements were made that condoms are porous, therefore a condom doesn't protect you against sexually transmitted disease -- that we should not allow Federal dollars to be used to transmit misinformation, information that is not scientifically accurate, that that is not a good use of our tax dollars? Would you at least agree with that, that we need to make sure that anything that is said in these abstinence programs must be scientifically accurate?

Senator BROWNBACK. I would. I would hope they would be applied to all sex education programs, the comprehensive ones, too. I would tie back in to your earliest piece of your statement. What about the emotional. There is an emotional issue that is involved here. Having three children

either in or recently gone through teenage time periods, this is a big emotional time period. I would hope we would have scientific evidence on all of it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, my challenge is, as an appropriator, with the limited amount of dollars that are available for public health, that every single penny that is spent should be made sure that the information is scientifically accurate.

Ms. Capps, it is my understanding--and I am sure you have read the GAO report--that is has only been recently that there has been any scrutiny on these programs to make sure that they are scientifically accurate. As a nurse, as a mother, how do you feel about that? As a taxpayer, how do you feel about that?

Ms. CAPPS. That distresses me because I have had personal experience in reviewing some of the abstinence-only materials. I will agree with the Ranking Member that they do discuss contraception, but I never saw one that said anything positive about it. It was always the failure rate. In other words, to infuse a sense of distrust among the students that they should rely on anything like this.

I am concerned that we are spending Federal dollars on misinformation.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Representative Capps, as a person who has worked in public health, you know that we might have juniors

and seniors in high school who don't have parents such as Senator Brownback, myself, you, and other members of the panel who would sit down and discuss fully options with our children as they are getting ready to perhaps even enter marriage. So knowing that we have 17-and 18-year-olds, do you feel that for many of these young adults in committed relationships who might be getting married at a very early age, that this might be the only information that is available to them?

Ms. CAPPS. I can tell you I have heard it with my own ears, I have seen, and, as I mentioned in my testimony, I worked in a program for parenting teens. Teens already having chosen to keep their parents (sic) and go to a comprehensive high school, we provided them with life skills. Many of them were married. They were asking us for help because they got pregnant in the first place because they didn't know enough, and now they wanted to make sure that they took good care of the child that they had and were able to plan their families in the future.

So there is a cry on the part of many teenagers for accurate information. Then, of course, we need to always be teaching them the life skills in order to make the good decisions about it, as well. The two go hand in hand.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Ms. McCollum.

Mr. Burton? 854 855 Mr. BURTON. I can wait. 856 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Shays? 857 Mr. SHAYS. I thank the colleague. Sometimes I think we are trying to repeal the law of 858 There are natural instincts that young people have, 859 gravity. and they are educated by their parents hopefully first to 860 know proper conduct, and hopefully are given informed 861 information in their process of going to school and so on. Ι 862 am a chief cosponsor of the Responsible Education About Life, 863 the REAL Act, which was introduced by Barbara Lee, and its 864 865 whole purpose is to provide a comprehensive approach to sex education that includes information both about abstinence and 866 867 contraception. 868 I read these questions and I thought, You know what? Maybe they shouldn't have been asked by someone in school in 869 870 a program, but they turn on their TV and they see it. We have had testimony in Congress where young people 871 didn't realize that oral sex they could transmit disease. 872 They just weren't informed, and they thought that wasn't sex, 873 maybe as defined by the former President of the United 874 875 States. But the bottom line is I don't understand why you 876 wouldn't make sure that young people had all the information 877

to counteract all the information they are getting every day

878

8.99

from the news media, from TV, from programs, from books. I mean, the books I used to read were so ridiculous compared to what kids read today. But, frankly, if it be told, probably every one of my fellow boys and young men that were at school would have had sex if the girl had said yes. So your parents basically tried to determine who you were going out with, what kind of girl you were out with. It is a different world today. It is a different world, Senator, than you grew up in.

I just don't know how we are going to help young people if we don't give them the information they need to make the choices, to know that they could get ill if they do certain things, to know the benefits of abstinence in the context of truly loving someone.

I would like you both to speak to that, in terms of what kids get every day in the media. So these questions aren't shocking. They get it every day. They see it. They read about it. Why shouldn't they talk about it?

Senator BROWNBACK. Well, first, thanks, Chris, and, believe me, I know we are not in the world I grew up in. I have got children operating in this culture. My older daughter is doing Teach for America in Houston in 7th grade, and the things she hears, that does shock me. So I am getting that.

But I think there is an issue here. What about setting

a high expectation? What if she in that 7th grade class sets a very low expectation and, you know, whatever you want with it.

Mr. SHAYS. I don't know what you mean by expectation. A high expectation to me means treating a young people with respect that they get the information they need to counteract the information they are getting from somewhere else, so I don't know what you mean by respect.

Senator BROWNBACK. Well, what I mean by high expectation is maybe buttressing the expectations of their parents instead of attacking them or saying, Well, we don't think you are really going to make that, so therefore let's go this route.

There is a down side to not having high expectations.

There is a clear downside. I think we should do that even in behavior areas.

What I am submitting here is that I think you can look at all these abstinence programs and find ones that haven't worked. I think that is good. Let's not do that. But let's fund the ones that do work so you really are buttressing what 80 percent of the parents want.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.

Ms. Capps?

Ms. CAPPS. Again, I agree with so much of what the Senator is saying, and I totally support you. I am on the

same legislation that you are co-authoring with our colleague, Barbara Lee. I would simply say that the studies are showing that the more information young people have the better decision-making skills they can employ, if they are taught some decision-making skills along the way. Schools are asked to do a lot of things today. They are asked to be parents and they are asked to bring up, for those kids who come, you know, with limited foundation at home, they are asked to teach young people to make good decisions, how to do that. But I believe that when you tie a hand behind your back when you are withheld information, you set up a sense of lacking trust. In fact, comprehensive sex education classes have encouraged young people to delay sex because they know all of the information.

Our teen program where the babies were there with the moms in a classroom setting was a big deterrent for kids having sex. They saw what happens when you do.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Shays.

Mr. Welch, you are next.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Brownback, in listening, everyone agrees that we want to have kids protected as much as possible, so really it seems like this is a tough discussion and debate about what

is effective to help kids make the right choices. But, as I understand your testimony, your view is that there should be no sex before marriage?

Senator BROWNBACK. I am saying eight of ten parents surveyed want that, and I am saying in our family that is what we talk about.

Mr. WELCH. And I obviously completely respect that. But I understand the statistics are that 95 percent of the American people do have sex before marriage.

Senator BROWNBACK. Well, the material I was looking at and that I think even the Ranking Member was citing was below 50 percent on teens, and I don't know of the full number of what you are talking about on before marriage activities.

Mr. WELCH. I think it was a USA Today survey, and my understanding is that is a pretty accepted figure. But the question here I think that we have to resolve is effective us of taxpayer dollars to achieve the goal of diminishing teen pregnancy and diminishing sexually transmitted disease.

Would you agree that that is a shared goal?

Ms. CAPPS. Yes.

Mr. WELCH. All right. So I would ask really both of you, bottom line, whether it is a comprehensive sex education program or an abstinence-only sex education program, that those programs should be subject to strict scrutiny for effectiveness before we allocate a taxpayer dollar. Do each

979 of you agree with that?

Senator BROWNBACK. If I could, absolutely. But you can't just look then at abstinence programs, you need to look at comprehensive ones that get, by far, the lion's share of the dollars, and obviously it has not worked.

Mr. WELCH. I agree that they should be both looked at.

That is what I am asking. Any time we spend money, we have
got to do oversight to see whether the intended purpose is
being achieved with the money we are spending.

Ms. CAPPS. Can I respond to that? You are talking about tax dollars, and it has come up before. To my knowledge, I want to address something that has come up where these figures come around like we spend \$12 for comprehensive sex education, Federal dollars, for every dollar that is spent on abstinence-only education. The truth is very different. To my knowledge the Federal Government has never funded comprehensive sex education as taught in a classroom, but rather these dollars are lumped together which are part of Title X, and all of the services, direct services that we provide for every age group through the Federal programs that we provide in family planning and contraception. I think those are very different.

I am not so sure that we want the Federal Government doing anything prescriptive about what curriculum my grandchildren and your children would be taught in a school

district. I think school districts and school boards and parents have the right and obligation really to choose what is appropriate for them. What I think we can lay out in these bills that I mentioned and that our colleague Mr. Shays is a coauthor of talk about the importance of doing that and making funds available so that districts can choose the appropriate methods that they want to teach.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you.

You know, we have been referring to this GAO report that has done a study of abstinence education programs and come to the conclusion that they are not effective. Now, if that is the report that gives us guidance and money spent on these programs is not achieving the intended result, would it be your position, Senator, that we should continue to spend more money on programs that are judged to be ineffective?

Senator BROWNBACK. My position would be I think you should look at all the studies. There are studies that I cited. You are going to have another witness here today that is citing studies of ones that have worked. My position would be that you should look at those that work so that you are really going in flow with what the parents of the Country want. The parents of the Country want their children to be abstinent. That is what they do in the survey results. So why would we flow against it? Why wouldn't you find the ones that are working well and then let's fund those? And you

really should look at comprehensive, because that is where we put most of the money, and that hasn't worked.

Mr. WELCH. Well, the dilemma we have is this: those of us who advocate always find something to hang our hat on to justify our position. That is you, it is me, it is all of us. But there are referees, and the GAO, when they do these studies at our request, is, in effect, an arbiter, and we either can disregard their study or accept the results and act accordingly.

My understanding is that the study that the GAO has done, kind of a peer reviewed study, has concluded that these abstinence-only programs are not achieving the results that you would like to see achieved, so why would we spend more money?

Senator BROWNBACK. I would hope you would look at all studies, sir.

Mr. WELCH. Okay. Thank you, Senator.

1046 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Welch.

1047 Mr. Burton?

1048 Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just say I am going to yield to my colleague from Indiana, Mr. Souder, but before I do let me just whistle into the wind a little bit. Mr. Shays mentioned what children are exposed to all the time, and I am sure this isn't going to change, but one of the things that disturbs me so much is

there is a constant barrage of sex and violence on television all the time. I know that you can't really stop it, I guess, but that has to be a contributing factor to the violence that we have seen in places like Columbine and this boy that was stopped from blowing up his school the other day and these college campus attacks. We have got to figure out some way as a society to cut back on the sex and violence that we are consuming, because as long as we do that, the kids are going to get a steady diet and you are going to have this thing go on and on.

With that, I yield to Mr. Souder.

Mr. SOUDER. I would first like to correct the record on a couple of things. I didn't use 12-to-1. I used 2-to-1 Federal funding for--

Ms. CAPPS. I am sorry. I have seen 12-to-1.

Mr. SOUDER. And you said that. You said you have seen 12-to-1. You didn't say that I said that, but I wanted to point out that I said 2-to-1 in direct Federal funding, 68 percent of the schools offer contraceptive education compared to 25 percent offering abstinence education. Not all of that is Federal funding and not all of it is even dollars, but that is also a fact. And there are ten Federal sources for funding for contraceptive education and just one for abstinence education.

Now, depending on what a school does with that funding,

they may not use it for the curriculum. They may be blending this with local funding from different health groups, like in our community part of it is funded by Planned Parenthood directly, maybe not from Government funds, or from a health center, not from Government funds. But the fact is that the disproportionate amount of money in the United States is, in fact, going to contraceptive education.

And we are also really happy to see that a number of people here seem to be expressing disappointment, even on the majority side, that we aren't looking at science on not only abstinence education but on the other, because clearly study after study have shown that contraceptive education hasn't worked on HPV, has not worked, either. And you can't just apply science when you ideologically oppose one goal but then not look at science, and we shouldn't pretend like science, GAO, or otherwise has defended the effectiveness of contraceptive programs.

But there is another fundamental question here that we are debating, and that is that 70 to 90 percent of American people oppose explicit sexual content in comprehensive sex education; 67 percent of teens who have initiated sex express regret for doing so; 90 percent of American people believe adolescents should not become sexually active; 70 to 90 percent want a strong abstinence message taught.

Do you believe, Senator Brownback and then Ms. Capps,

that the public, what they want from the schools, is at all relevant in this debate?

Senator BROWNBACK. I would hope it is relevant in this debate, and if it is not, you are going to be running at counter purposes and people are going to be arguing with it all the time and it is not going to be effective. But if we will work in concert with parents, I think we can have an effective program moving on forward.

Ms. CAPPS. Thank you. I want to stress again that all of us--and I am now going back to my past life as a school nurse--in the local schools I don't know a person who doesn't favor abstinence-only until it comes to the point of the knowledge that is available should abstinence not work for a particular child. We can't control what happens to them after school. Most of us want not abstinence-only but abstinence coupled with an understanding of available resources should they need it.

Now, I also would like to say that I have never been a part of a plan or program that is called contraceptive education. I have only been associated with anything in my schools where I worked that was comprehensive sex education that included abstinence and also gave other information.

Now, what I would say is that this decision, the public has its way of recording its desires and what it believes in and so forth, but really the important people in this

conversation who we are talking about are the parents who send their kids to public school every day.

Mr. SOUDER. How do you handle this question, and that is that those using the male condom at first sex has tripled from 22 to 67 percent, contraceptive use has nearly doubled since the 1970s to 79 percent, and yet STDs and other problems are still increasing. How can anything but abstinence be said to be working?

Ms. CAPPS. Abstinence works 100 percent, and that is why it should be the core of any kind of comprehensive education that involves sexuality with teenagers. Again, the decision should be made by the parents, and the young people are asking for information, and if they are asking they should get reliable information.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

I am going to now recognize Ms. Norton, but I want to indicate that our second panel will discuss evaluations of both and all sex education classes, which I think will be very helpful for the Committee.

Ms. Norton.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have had the pleasure of working with you both, and I want to thank you both for very important leadership that I am personally aware of. Ms. Capps, you have become a particular leader on health issues here in the Congress, and

Mr. Brownback and I have worked together on a number of issues, including issues that proved controversial in some forms--the marriage issue, where there has been a decline among African Americans. It is catastrophic. And I must say a similar decline among white people, except for people in the upper middle and upper classes.

May I thank you, Mr. Brownback, for what you said about Best Friends. Best Friends has done an extraordinary job in the District of Columbia with its abstinence-only approach. The kind of caring attention that it gives is rare for any program. I know you did not mean to indicate that that was what abstinence programs usually offered; nevertheless, this has been an extraordinary program of great value to us and the children and the parents that have chosen it.

I don't understand why this subject has been so contentious. I agree with Mr. Brownback we ought to look at all the studies. Don't put a dime on comprehensive sex education programs that don't work. Test them in the same way that we test abstinence-only programs.

The concern that many of us have with abstinence-only programs is the notion that there would be any such matter where one size could possibly fit all. It is so individual, so family oriented.

Mr. Brownback, you have been Chair of the D.C.

Appropriations Subcommittee. I don't need to tell you that

1179|

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

1203

you would be laughed out of many classrooms in the District of Columbia if you talked about abstinence where the children come to junior high school and high school already experiencing sex. This troubles me greatly. I wish there were some way. I cannot imagine wanting my own child to do anything but abstain until marriage. Frankly, that would be my wish. I would do everything I could to encourage that to happen, and many parents find that is a failing effort today.

My question is particularly, Mr. Brownback, I know from my friendship with you, from your own work, your respect for local control, for the views of parents, the sensitive way you have handled the marriage funding that we did here, all with consent and encouraging greater marriage in some of our poorer communities. I am wondering why committing this to local control, where you might have some people--and I can tell you there would be some in the District that would say, I want a program like Best Friends in my community, and where you would have others with parents who are at their wits' end. Many of them are poor parents and single parents. of them are single parents of boy children. They can't begin to even talk with them about sex. If there is somebody in school that will give them the whole deal when this mother who works every day as a single mother doesn't even know how to approach the subject, is poorly educated, if you tell her that her son or her daughter should have an abstinence-only

1204 program she will be puzzled.

Would there be any harm in allowing local communities to make this decision based on their own family needs, based on the composition of the community? Would that be consistent with your values and mine?

Senator BROWNBACK. First, let me say it has always been my pleasure to work with you, and I was looking at you and thinking there is nobody on your side of the aisle that has gotten more votes out of me than you on a whole range of topics, and I can't recall me getting one back from you.

Ms. NORTON. There is one more I want from you, too.

Senator BROWNBACK. I just want my first out of you. That is all I am looking for. I can't even get her to--I don't know, did you cheer for the Jayhawks in the final four?

Ms. NORTON. Don't change the subject, Sam.

Senator BROWNBACK. I just wanted you to at least give me that.

You know, I have enjoyed working with you. I have enjoyed working in D.C. I know you say I would get laughed out of the classroom. I recall I think we were getting laughed out when we were promoting marriage. There are certain areas that people getting married is unusual within that block or that area. Now we have got people that are getting married in some of these communities.

Ms. NORTON. Yes, but we don't have marriage only. We

encourage them to come in. It is the exclusivity of the approach.

Senator BROWNBACK. I know, but let me make my point on this. Let me make my point, because you are very good at making yours.

Ms. NORTON. Okay.

Senator BROWNBACK. Senator Moynihan, I took a lot of guidance from him before he left this body and passed away, and his view was the key thing we ought to be focused on is how you raise your next generation. The key thing you ought to be focused on is how you raise your next generation. I think for us, the Federal Government, to say, Here are funds that we believe this is the high expectation approach is fully appropriate for the Federal Government to do, of a high expectation.

Now, you are saying a bunch of States say we don't want it. Maybe the District of Columbia has said the same thing. We have got a lot of money going to the sex education programs. GAO says it is 5-to-1 on comprehensive. There is a lot of funds going in there. I think this amount that we are putting in, what I would be critical of on it is that I think we need to make sure we are at ones like Best Friends that work and not ones that don't work. I think that really is where our focus should be.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Ms. Norton.

Let me advise the members of the Committee that our two witnesses have other responsibilities and are anxious to go to them. I don't want to deny or deprive any Member of an opportunity to ask questions, because our rules do provide for five minutes.

Let me ask Members who are cognizant of that fact to try to limit your questions, recognizing the time constraints of our witnesses.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman WAXMAN. Yes.

Ms. FOXX. I am having difficulty hearing people down here. I would just like to ask if people could really put the mics close and speak up. I just ask for clarity. I would really appreciate that. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. Good point.

Mr. Duncan?

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have someone waiting in my office, so I will be very brief.

Senator Brownback just said a few minutes ago that the culture is pushing in the opposite or harmful direction at times, and someone else mentioned the TV shows and the movies, and they all work together to almost seem to pressure young people into thinking that they are odd if they don't have early sex. But Senator Brownback just mentioned Senator Moynihan, and Senator Moynihan made a famous statement

several years ago. He said we have been defining deviancy down, accepting as a part of life what we once found repugnant. That seems to become more true with each passing year. So I think Senator Brownback is right when he says that we should encourage people to higher expectations or higher or better goals.

There is some discrepancy that I don't understand. Maybe the witnesses can explain it later. But there is a Heritage study that came out yesterday that said we spend 12 times this much on comprehensive sex education as opposed to abstinence-only education, but the Zogby poll that has been mentioned showed that by more than a 2-to-1 margin that parents want or prefer the abstinence approach, and it seems rather elitist to me for people who maybe have degrees in this field to feel that they, because they have studied it, somehow know better than the parents what is best. I still think parents know what is best for their children.

The message that teens receive from abstinence is pretty simple and very clear. The only way to avoid all the harmful consequences of sexual activity is to abstain. Education about abstaining teaches young people how to set goals and build healthy relationships. So I don't think it is something that we should abandon, which seems to be sort of the thrust of where we are headed.

The people who want to encourage young people to abstain

could have produced numerous witnesses here to support or to 1304 show that this type of training is working, and so with that 1305 I will yield whatever time I have left to Mr. Issa. 1306 Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman, and I will try to use 1307 this time rather than any further time. 1308 Lois, Sam, if we can get you two to agree on things I 1309 think it would go a long way towards this Committee doing the 1310 right thing. Nancy Reagan, a famous California lady, had the 1311 expression Just Say No when it came to drugs. It didn't 1312 work, did it? People still use illegal drugs, don't they? 1313 Ms. CAPPS. Yes, they do. 1314 Mr. ISSA. Okay. We agree. But don't we also agree that 1315 the message of not doing illegal drugs is a good one to 1316 continue having? 1317 1318 Ms. CAPPS. Are you asking me? Mr. ISSA. Both of you. 1319 Ms. CAPPS. All right. I will answer quickly. 1320 1321 Mr. ISSA. I am looking for all yeses, because I think in a sense we are concentrating on what we disagree on rather 1322 1323 than what we agree on. Ms. CAPPS. We agree on that, but I guess I would say 1324 knowing why you are saying no is a good idea. 1325 1326 I apologize. I am going to have to leave the rest of this. 1327 Senator BROWNBACK. I agree. 1328

Mr. ISSA. So, Senator, continuing on with you, when we get to what is being called abstinence here, aren't we really just saying no, but the reason it is a chorus and not just abstinence is that it takes longer to explain to young and women why there are advantages health-wise, relation-wise, future-wise, that, in fact, abstinence training is a process of teaching why waiting makes sense, isn't it?

Senator BROWNBACK. Absolutely. And you didn't touch on the emotional side of it, but you are dealing with a teenage person generally with this, and the emotional side of this is so critical. And you are finding, too, in these studies that I have reviewed, that the abstinence programs that work the best generally spend the most time. They spend a lot of time drilling into these concepts as to why. And those are the ones that are more successful, not a superficial deal.

Mr. ISSA. So, just to conclude, because my time is limited, too, or Mr. Duncan's time is limited, two things: one, even though we will not have 100 percent success in abstinence, even though the figures will show that it does not work all the time, there is no reason not to continue doing it, for the same reason as we continue to teach not to take illegal drugs because men and women are dying in America.

Senator BROWNBACK. Agreed.

Mr. ISSA. And then, last, when it comes to the other

side of the issue, teaching people that transmittable diseases have to be prevented and teaching about the consequences of those, that has to be done regardless of whether you are teaching it through abstinence or you are teaching it through other parts of sex education. That is just as important for men and women for their protection, young men and women.

Senator BROWNBACK. I have got a book here that we could enter into the record that does that that is an abstinence education booklet that teaches about that, as well.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Chairman's consent that be entered into the record.

Chairman WAXMAN. Without objection, that will be the order.

[The referenced information follows:]

1369 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

1370 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Senator. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1371 1372 Chairman WAXMAN. Ms. Watson, do you wish to take your 1373 time? What some of the Members are going to be doing on the other side is splitting their time. 1374 Ms. WATSON. Okay. I will be real quick. I would like 1375 permission to submit my speech into the record, please. 1376 1377 Chairman WAXMAN. Without objection. [Prepared statement of Ms. Watson follows:] 1378 1379 ******* INSERT ******

Ms. WATSON. I just wanted to say this. As I listened to these two very fine, fine colleagues of mine, I see an ideological discussion versus a reality discussion.

Abstinence-only is more ideological rather than comprehensive sex education programs. Reality.

I represent a community called Hollywood, and so many of the young people in my District and in California look at these performers as idols, and we watch their behavior and they pattern after that behavior. Abstinence-only does not reach in a comprehensive way these young people, because they take their lead from what they see on the Internet, what they see on television, what they hear in terms of music.

So my question is: how do we get to the range of experiences when we talk about abstinence-only? Also, I represent an area where there are no fathers in the home, and mothers are there taking care the best they can. They are busy working one, two, and three jobs. They don't have time to focus on discussions of sex when the youngsters are on the streets and they take the lead from their peers. So my question to you, Senator Brownback: how do we then convey with funding only for--California turned down the abstinence-only funds. How do we convey to our young people when we don't have an intact home, we don't have a functioning home, we don't have two parents in the home, and we don't have the resources to really address

abstinence-only? We really need to look at a comprehensive sex education program.

1406 l

Senator BROWNBACK. Well, number one, I think you and the Chairman probably represent the Districts that could affect this debate more than anybody else in the whole world, and your working with people in your Districts would probably do the most to change this whole debate of anybody anywhere because of what is coming out culturally--

Ms. WATSON. Taking back my time for a second, I have got a bill out there that we are using films as diplomacy. it happens to be down in South Africa, because we are looking at the spread of HIV/AIDS. I would like to talk to you about going on as an author, because what we are trying to do is use those quality films to impress certain behaviors in other people and certain respect for us here in the United States. I would like to talk to you about it, because we are trying to use a media to give the right messages.

But I don't see it in a narrow perspective of abstinence-only. We have to face the reality of the audiences that we are dealing with, and we are trying to do that through a means of communication. We are going to use films, Hollywood.

Senator BROWNBACK. I work with a number of people from Hollywood a lot on African issues, because I have been involved a lot with the African continent. They are the ones

that could change this debate more than anybody else. 1430 would hope and pray they would do it in an abstinence and be 1431 faithful setting. 1432 1433 Ms. WATSON. But, you see, that is not the only means. 1434 Senator BROWNBACK. I know that. Ms. WATSON. Yes. 1435 Senator BROWNBACK. You know that. But there is an 1436 expectation that we can set for society, we can set for our 1437 kids. You know, I want you to make all A's. 1438 Chairman WAXMAN. And not see those movies and not listen 1439 to those records. 1440 Senator BROWNBACK. But my point is I don't set a low 1441 1442 expectation --Chairman WAXMAN. I think you can that in Kansas, not 1443 1444 only in Hollywood. Senator BROWNBACK. -- and nor should the Federal 1445 Government set a low expectation. 1446 Ms. WATSON. Just the bottom line is I don't think one 1447 size fits all, and that is the reason why California turned, 1448 because we deal with the realities of our various diversified 1449 segments of California, and we have to send a comprehensive 1450 message out there and hope that it can be backed up in the 1451 home and in the community as a whole. 1452 Senator BROWNBACK. The comprehensive message hasn't 1453 We have got one in two African American teenage 1454 worked.

1455 girls with an STD.

Ms. WATSON. Well, abstinence-only, and we have results
from other areas where it has not worked, so I don't know if
we are using our money wisely.

Thank you, and I yield back my time.

Senator BROWNBACK. The current approach hasn't worked.

Chairman WAXMAN. We are going to find out from the next panel, because they have done actual measurements, not just given us opinions. Let's find out what has worked.

Senator, we still have some other Members who wish to ask you some questions.

Senator BROWNBACK. I am way past due on another set of activities that I was supposed to go to. I need to move on if I can, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, my colleagues, I don't know what to do here, but I think out of respect to the Senator, who has given us very generously a great deal of his time, I think we ought to release him, unless there is objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Reserving the right to object, what I have said is I will yield my time first on the next panel to the Members on our side who didn't get a chance.

Senator BROWNBACK. Mr. Chairman, thanks for your time and thanks for your courtesy. I appreciate both greatly.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you so much.

1479 For our next panel we have the following witnesses who

will share their assessment of the existing body of evidence on abstinence-only and comprehensive sex education programs.

Dr. John Santelli is a Professor and Chair of the Halbren Department of Population and Family Health at the School of Public Health at Columbia University and a Senior Fellow at the Gutkmacher Institute. He is a pediatrician, an adolescent medicine specialist who has conducted research on HIV/SKD risk behaviors, programs to prevent STD, HIV, and unintended pregnancy among adolescents, women, school-based health centers, and research ethics.

Dr. Georges Benjamin has been the Executive Director for the American Public Health Association, the oldest and largest organization of public health professionals in the United States since December of 2002. His prior positions include Chief of Staff for Emergency Medicine at Walter Reed, and he is also a member of the Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Science.

Dr. Margaret J. Blythe is Chair of the Committee on Adolescence for the American Academy of Pediatrics. She is a Professor of Pediatrics at Indiana University School of Medicine.

Dr. Stanley Weed is the Director of the Institute for Research and Evaluation, which he and colleagues formed in 1988 to focus on social problems and programs related to adolescence, including teen pregnancy, drug abuse, and

1505 delinquency.

Finally, we are very honored to have Dr. Harvey
Fineberg, President of the Institute of Medicine of the
National Academies. At the IOM he has chaired and served on
numerous health policy panels ranging from AIDS to new
medical technology.

The last two speakers on this panel will help us put a face on the scientific evidence we discuss here today.

At the age of 15, Shelby Knox led a campaign to replace her high school's abstinence-only curricula with the medically accurate, comprehensive sex education after realizing the programs were ineffective in preventing rising teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. Today she is a writer and speaker on youth and reproductive health.

And Max Siegel leads the student-based HIV prevention interventions and is a policy association at the AIDS Alliance for Children, Youth and Families.

We are pleased to have you here us at this hearing.

Your prepared statements will be made part of the record in its entirety. We would like to ask each of you, however, to limit your oral presentations to no more than five minutes.

Dr. Santelli, we will start with you. There is a button on the base of the mic. Please be sure it is pressed in so that the microphone is working. We will start with you.

1529	STATEMENTS OF JOHN SANTELLI, DEPARTMENT CHAIR, PROFESSOR OF
1530	CLINICAL POPULATION AND FAMILY HEALTH, MAILMAN SCHOOL OF
1531	PUBLIC HEALTH, AND PROFESSOR OF CLINICAL PEDIATRICS, COLLEGE
1532	OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY; GEORGES
1533	BENJAMIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH
1534	ASSOCIATION; MARGARET J. BLYTHE, M.D., CHAIR OF AMERICAN
1535	ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS' COMMITTEE ON ADOLESCENCE; STANLEY
1536	WEED, PH.D., DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
1537	HARVEY FINEBERG, M.D., PH.D., PRESIDENT, INSTITUTE OF
1538	MEDICINE OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES; MAX SIEGEL, POLICY
1539	ASSOCIATE, AIDS ALLIANCE FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES;
1540	AND SHELBY KNOX, YOUTH SPEAKER

1541 STATEMENT OF JOHN SANTELLI

Dr. SANTELLI. Thank you, Chairman Waxman, distinguished members of the Committee, and guests. Thank you all for the opportunity today to speak to you about the health needs of adolescents and my own research on abstinence-only education.

My name is John Santelli, as the Chairman indicated. I am a pediatrician, a father, and chair a department at Columbia.

Importantly, before moving to New York City I worked for

thirteen years with the CDC and, in fact, five years as a school health doctor for Baltimore City, worked extensively in research ethics.

In the past few years I have conducted research that seeks to understand adolescent sexual behavior and the reasons for the recent declines in teen pregnancy rates.

That is what I would like to speak with you about today.

My written testimony goes into some of the other important scientific and ethical critiques that have been raised about abstinence-only education for young people. I brought slides today, so I hope this works.

[Simultaneous slide presentation.]

Dr. SANTELLI. First I would like to speak they about some of the demographic realities for young people. I would suggest to you that the current U.S. emphasis on abstinence-only or abstinence-until-marriage is out of touch with the broad demographic trends and the realities of young people's lives. Premarital sex is nearly universal among young people. Based on CDC data, by the time one reaches age 44, 99 percent of Americans have had sex, and 95 percent have had premarital sex.

This reality is the result of both trends towards an earlier age of sex, beginning in the 1960s at some point, but also later trends in marriage. So, as the slide shows, in 1970 there was a gap, a small gap of only about a

year-and-a-half between first sexual intercourse and marriage, but by 2002 the gap for young women was a full eight years. For young men it is more like ten years. This is a fairly universal phenomenon. It is seen around the globe, this rising age at marriage. And it suggests that trying to get young people to wait until marriage is going to be somewhat unrealistic.

This is just to remind you of the statistic that has already been mentioned today. Teen pregnancy rates really declined fairly dramatically. Beginning around 1990 both teen birth rates and teen pregnancy rates declined pretty dramatically. The biggest declines have been among young people, often among minority youth, and that is all good news.

Of course, there is this worrisome trend that is a little hard to see, but in 2006 the birth rates went up. Let me then talk about some of the explanation for that.

Recent declines in teen sexual activity appear to be unrelated to the Federal program. According to data from CDC, rates of sexual experience among high school kids grades nine to twelve declined from about 54 percent in 1991 to about 47 percent in 2002, and essentially have been flat since 2001.

Much of the reduction in the rates of adolescent sexual activity occurred before the Federal Government began

widespread funding of abstinence education in 1998. You can see the points at which the two Federal programs were instituted.

My own research suggests that most of the decline in teen pregnancy rates, about 86 percent among 15-to 19-year-olds between 1995 and 2002 was the result of improved contraceptive use. Not surprisingly, abstinence played a somewhat greater role for the younger kids, those 15 to 17, but even in that group three-quarters of the decline was the result of improved contraceptive use. This is data based on the CDC's National Survey of Family Growth, but we have recently repeated that data using the Youth Risk Behavior Survey data, and again we found about 70 percent of that decline was the result of improved contraceptive use, consistent, I would suggest, with the European experience where European teens have much lower pregnancy rates, similar rates of sexual involvement, but much, much better contraceptive use, and therefore much lower pregnancy rates.

Unfortunately, these positive trends in contraceptive use reversed in 2005. Again, the top line is condom use, but you can see many of the other methods listed there. And you can see that in 2005, again in the high school data, condom use declined somewhat. Use of no method increased somewhat. This lines up precisely with the increase in birth rates. It is only a one-year change, but we need to keep monitoring

1625	this.
1626	Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Santelli.
1627	Dr. SANTELLI. Am I out of time?
1628	Chairman WAXMAN. You are.
1629	Dr. SANTELLI. Okay.
1630	Chairman WAXMAN. Do you want to make a concluding
1631	statement?
1632	Dr. SANTELLI. Let me just say one thing. I think a lot
1633	of what we are going to hear today or we have already heard
1634	today are differences of opinion about the facts. Good
1635	commonality on our goals. We all care about young people and
1636	I am glad to hear that. I think the panel today represents
1637	the folks who put together scientific and medical consensus
1638	in this Country, and I hope we will stop arguing over the
1639	facts and move on to what we know works.
1640	Thank you.
1641	[Prepared statement of Dr. Santelli follows:]

1642

******* INSERT *******

1643 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

Dr. Benjamin?

1645 STATEMENT OF GEORGES BENJAMIN

Dr. BENJAMIN. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. Let me just first of all thank you very much for having this hearing and just say that I am here representing the American Public Health Association, and we adopt policies every year looking at very, very important public policy issues. We have addressed this issue in 1990, 2003, 2005, and then again in 2006.

Let me just say the bulk of our policies certainly recognize the critical, critical importance of ensuring abstinence. I think every public policy person and every parent certainly wants to do that. But we have expressed significant concern about abstinence-only programs, and actually would call for their termination in terms of Federal funding in their current form.

We have had three areas of concern. Area of concern number one is fundamentally do they work. We think certainly that the weight of the evidence today, as they are currently constructed they do not work. What I mean by work means that do they create abstinence and do they create the public health outcomes that we really need in the long term. We don't think that they do that.

Secondly, just to point out that we do believe that the

alternative is comprehensive health education, particularly around sexuality issues, and we do think they work. We think that certainly nothing is perfect, but when you compare the two, that the comprehensive approach is much better.

Secondly, do the abstinence-only programs complicate other public health measures? The answer to that we certainly think is that they do, and they do in a variety of ways. One, they cause a great deal of confusion. One of the things I have learned, both in my time practicing clinical medicine, and, of course, certainly my time as a parent, that our kids are much farther along than we think they are. They know much more and they are a whole lot more curious than we think. So when you give them only a single message, they are going to seek the stuff we don't tell them in other places.

These programs in many cases don't give the kids the tools that they need, the facts that they need to combat in appropriate or inadequate or unscientific information that they may hear or pick up amongst their peers or in other places. We think there are lots of problems with that.

We think that there has been real targeting on the efficacy of condoms as an alternative, again, for those children for which abstinence has now failed. It really doesn't give them the tools to go about that, because of the lack of facts.

We think that certainly the fact that 17 States have now

said that they are not going to take funding, having been a health officer in two jurisdictions, here in the District of Columbia and in the State of Maryland, I can tell you for a health department to give up finding is a very, very significant act. That is money that could go for very important public health efforts.

And then I think finally significant ethical concerns. As a clinician, one of the challenges that I have always is figuring out what to tell people, what to tell patients, what to tell the community. I have discovered the best answer to that is to tell them what I know, tell them what I don't know, to be very clear with them, to tell them at a level, either if I am writing, at a literacy level, or in speaking, in a language that they will understand, that is culturally appropriate, that is age appropriate, and to deal with that in the most honest way that I can.

My real concerns, I think the concerns of APHA, is that, at least as currently constructed, these abstinence-only programs on bulk don't do that, and so we have real significant concerns about their continuation.

With that I will stop. Thank you.

1714 [Prepared statement of Dr. Benjamin follows:]

1715 ******** INSERT *******

1716 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Benjamin.
1717 Dr. Blythe?

1718 | STATEMENT OF MARGARET J. BLYTHE

Dr. BLYTHE. Chairman Waxman, Ranking Member Davis, members of the Committee, good morning and thank you for inviting me.

As a current Chair for the Committee on Adolescence, I have been asked to give testimony regarding the position of the American Academy of Pediatrics on Abstinence-Only Education and comprehensive sexuality education and the evidence supporting this decision.

The American Academy of Pediatrics supports
age-appropriate, comprehensive sexuality education and wants
to ensure that our Nation's resources are being allocated
towards educational approaches that are science based,
emphasize abstinence, but also provide medically accurate
information for those teens contemplating or already having
sexual experiences. That support for comprehensive education
is apparent in the policies that we have written and endorsed
and listed in this testimony.

Nearly all teens experience pressure to have sex at some time, and therefore nearly all teens are at risk for having a pregnancy or a sexually transmitted infection.

Abstinence-only programs have not been proven to change or impact adolescent sexual behaviors in an effective way, as

documented by five reviews, which include the Federally funded evaluation. Yet, vast sums of Federal monies continue to be directed towards these programs.

In fact, there is evidence to suggest that some of these programs are even harmful and have negative consequences by not providing adequate information for those teens who do become sexually active. Comprehensive sexuality education supports abstinence as the best strategy in which a teen can use to decrease the risk of unintended pregnancy and sexually acquired infections. Those adolescents who choose to abstain from sexual intercourse should obviously be encouraged and supported in their decisions by their families, peers, and communities. But abstinence should not be the only strategy that is discussed. Rigorous scientifically valid research supports the effectiveness of comprehensive sexuality education in delaying the initiation of sexual intercourse and reducing risky sexual behaviors.

When the information presented is straightforward, that means real or relevant to their life experiences and specific. That means medically accurate and correct. This means that sex education must include information on contraception and condom use.

Providing information to adolescents about contraception does not result in increased rates of sexual activity, earlier age of first intercourse, or result in a greater

number of sexual partners. Emphasizing both abstinence and protection for those who do have sex is a realistic, effective approach that does not appear to confuse young people, only perhaps sometimes the adults around them.

But, despite the encouraging results that have been reported when using comprehensive approaches, there have been no Federal monies directed specifically towards education programs. Getting teens to delay having sex or to use safer sex practices remains a challenge, as there are many factors that determine sexual behavior, and estimates suggest that there are over 500 different factors.

The most recent data suggests for the first time in 14 years the birth rate for teens in the United States has increased across virtually all racial and ethnic groups. A recent report by the Center for Disease Control estimates that one in four girls between the ages of 14 to 19 has at least one sexually transmitted infection, and, as already indicated this morning, citing the ineffectiveness of abstinence-only programs, 17 States have opted out of Federal funding.

Adolescence is a time of growth both physically, psycho-socially, and emotionally. Developing a healthy sexuality is a key developmental task for adolescents. As a physician, I spend the majority of my professional time in the trenches. Each week I personally see teens in

consultation clinics, three different community sites, a school-based clinic, and the county juvenile detention center. I also serve as the medical director of the clinical program that provided over 40,000 visits to teens last year in these different settings. In every venue teens are trying to figure it out--who they are, where they want to go, and what they want to be.

Adolescence is a time of trial and error, and, frankly, sometimes they get burned even when appropriate information has been offered or given. But we do not want them to get burned just because the information given or offered was inaccurate or distorted or not available at all. We need available to us in the trenches evidence-based approaches that support healthy decision-making regarding sexuality, which will benefit not only the health of the teens we work with on a day-to-day basis, but ultimately the health of our society and Nation as a whole.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Blythe follows:]

1810 ******** INSERT *******

1811 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Blythe.

1812 Dr. Weed?

1813 | STATEMENT OF STANLEY WEED

Mr. WEED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for inviting me here today. I have been working in this field for almost 20 years. I have learned some things about abstinence education programs. I started with a very skeptical attitude thinking how in the world could this work, given the culture and the society that kids live in. Since that time I have learned that it can work. Not all of them do, but many of them do, and we have learned which ones do and why.

I have also seen that there is a lot of misunderstanding and misperceptions. Let me give you two examples.

One young man who was asked about if he was abstinent said, No, sir. I am here every day. Another example, I have heard the phrase abstinence-only maybe 100 times here today, and in the 100 programs that I have evaluated I wouldn't classify any of them as abstinence-only. They are much broader, they are much richer, and they are much deeper than an abstinence-only just say no kind of message.

[Simultaneous slide presentation.]

Mr. WEED. With chart number four I would like to illustrate some examples of programs that work. This is out of Virginia. This program, the comparison group without the program, their initiation rate 12 months later was 16.4

percent. The program kids, their transition rate was 9.2

percent. That is a fairly substantial and significant

difference in terms of impact on initiation rates.

Patters of evidence are critical in terms of understanding program and policy effects. One rigorous study along is not sufficient. Informed decisions require multiple studies with replication of results across populations, programs, and settings. Our goal should be to look for patterns of research results that can inform best practices for risk avoidance programs.

Here is another example. This one comes from Georgia.

Our comparison kids, the transition rate for this group is

20.9 percent, and for our program kids it was 11.1

percent--again, 47 percent is likely to initiate sexual

activity, a fairly substantial impact in terms of initiation rates.

The next example, this one comes from South Carolina, a large study of kids where the comparison group initiation rates of sexual activity is 26.5 percent, and in our program group it was 14.5 percent.

Again, in all three cases cutting initiation rates in half in a one-year time period.

Now, there is a public perception that abstinence education doesn't work and that contraceptive education does work. In fact, there is a brochure out by the national

Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy. There is a brochure that says we have strong evidence about what works in preventing teen pregnancy. They list 28 programs, the impression being any one of these 28 will reduce teen pregnancy. Twenty of those twenty-eight never measured the impact on teen pregnancy. The eight that did measure it, three had results twelve months or beyond. One of the three was not a sex education program, one was retested later and failed to find results, and one of twenty-eight reported pregnancy reduction beyond twelve months. That does not constitute, in my opinion, strong evidence, nor does it support the public perception that we have mounds of evidence that this works.

Douglas Kirby, a colleague of yours and mine, I think, reviewed 115 programs--released in 2007 called Emerging

Answers--108 could be considered, could be categorized as comprehensive in terms of providing contraceptive education to kids. However, only 22 of those 115 measured the most important measure of condom use, which I think we all agree is consistent condom use. Of those twenty-two, one reported an increase in consistent condom use, and this occurred in a clinic setting not in a public school education setting. One reported no increase, but it did better than the comparison group. One out of one-hundred-and-fifteen does not constitute compelling evidence favoring contraceptive education.

There is an important point here about measurement and impact and effects. This critical measure of consistent condom use is the best indicator of success. Anything less than this standard of effectiveness cannot be considered success. Inconsistent use, according to the CDC, failure to use condoms with every act of intercourse, can lead to STD transmission because transmission can occur with a single act of intercourse.

So when we look at these programs, we are trying to compare them and weigh the evidence--which I think is your goal and I applaud you for it--we have to look at these programs in terms of do they have similar behavioral outcomes, and abstaining from sexual activity is a clear one, and consistent condom use is as close as we can come in comprehensive sex to that behavioral short-term kind of outcome. We have to have similar target populations and appropriate and similar timeframes.

Based on comparability categories--that is, population and program settings are the same, follow-up is the same, outcome measures are the same--we have only got eight studies in the abstinence category, we have thirty-four, and not all of them measure CCU.

Here's the bottom line: even when we have comparable programs, the abstinence education in Kirby's review showed five out of seven increased abstinence and nine out of

1911	thirty-four increased abstinence in the comprehensive
1912	program. However, consistent condom use, zero out of
1913	thirty-four in the comprehensive side, zero out of
1914	thirty-four that decreased STD rates. It was three that
1915	decreased pregnancy, but one of them was, as I mentioned, not
1916	replicated.
1917	I see my time is up. I can hold my last two slides if
1918	there are questions. Thank you very much.
1919	[Prepared statement of Mr. Weed follows:]
1920	****** INSERT ******

1921 Chairman WAXMAN. Okay. Thank you very much, Dr. Weed.
1922 Dr. Fineberg, good to see you again.

1923 | STATEMENT OF HARVEY FINEBERG

Dr. FINEBERG. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I am Harvey Fineberg. I am the President of the Institute of Medicine. Prior to becoming the President of the organization, I did serve as the chair of the committee that was looking into ways to reduce the risk of HIV infection, produced a report in 1999, No Time to Lose. Before that I served as Dean at the Harvard School of Public Health, and prior to that practiced part time in neighborhood health centers in Boston. I have seen this issue from a variety of perspectives.

I would like to make five points in my oral presentation to supplement the written testimony that I have submitted.

First point I would like to make is that we are dealing with very complicated and variable interventions when we talk about sex education. Even though we are lumping them in two big categories of abstinence-only or abstinence-plus, the variety of elements in these programs should be a cautionary note to us in trying to interpret their effects. Exactly what is included? Exactly who is taught? Exactly how often? Exactly by whom? Over what timeframe? What exactly is being measured as the outcome that you are interested in? And how are you deciding whether or not the program is successful?

These are all highly variable enterprises.

My second point: if you are looking for penicillin to treat pneumonia, something that has proven to work and is demonstrably successful almost all the time, no one has yet found that magic formula for sex education. Programs can be variably successful for variable times on variable outcomes, but fundamentally the dominant problems that we have in sexually transmitted infections in our young people and the continued risks of exposure to infection, as well as these other problems, are still very significant and still the most important problem that I believe you, as Members of the Congress, should be concerned with and attempting to help our Nation do better with.

My third point: because of all the variability and because of the emotionality and the prefixed positions about what works or should work, what do we want to work, one has to be especially scrupulous in examining the evidence in order to try to discern what does it tell us to date beyond this fundamental conclusion that there is no dominant, clearly victorious, magic strategy that will solve all of these problems.

And if you look at the studies that have tried to separate out the most rigorous evaluations and combine them in these broad clusters of abstinence-only or abstinence-plus and ask them, when they have looked at behavioral

interventions, that is behavioral outcome reports by individuals in the studies--are they having sex earlier, are they having more or less sex, are they using protection--when you apply those standards and look at the studies in that light, two very significant reviews from the Cochran Collaborative give us the following bottom-line information:

If you look at the abstinence-only studies of the 13 that they included, none of those studies that passed this rigorous methodologic standard demonstrated to have enduring behavioral affects. If you look at the 39 studies that they classified as abstinence-plus--and there is a lot of variability of what counts as abstinence-plus--23 of the 39 of those studies in this rigorous review found at least some benefit reported on one or another measure of behavior as a result of exposure to the programs.

Now, that doesn't mean they worked very, very well, and it doesn't mean that it is impossible that other programs could be constructed that would work better. In fact, my hope is and my urging is that we will look for those.

So my fourth point is: if you want to base your judgment on the evidence and where your dollars will go the furthest, to hamstring the interventions and the assessments, to limit them to abstinence-only education does not, in my judgment, comport with the evidence. It does not seem wise.

And my final point is that it is incumbent, I believe,

to have a more flexible, substantive, careful, evaluative 1996 approach, allowing more different strategies to be tried that 1997 are built upon the evidence to date so that we can learn 1998 1999 better what works over time, and in another ten years, when 2000 another committee is looking at the question of sex education, we will not be in the same position that we are 2001 2002 today. 2003 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. [Prepared statement of Dr. Fineberg follows:] 2004

******* INSERT *******

2005

2006

Mr. SARBANES. [Presiding]. Thank you.

2007 | STATEMENT OF MAX SIEGEL

Mr. SIEGEL. Good morning. My name is Max Siegel. Thank you for the chance to address abstinence-only-until-marriage, a policy that has transformed my life.

I share my recommendations on how to improve sexuality education programs as a 23-year-old living with HIV who has spent the entirety of his young adulthood working to prevent new infections. My goal is to portray the personal impact of this flawed policy, while explaining how the lessons I have learned may apply to other young people who today make up 15 percent of all new HIV infections.

Thank you to Chairman Waxman and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for including a HIV-positive young people in today's hearing.

I experienced abstinence-only-until-marriage education taught by my junior high school gym teacher. In his class he told me and my male classmates that sex is dangerous and that we should think more seriously about it when we grow up and marry. He made clear that only one kind of sexuality, heterosexuality, ending in marriage was acceptable to talk about. Already aware of my sexual orientation, I found no value in his speech. It did not speak to me in my life. It might as well not have happened.

While most formal abstinence-only programs are more extensive than the class I experience, they rely on similarly exclusive and stigmatizing messages that lack basic information about sexual health. Multiple studies, including a recent Federal evaluation, have found that the more expansive abstinence-only programs do not work either.

When I was 17 I began seeing someone 6 years older than me. The first time we had sex I took out a condom but he ignored it. I did not know how to assert myself further. I knew enough to suggest a condom, but I didn't adequately understand the importance of using one. And even if I did, I had no idea how to discuss condoms with my partner. The abstinence-only message did not prepare me for life, and I contracted HIV from the first person with whom I consented to having unprotected sex. I was still in high school.

I was diagnosed with HIV a few months after becoming infected. My friends and family were devastated. We didn't know about HIV, and we quickly developed false and damaging beliefs about my situation. It seemed as though I had done something particularly wrong, but it never occurred to us that I, in fact, engaged in fewer risk behaviors for HIV infection than most of my peers.

My parents were in no position to dispel these beliefs or otherwise educate me about HIV or AIDS because they, too, lacked sufficient knowledge of sexual health. Instead, they

2055 mourned the loss of their child.

I decided to pursue a career in the prevention and treatment of the virus, and one role I assumed was the role of an HIV test counselor. Over three years I gained a great deal of insight into the shared experiences of individuals living with HIV. I have not allowed discomfort to prevent me from addressing the needs of those around me, and as an educator from reacting in ways that are proven to be helpful. Sexuality education shouldn't be different. Adults should not allow their moments of discomfort to trump the needs of youth for complete and accurate information.

Sexuality education programs must be as focused as my counselling sessions. Programs must be designed to meed the needs of individual students, most of whom will be sexually active before high school graduation. Students of all ages should know abstinence as the primary method to maintain one's sexual health, but they must be given additional tools to equip them for later life. Those tools should be discussed in a way that is age appropriate by educators with whom students can identify and communicate openly. We must facilitate critical thought about sexuality in terms of keeping students healthy and ultimately alive.

Today's hearing is not about abstinence being a prevention tool--I think we all agree it is--but rather whether abstinence-only programs are deserving of Federal

resources, and the answer is no.

More individuals have this virus now than ever before in history. Most children born with HIV no longer die, they go into adolescence and adulthood. Within and outside of marriage, these young people must know how to prevent transmission of HIV to their sexual partners and how to protect themselves from further co-infection, other infections, and unintended pregnancy.

Abstinence-only curricula fail to meet the needs of individuals who are living with HIV. They further disparage HIV-positive youth by suggesting that they are dirty, dying, and unfit to be loved.

What I experienced in junior high gym class is a routine example of the messages of abstinence-only-until-marriage programs that children across the Country still experience today. These programs ignore the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans-gender youth who are at particularly high risk for HIV infection, and use Government dollars to condemn them. They also compromise young women's safety by portraying sexually active females as scarred and untrustworthy.

From the health care perspective, it is essential that Congressional scrutiny of these programs focus on the consequences of abstinence-only's condemnation of young people.

epidemic now. I have worked with many women who contracted HIV within marriage. A woman asking her husband to respect her decision to abstain from sex or to use a condom is not supported by abstinence-only's teaching that sex is an expectation within marriage and that condoms do not work. There is no sufficient reason why this completely preventable infectious disease should have impacted any of our lives.

After six years of living with HIV and striving to prevent this virus in others, I strongly believe that it is society's responsibility to give young people all the tools they will need to lead healthy lives. Any American infected with HIV is a societal failure. I see no room for abstinence-only in this time of shrinking public health budgets and increased accountability. Please end the failed experiment of abstinence-only-until-marriage education.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Siegel follows:]

2122 ******** INSERT *******

2123 Mr. SARBANES. Thank you very much, Mr. Siegel.

2124 Ms. Knox, please, five minutes.

2125 STATEMENT OF SHELBY KNOX

2126 Ms. KNOX. Thank you.

Good morning distinguished members of the Committee. My name is Shelby Knox, and I am a 21-year-old speaker and sexual health educator. It is an honor to be here to share my personal experience with abstinence-only-until-marriage programs and to provide a youth perspective on their appropriateness and effectiveness.

I was born and raised in a Southern Baptist family in Lubbock, Texas, a city with some of the highest rates of sexually transmitted infection and teen pregnancy in the Nation. At 15, in accordance with my faith, I took a virginity pledge at my church. The same pastor who officiated at my religious pledge ceremony also presented a secularized abstinence-only program to students in my school district. Many students were already having sex and needed information to protect their health; however, he expounded on the ineffectiveness of condoms, explaining in graphic detail and with even more graphic pictures the sexually transmitted infections one could get if we trusted our health to a flimsy piece of latex.

We were all too intimidated or embarrassed to ask for clarification, but it seemed as if sex with a condom was the

equivalent of sex without a condom.

He also touched on the ills of masturbation and warned against homosexual sex. One demonstration he used left little doubt as to our worth as a future spouse or partner or person if we were to engage in sexual activity before marriage. He pulled an often squirming and reluctant and always female volunteer onto the stage, took out a toothbrush that looked like it had been used to scrub toilets, and asked her if she would brush her teeth with it. When she predictably refused, he pulled out another toothbrush, this one pristine, in its original box, and asked her if she would brush her teeth with that toothbrush. When she answered in the affirmative, he turned to the assembly and said, If you have sex before marriage, you are a dirty toothbrush.

Many of my peers were struggling with questions, and most were not abstaining from sex. The statistics became alarmingly personal when the girl who sat next to me in math class got pregnant. She told me her boyfriend had said she couldn't get pregnant the first time she had sex. Her growing belly was the result of that first and only time.

Another friend, trying to be responsible, used two condoms at once. He had been taught that using a condom wouldn't work, so he tried two. Only later did I find out that using two condoms together was likely to cause both to break.

I believed in abstinence in a religious sense, but it was clear that abstinence-only as a policy for students who simply were not abstaining was dangerous. Even if we did wait until marriage, we still lacked a basic understanding of our bodies, reproduction, and how to prevent pregnancy, as well as a long list of sexually transmitted infections, including HIV, and the skills to have conversations about sex and protection. I felt betrayed by the people who I trusted to tell me the truth--my pastor, my teachers, the school district, and the elected officials who deemed an ineffective policy good politics if not sound science.

I got involved with a group urging the school district to change the abstinence-only policy to a more comprehensive sexuality education curriculum that would include abstinence, as well as medically accurate information on a wide range of human sexuality topics.

My parents, proud conservatives who encouraged my virginity pledge, joined me in asking the school board to change the curriculum, because they wanted me to have complete and accurate information about my body and sexuality. They didn't see a conflict with encouraging me to remain abstinence while at the same time ensuring that my classmates and I received the tools in school to make healthy and responsible decisions about our lives. They were in good company--85 percent of parents believe that teens should

2198 receive information about abstinence as well as how to 2199 protect themselves.

Abstinence works. Abstinence-only-until-marriage does not. It is morally unethical to leave young people without the information they need to protect themselves. Studies have shown a more comprehensive approach to sex education that gives us a strong message about abstinence and information about condoms and contraception do a better job helping young people abstain than do abstinence-only-until-marriage programs.

So why is it that not a single Federal dollar has ever been dedicated to a comprehensive approach while more than \$1 billion has been spent on abstinence-only education? As a young person with first-hand experience about the misinformation, shame, guilt, and intolerance propagated by these programs, I urge you to eliminate funding for abstinence-only-until-marriage programs and to, instead, allocate those funds to comprehensive, medically accurate sex education that provides young people with the tools they need to make responsible, informed decisions about their sexual health.

Once again, it was an honor to speak to you today, and I will be happy to answer any of your questions at the appropriate time.

[Prepared statement of Ms. Knox follows:]

PAGE 104

HGO114.000

2223 ********** INSERT ********

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you very much for the testimony, everybody on the panel, in particular Mr. Siegel and Ms. Knox for relating your personal perspective on these issues.

I share the concern of a number who have already spoken today about the failure of these programs to demonstrate success, the abstinence-only programs, to demonstrate success, and the fact that we plow over \$1 billion now into these programs.

One of the questions that I wanted to ask you, Dr.

Benjamin, you noted--and I have taken note of this, as

well--that 17 States have now refused to take this funding

because of the restrictions that accompany it, and you

mentioned that that is a huge decision. I mean, States are

strapped. They need as many dollars as they can to support

their public health initiatives. I was curious if you could

maybe expound on that a little bit. What would go into a

decision at the State level to pass up that kind of funding?

what would the discussion process be inside the department?

Dr. BENJAMIN. You know, we would first of all look at the program guidance and see if a particular program strapped our hands around our other programs. That would be the first thing we looked at. If that did, that creates a real problem for us.

Secondly, we have lots of programs already in place, and the question is would it create a dilemma for us to have a

program where our citizens were going into Door A and getting one kind of program, which was maybe State funded and supported, which was more comprehensive, and then Door B, where they could only get another particular program. That creates logistical, ethical, and programmatic problems.

I think at the end of the day are the reporting requirements and are the logistical problems and ethical problems not worth taking the money, quite frankly. At least that is what we would do at my health department. We would have sat down and had those discussions.

We would certainly also ask ourselves how can we effectively evaluate these programs. In other words, you know, we are always doing pilots. As you know, I am from Maryland, so we love pilots in Maryland, at least we did. We might have even tried to do a pilot program. Let's see if they work. But then, of course, we would have to have adequate funds to evaluate that program. And then, of course, if it didn't work we would stop.

Mr. SARBANES. Beyond the logistics of it, presumably these States have made a judgment, based on the research and the success or lack of success of these programs, that it is not worth the funding.

Dr. BENJAMIN. I think from a programmatic and policy perspective, absolutely.

Mr. SARBANES. Right.

2274

2275

2276

2277

2278

2279

2280

2281

2282

2283

2284

2285

2286

2287

2288

2289

2290

2291

2292

2293

2294

2295

2296

2297

2298

Dr. BENJAMIN. And the more evidence that comes out that suggests they may not work, the more States you will see not taking the dollars.

Mr. SARBANES. This is a question I would put to anyone on the panel who would like to answer it, including Mr. Siegel and Ms. Knox, and that is: I am getting the impression that there has been a lot of testimony that the comprehensive sex education programs are more effective, and the debate is largely a false one because we keep hearing people interpret the objection to abstinence-only programs as an objection to abstinence education, when, in fact, I don't think that is what anyone is saying here who opposes abstinence-only. So we kind of dance around the concept, but not landing on it four square yet, and that is this: listening to testimony and reading the research, it strikes me that the abstinence education actually is advanced and reinforced when it is inside of a comprehensive program, so that those who feel strongly about the message of abstinence -- and I echo the parents who have spoken here today. I have a 17-year-old, a 14-year-old, and a 9-year-old, so all these statistics are ones that catch my attention, and I understand what my own kids are grappling with. But as somebody who would like them to get that message of the benefits of abstinence, I come away from this discussion believing strongly that if they get that message

2299 | inside a larger program it is going to be more effective.

I invite anybody to address that. We can just go down the line here.

Mr. WEED. I would like to respond to that, Mr. Chairman.

Looking at the evidence in terms of abstinence in the context of the broader, there are some studies that have produced effects in terms of initiation of sexual activity, but those effects have been smaller for initiation than the effects that we find in programs that are abstinence centered, and I will use that term advisedly rather than abstinence-only. The effects are smaller when it is in the context than they are when it is done well and separately.

Mr. SARBANES. Let me get some other perspectives on that, going down the line.

Dr. SANTELLI. I guess I would firmly agree with you. I draw the attention of the Committee to the written testimony of Doug Kirby, who is, I think, the leading expert at reviewing sexuality education. It is fully consistent with what Dr. Fineberg was talking about, the Cochran reviews. Those evaluations suggest that many of the comprehensive sexuality education programs are effective when they deliver both messages, if you will, are effective at getting kids to delay initiative.

Now, on the other hand I would point out that across these programs, even the best ones, we are talking about a

delay of maybe four to six months, sometimes smaller, and 2324 l that really begs the question: what are we doing for kids 2325 for the rest of their lives? So if we delay from 15 to 2326 2327 15-and-a-half or 17 to 17-and-a-half or 18, we need to make sure that those young people are ready. 2328 2329 Dr. BLYTHE. Can I have another comment? 2330 Mr. SARBANES. Yes. Dr. BLYTHE. As a physician in the field, in the 2331 trenches, one of the issues that has come up is the teaching 2332 that we give in clinics, and even families give to their 2333 young people, are being revoked by the education in school. 2334 We had a clear example of this last week when a young man was 2335 being pulled into the clinic by his Mom, 16-year-old, with an 2336 obvious genital infection, and his comment to her was, But, 2337 2338 Mom, I was told in school they don't work. So when our clinical messages are being revoked by the education that 2339 they are getting in the schools, it is clearly 2340 counterproductive to the health of these young people. 2341 Mr. SARBANES. I have run out of time, but maybe if you 2342 two have a brief response. 2343 2344 Mr. SIEGEL. It is a blatant indication of policy-makers' distrust of youth to make responsible decisions about their 2345 sexual health, and it is not empirically supported. 2346 been shown repeatedly in Federal evaluation that 2347 comprehensive sexuality education is better at leading to 2348

abstinence, which should be the goal of these programs, along 2349 2350 with preventing HIV and other STIs and unintended pregnancy. Mr. SARBANES. Thank you very much. 2351 2352 Mr. Sali? Mr. SALI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2353 First of all, I have a written statement that I had 2354 intended to give at the beginning of the meeting but wasn't 2355 2356 allowed the opportunity. I would ask unanimous consent that 2357 that be added to the record. 2358 Mr. SARBANES. Without objection. [Prepared statement of Mr. Sali follows:] 2359

******* INSERT *******

2360

Mr. SALI. As a part of this, as well, Senator Brownback referred to a Heritage Foundation study that was released yesterday, and I would ask unanimous consent that that be included as part of the record of the hearing today, as well.

Mr. SARBANES. Without objection.

[The referenced information follows:]

Mr. SALI. Thank you.

Dr. Benjamin, a moment ago I was hearing some discussion about the delay of sexual activity, and I think I heard a number of four to six months delay. I think in your testimony you refer to a delay from abstinence pledges by up to 18 months, delaying the sexual activity. Am I correct, number one, in your statement? And can you tell me why we are getting that disparity in the figures that we are hearing here?

Dr. BENJAMIN. The answer is yes, that is what we said.

Dr. SANTELLI. I mean, one has to look at programs that are attempting and a curriculum that are attempting to change something and a study that is following kids who then self report. Okay? So the 18-month delay which was found by Peter Bearman and his colleagues was a study where kids said they signed up for a virginity pledge. If you intend to be abstinent, you are more likely.

I would also point out that in Dr. Bearman's own work, that the long-term follow-up of that was that STD rates were the same among the pledging group and among the non-pledging group, and, in fact, there was--what shall we say, a displacement phenomenon? So word on anal sex was increased in the pledging group. So yes, there is one study that shows this long delay, but in terms of the outcomes that Stan was mentioning, we are not seeing them.

Mr. SALI. That would lead me to believe that the 2393 information about abstinence was incomplete. Is that what 2394 you are saying? In other words, nobody told the kids that if 2395 2396 they deviate from regular intercourse, heterosexual 2397 intercourse, that that wouldn't be abstinent? Is that the message you are telling? 2398 Dr. BENJAMIN. That is correct. I think the point is 2399 that if you don't give kids all of the information, then they 2400 misinterpret vaginal intercourse and they totally associate 2401 that with abstinence, and yet then they have these other 2402 risky behaviors, which they do continue because they don't 2403 2404 think that is sex. Mr. SALI. Thank you. 2405 Dr. Weed, you had a couple slides you didn't get to. 2406 2407 there any way we could see those at this time? 2408 Mr. WEED. I could tell you something. Put number 15 up There are effective programs, there are 2409 2410 less-effective programs when it comes to abstinence education. Just to clarify, however, on the Bearman study, 2411 we wouldn't call that an abstinence education program. 2412 was kind of a rally and a pledge deal, but it didn't fulfill 2413 2414 the kinds of requirements we think that effective programs 2415 need. 2416 I have listed them up here. First of all, an effective program has adequate dosage. Successful programs attend to 2417

the critical factor of adequate dosage and deliver that dosage on an effective schedule.

The pledge programs don't meet that criteria. There are important mediating factors, and this goes beyond the simplistic notion of providing information, but effectively addressing the key predictors of adolescent sexual risk behavior that are amenable to intervention, and we have identified at least a half dozen of these important mediating variables, and if a program doesn't address those it will not, in all likelihood, produce an effect on sexual activity.

We have also determined that the messenger in a program is at least as important as the message. I am thinking of Max's example. I think he didn't have a very good messenger in that gym teacher. Effective teachers make more of a difference in program outcomes than do printed materials. These teachers engage students in the learning process, gain their respect, model their message, and believe in their ability to impact students.

Finally, effective programs conduct quality program evaluation and take seriously the lessons learned, especially those that identify program shortcomings.

So it is a process of growth and development and maturation, and effective programs that follow even those basic steps are within a 12-month period, after a 12-month period are reducing transition rates by 50 percent.

Mr. SALI. Dr. Weed, if I understand you correctly, your 2443 message here is that an effective abstinence program will 2444 2445 make a difference, but the program is most of what has been 2446 passing for abstinence, that message is either not the message, it is not delivered in the correct manner, or the 2447 people who are delivering it are not doing a good job at it. 2448 2449 Is that accurate? 2450 Mr. WEED. That is correct. 2451 Mr. SALI. Thank you. 2452 Mr. WEED. And there are good ones, there are weak ones. 2453 They vary. Dr. BLYTHE. Can I just hasten to make a comment? 2454 2455 Mr. SALI. Quickly. Dr. BLYTHE. That particular study is good, but we also 2456 have to realize that was in 7th graders, and so when the rate 2457 of sexual experience is very low we need to look at programs 2458 that carry forth the message of abstinence in a realistic way 2459 2460 into the high school years in terms of as kids get older. 2461 just hesitate to say that this gives a good example of all 2462 the information that kids need, obviously. Mr. SARBANES. Thank you. 2463 Mr. Hodes? 2464 2465 Mr. SIEGEL. May I also respond to the personal statement about my personal experience? 2466 Mr. SARBANES. Let me just get to Mr. Hodes, because I 2467

2468 know he has to get to another hearing.

2469 Mr. Hodes?

2470 Mr. HODES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank the panel for your testimony. We are dealing with what strikes me as a public health crisis, and we are doing so in a society which has an extraordinarily uneasy relationship with the issues of sexual activity, given what we see in the media, given the messages our kids get, given my experience prior to coming to Congress as a family lawyer where I saw divorce rates above 50 percent, so marriage isn't always working the way it should.

But our Nation is facing a crisis in adolescent reproductive health--750,000 pregnancies among teens aged 15 to 19 annually, nearly one in three teen girls becomes pregnant before reaching the age of 20. Last year, as we have heard, the teen birth rate rose for the first time in 15 years, and the CDC is telling us that one in four teen girls has a sexually transmitted disease.

In terms of an effective response to this public health crisis, does the impartial, peer-reviewed, scientific evidence support abstinence-only programs as an effective response to this crisis? Dr. Santelli?

Dr. SANTELLI. No. You would have to say no. I mean, I think science operates by a number of mechanisms, one of which is peer review, another of which is weight of the

evidence, so one realizes that it is difficult to establish cause and effect, that the program actually worked. These are not easy things, and so scientists work together through their professional associations, through journals, medical and scientific journals, to establish what we understand is the weight of the evidence. And then people like the Cochran Group in Great Britain, people like Doug Kirby then try to review the evidence.

The answer, from both Cochran and Dr. Kirby, is no, these programs are not working. I know we have heard some evidence presented today. I would take exception to some of the specifics that I heard today. At least one of the studies was passing out condoms that is represented as an abstinence-only study. I think that the work of Mr. Rector and Stan's review here needs to be subjected to peer review, and I don't think it is going to hold up.

Mr. HODES. Dr. Benjamin?

Dr. BENJAMIN. I think the answer is not as currently constructed for the abstinence-only programs. May I go further by saying that I do think that we have a crisis. I agree wholeheartedly with you. And I believe that means that we need to structure, fund, and fully support a more comprehensive approach. I do believe those programs should be evaluated, and then we should continue to fund those things that work, and they need to have a very strong

2518 abstinence component to them.

Mr. HODES. Dr. Blythe?

Dr. BLYTHE. I think the short answer is no, obviously both from the reviews that are being mentioned, but also from a clinical perspective, as well as a policy perspective.

Mr. HODES. Dr. Weed?

Mr. WEED. Thank you. It is true that there is a small amount of evidence even available on abstinence education. There is not a lot of people that do that kind of work. Our company probably does more than anybody in the Nation. But if you look on balance, you look at where we are with contraceptive programs, contraceptive education, and after 115 peer-reviewed studies they haven't been able to demonstrate an impact on STD rates, then we are not very good in that camp, either. So let's look at both, figure out what is going to work, and be fair about how we compare them.

Dr. Fineberg mentioned that there were nine studies that showed some positive outcomes. Well, that is great, but if they don't produce consistent condom use they are not going to be protected, and we can't find any studies in a school or community setting, never mind the clinic, but in a school or community setting where consistent condom use has been increased by contraceptive and comprehensive sex education.

Mr. HODES. Dr. Weed, could I just drill down for a moment?

2543	Mr. WEED. You bet.
2544	Mr. HODES. One thing I would like to ask you. You
2545	understand the importance and value and general accepted
2546	standard of impartial peer review of studies, do you not?
2547	Mr. WEED. Sure.
2548	Mr. HODES. Has an impartial peer review journal ever
2549	endorsed or reported your findings?
2550	Mr. WEED. Yes. The three that I put up, two of them
2551	have been peer reviewed and the third one is in the pipeline
2552	Mr. HODES. Could I ask one last question, just finish
2553	this with Dr. Fineberg?
2554	Briefly, Dr. Fineberg, my question: does the impartial
2555	peer-reviewed scientific evidence support abstinence-only as
2556	an effective response to our public health crisis?
2557	Dr. FINEBERG. It does not.
2558	Mr. HODES. Thank you.
2559	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2560	Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Jordan?
2561	Mr. JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would ask
2562	unanimous consent that my statement and some accompanying
2563	abstinence education material be included in the record.
2564	Mr. SARBANES. Without objection.
2565	[Prepared statement of Mr. Jordan and referenced
2566	information follow:]

PAGE 120

HGO114.000

2567 ******* INSERT *******

2568 Mr. JORDAN. Thank you.

I want to thank the panel for being here, too. I have got two fundamental questions that I want to ask, and I was going to ask these of the Senator and I should say at the start I kind of share the Senator's perspective on this entire issue, but I want to get to two fundamental questions. Do you really think the Federal Government should be involved in this area to begin with, the same Federal Government that can't secure the border, loses your tax return, the same Federal Government that is going to spend \$3.1 trillion this year? Do you really think this is an area that the Federal Government should be involved with to begin with, regardless of which one it is, but particularly, in my judgment, the comprehensive approach?

And then the second question--and you can all jump in on both of these when I finish--the premise of all this, particularly the comprehensive approach is--and we have heard this discussed here all morning long--the premise is the culture is such young people are bombarded with all kinds of messages, they are already engaging in some of this risky behavior, so we need to talk about a comprehensive approach, we need to give them the facts on how to prevent disease, etc.

But do you ever think that by the fact we are having educators, people in positions of authority, talk about this,

we actually might contribute to the problem? I think,

Doctor, we talked about effective educators versus those who

aren't. Maybe this is just a country boy from ohio talking,

but I have heard this from constituents: the more you talk

about it, the more it happens, particularly when someone in

positions of authority giving mixed messages to young people.

I want to just cite one example of that, and then I will be happy to hear your response.

This is material our office obtained. It is called, Be Proud, Be Responsible: Strategies to Empower Youth to Reduce the Risk of HIV and AIDS. It was put together by a grant.

Are any of you familiar with this curriculum? Heads shaking.

Okay.

I look at one of the worksheets here. Talk about mixed messages and are we maybe even contributing to some of the figures that were given to us. This is an HIV risk continuum worksheet, lists different things. Then it has on the side here red light, yellow light, green light. Red light, don't do; yellow light caution, obviously. And we are all familiar with this green light, or some of us view yellow lights as different than caution, but I understand.

But I will list just a couple. One says having sex with multiple partners and not using a condom, red light. Two others, though, showering together, green light. So maybe there is a green light, but think about the message that

indirectly sends to young people. The third, doing drugs but not sharing needles and syringes, and the correct placement here on the side says yellow or green light.

Again, I think sometimes we get so focused on what is happening, but we might be sending the wrong kind of message, and that has always been my concern with the comprehensive approach, the mixed messages we are sending out there to people.

I would also argue that folks in west-central Ohio, which I get the chance to represent, when you talk to them about the Federal Government getting involved--I made a statement yesterday to a group of folks I made a speech to, and I said 15 months on the job--I am just a rookie--has confirmed what I suspected: with the exception of the military, the Federal Government doesn't do anything very well. And now we are going to get into this whole area.

With all that, fire away and tell me if I am wrong or tell me if you agree with me.

Mr. SIEGEL. Can I respond? It is great to hear someone from ohio speak. Ohio recently rejected the Title V funding and applied for CDC-dash funding, so they are moving in the direction of comprehensive from what I can tell.

Responding to your first question about Government involvement, I definitely understand what you are saying. I mean, if Government is a consumer they have two products to

PAGE 124 HGO114.000

They can buy from the abstinence-only program or 2643 they can buy from the comprehensive sexuality education 2644 program.

2645

2646

2647

2648

2649

2650

2651

2652

2653

2654

2655

2656

2657

2658

2659

2660

2661

2662

2663

2664

2665

2666

2667

Mr. JORDAN. My point is this, though: should they be buying from the Federal Government, or would we be better served if they bought from the State and local government, parents, school boards, teachers, and folks at the State level.

Mr. SIEGEL. Which I agree with. I definitely think that local level they need to make those decisions, which Ohio is doing, from what I can tell.

Also, as far as mixed messages, I don't totally understand that logic and never have as an educator. I feel like if you teach students about fire extinguishers, you are not encouraging them to start fires. I don't see what the mixed message is and I don't think that shows up in the research as frequently.

Mr. JORDAN. Most everywhere else educators set the standard, recognizing that 100 percent of the students won't meet the standard, but we set the standard and that is what we aim for. We don't say, Oh, because we know some of you aren't going to get there, here's what you should. Everywhere else in our culture, everywhere else in life, everywhere else in education we set the high standard. is coming from someone that spent years in the coaching and

2668 teaching profession. That is what we do. Yet this area is 2669 different.

Mr. SIEGEL. It hasn't been different, though, is the thing.

Mr. JORDAN. I would argue it has.

2685 l

2689 l

Ms. KNOX. May I respond, as well? Could I say that west Texas is a lot like Ohio. That is where I come from, west Texas. My parents, who are no fans of Government involvement in anything, always told me that they wanted the school to be teaching this information because they didn't have that information themselves. They wanted me to have complete and accurate medical information about my sexual health, but neither of them had been to medical school, neither of them had gotten information about the up-to-date information to protect yourself, so they wanted a reliable sex education program within the schools to be teaching me that information. That is just coming from my perspective with my parents.

I also wanted to add really quickly--

Mr. JORDAN. I want to hear from two others up there.

Ms. KNOX. I have always liked the analysis that umbrellas don't cause rain. Young people are smart enough to make responsible decisions, especially when they are given the tools to interpret those complex messages that we are receiving.

Mr. JORDAN. Let me hear from Dr. Weed and Dr. Santelli.

Mr. WEED. The question I think you are asking--let me get back to it--is should the Federal Government be involved in trying to promote good health and preventive medicine. If we could do it right, if we could do it well, I would say yes. So far we haven't done that. I think there are ways that we can structure policies and programs and funding strategies to be more effective.

For example, in the abstinence education area I have got some suggestions on how that money could be better spent. I have also got some suggestions on how we could do better with our comprehensive sex dollars and hold them to a standard and evaluate them the same way we are doing with the abstinence programs.

I think there is a role, but it is that the responsibility is so huge and the impact is so large it has to be done extremely well, and we haven't been very good at it.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you.

2712 Ms. McCollum?

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I was in my office, and people were kind of watching
this along with me, so I didn't get all of the testimony but
quite a bit of it.

Dr. Blythe, if I could pull from the back end of your

testimony, the Society of Adolescence Medicine summarizes its 2718 2719 expert review of sexuality education with the following: ''Abstinence from sexual intercourse represents a healthy 2720 choice for teenagers. As teenagers face considerable risk to 2721 their reproductive health from unintended pregnancies, STIs, 2722 including infection with HIV. Remaining abstinent -- ' and I 2723 2724 am quoting from your words. I think this is wonderful. "Remaining abstinent, at least through high school, is 2725 strongly supported by parents and even adolescents, 2726 themselves. However, few Americans remain abstinent until 2727 marriage. Many do or cannot marry, and the most intimate 2728 sexual intercourse and other sexual behaviors as adolescents. 2729 2730 Abstinence as a behavioral goal is not the same as 2731 abstinence-only programs. Abstinence from sexual intercourse, while theoretically is fully protective, often 2732 fails to provide against pregnancy, disease, and actual 2733 practice because abstinence is not maintained.'' In other 2734 words, it is having all the information available to you. 2735 2736 We talked to the earlier panel. There is a continuum of I mean, parents with different skill sets 2737 sex education. 2738 feel more comfortable talking to their children. We just heard Ms. Knox say her parents liked having accurate, 2739 scientific information made available to their daughter. 2740 2741 I would like you to address why it is so important that age-appropriate, parent-involved--and I think school boards 2742

need to involve the parents when they do this--why this is so important to a whole child's health, because pediatrics doesn't end when they are 10, 12, 13, or 14.

And then to the two women on the panel, I am kind of concerned about some of the things that have been said both in testimony and by some of my colleagues up here. One in fourteen (sic) girls having sexually transmitted diseases. Well you know, folks, it just isn't the girls that have the sexually transmitted diseases. You know, checking out who my son was going out with or who my daughter is going out with, with the implication one gender is more temptuous or whatever. I hope we can leave those stereotypes behind, because the stereotypes are also in some of the abstinence-only, such as the man's role is to protect the woman, or that women need financial support. Women, we need to protect ourselves and we need to support ourselves.

Doctor, would you please?

Dr. BLYTHE. Well, obviously the statement stands, as we believe. I think a couple comments. Abstinence is part of comprehensive sexuality education, and we have heard several comments this morning about parents want abstinence for their children, and that is correct, but in all the surveys that we have available—and the most recent one actually just came out of Minnesota—is that 89 percent of parents of school—aged children want their young people to have

comprehensive, age-appropriate sexuality education, with
abstinence as a center stage, but also giving them the tools
to deal with the complexities of life that they are faced
with on a day-to-day basis.

So in young people, meaning in the middle school age, strong messages of abstinence often work. But as they get older and they become more cognitively complex, then they need more answers than just this or that, so we need to be able to give them the tools to deal with the different issues, the different situations that come up on a day-by-day basis as they get older.

- Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you.
- 2780 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 2781 Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Ms. McCollum.
- 2782 Ms. Foxx?

2772

2773

2774

2775

2776

2777

2778

2779

- 2783 Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- There is so much to try to get on the record in so
 little time. I want to ask the panel a question. Mr. Hodes
 a few minutes ago made the comment that 50 percent of
 marriages end in divorce. How many of you have heard that
 before and think that it is the commonly accepted fact in our
 Country? Would you hold up your hand? Just hold up your
 hand if you believe that.
- 2791 Mr. WEED. That was 50 percent of what?
- 2792 Ms. FOXX. That 50 percent of marriages end in divorce.

How many of you have heard that comment over and over in our Country and believe it? You believe it, hold up your hand.

[Show of hands.]

2793

2794

2795

2796

2797

2798

2799

2800

2801

2802

2803

2804

2805

2806

2807

2808

2809

2810

2811

2812

2813

2814

2815

2816

2817

Ms. FOXX. All right. Well, let me tell you, in 1987 pollster Lew Harris has written, 'The idea that half of American marriages are doomed is one of the most specious pieces of statistical nonsense ever perpetuated in modern It all began when the Census Bureau noted that during one year there were 2.4 million marriages and 1.2 million divorces. Someone did the math without calculating the 54 million marriages already in existence, and presto, a ridiculous but quotable statistic was born.'' Harris concludes, ''Only one out of eight marriages will end in divorce. In any single year, only about 2 percent of existing marriages will break up.'' task order my point on that is to support what Mark Twain said: figures often bequile me, particularly when I have the arranging of them myself, in which case the remark attributed to Desraili would often apply with justice and force. There are three kinds of lies: lies, damn lies, and statistics. Both of those things I think sort of the framework for what we have been listening to this morning.

I want to also make a comment about what Ms. Knox said in her comments: ''So why is it that there is not a single Federal dollar dedicated to a comprehensive approach, while

more than \$1 billion has been spent on 2818 abstinence-only-until-marriage?'' This from someone who sat 2819 through all of the testimony this morning on the fact that 2820 seven times more money is going into comprehensive programs 2821 2822 than abstinence programs. I have one other question I would like to ask you, and I 2823 just want a yes or no answer from each member of the panel. 2824 2825 I will start on that end. If, provided evidence of abstinence education programs 2826 are as or more effective than comprehensive sex education, 2827 would you support optional Federal funding for such programs? 2828 2829 I just want a yes or no. Dr. SANTELLI. No. 2830 Ms. FOXX. Next person. 2831 Dr. BENJAMIN. No. 2832 2833 Dr. BLYTHE. No. 2834 Mr. WEED. Yes. Dr. FINEBERG. Yes. 2835 Mr. SIEGEL. No. 2836 2837 Ms. KNOX. No. Thank you very much. The record will Ms. FOXX. Okay. 2838 2839 show how each person answered. To me I think this shows the situation that we are 2840 dealing with here. I also find it very interesting that the 2841 word scientific has been used a lot. Do we have scientific 2842

2843 l

studies that prove the abstinence issue? Well, I would like to say to you that there is no more scientific fact than that abstinence is the only sure way to avoid pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. I don't know how anybody could argue that that is the scientific fact. Yet, people keep saying we need scientific evidence that these programs are working, and we don't have the scientific evidence that they are working.

I want to tell you I come from a background of being a social scientists, so I know a little bit about how these things can be used.

I have one more question. Dr. Weed, you stated about goals, intensity, content, all of those things vary across all types of sex education programs. Do we have any kind of evidence as to the effectiveness of the programs? And, Dr. Fineberg, you can answer this, too, but, Dr. Weed, would you answer it? I believe you have a study that shows that; is that correct?

Mr. WEED. I am trying to sort the question out. The studies that we have done, if the program is designed well, implemented well, has the right kind of teachers, focuses on the right kind of issues, and is not narrowly defined and prescribed as an abstinence-only, which I think is a terrible misnomer, if it is done well, if it is done right we see impact. However, programs that are fairly new, fresh out of

the block, they are trying to figure it out, it sometimes
takes them about three years to work out the kinks and get on
a track where they have an impact.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you.

Dr. Fineberg, would you like to say anything?

Dr. FINEBERG. Again, the most rigorous comparisons with very strict methodologic requirements to look at the studies find that the more comprehensive and inclusive programs do have approximately two-thirds of the time in those studies some positive effects. That was 23 of 39 studies.

Of the studies that were looked at, the 13 that were more narrowly framed as abstinence-only, they found in none of those cases that there were positive behavioral effects.

That was in, again, applying this very strict, rigorous, methodologic screen for studies aimed at preventing infection of HIV and sexually transmitted infections.

Ms. FOXX. Who did that study?

Dr. FINEBERG. These are studies by the Cochran Collaboration, the lead author is Underhill. I did include the citations in my written testimony.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have just one other comment to make.

We have thrown again a lot of statistics around here, and much has been made about the fact that 17 States are not taking the funding, but let me point out 33 is more than 17.

2893 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman WAXMAN. [Presiding]. Mr. Yarmuth? 2894 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank all the 2895 2896 witnesses. Doctor Weed, you showed us some studies that indicated 2897 that in--I quess you call them abstinence-centered programs? 2898 2899 Mr. WEED. Abstinence-centered would be the preferred 2900 term. Mr. YARMUTH. -- succeeded in reducing the rate of 2901 initiation of sex by 40 something percent, which I think 2902 2903 people would say that is a benefit. That would be 2904 successful. But in the most optimum case, the rate of those who, if I read the chart correctly, who did initiate sex in 2905 spite of that was still around 10 percent. That was the best 2906 l performance. So my question is, While we may say that the 2907 2908 program was successful in one respect, was it a failure with regard to the 10 percent or more, and, in fact, did we not do 2909 2910 them a disservice and maybe even put them at risk because we 2911 didn't give them other information? Mr. WEED. I think that is a good question, because--by 2912 2913 the way, it applies broadly. If we want to apply that standard of success, we say yes, we had a 10 percent failure, 2914 2915 whereas in terms of consistent condom use we have 100 percent failure. So let's kind of balance it and look at both sides. 2916

Mr. YARMUTH. I get that, but would not the real

2917

follow-up to that be: did you do any damage by including comprehensive? Did you make it worse for anyone by including comprehensive sex education, because, as I understand all the rest of the studies, there really isn't any evidence that comprehensive sex education increases the rate of sexual activity.

Mr. WEED. We can apply one standard that says it doesn't increase the rate, and we can apply the other standard that says it fails 10 percent of the time. Those are two different standards. I am just asking for using the same standards when we do the comparison.

Mr. YARMUTH. All right. Let me ask Mr. Siegel and Ms. Knox, because they both alluded to things that have intrigued me, and I only focus on you because you are the youngest among us.

Is sex education, whether it is abstinence-only or comprehensive or anything else they learn in school the only thing kids learn about sex?

Mr. SIEGEL. Absolutely not.

Mr. YARMUTH. So what you may learn in abstinence-only education or in comprehensive sex education actually is considered, and it is input that is taken against a backdrop of a lot of different input about sex, including peers, information from your peers, including media, all sorts of things.

Ms. KNOX. Yes, I would agree, although let me point out quickly that I have undergone both abstinence-only and comprehensive sex education. Only comprehensive sex education gave me the tools, gave me the information to go out and interpret the other messages that I was getting from the media, from my peers, other things that I was hearing.

Mr. YARMUTH. So if you are getting information, let's say you are getting abstinence-only education in school or abstinence-centered education, there is a real danger that it is going to run up against a lot of different contrary input that you are getting from your friends. I mean, you may be talking to your friends who are having sex every weekend, unprotected, protected, but you are getting different information from them than you are getting in school. My question would be: how does that make you feel about the rest of your education? Does it undermine the credibility of what you are getting in other areas?

Ms. KNOX. It would be the same to me as if I went into math class and my teacher said two plus two is five. I mean, that doesn't jive with anything that I have ever heard out there in the world. That is what abstinence-only education was to me. It was not in reality as to what was happening in my live and in the lives of other people in my community.

Mr. SIEGEL. May I also add abstinence-only education teaches stigma. If you can't get married, how is abstinence

PAGE 137 HGO114.000

ever going to help you? That is reinforced by the rest of 2968 society as a young person when you go out there, and it doesn't serve the needs of young people living with HIV, because they will need to know how to use condoms even if they get married. So once again it is neglected. It is neglected in greater culture and it is neglected in the classroom.

Mr. YARMUTH. I am not sure exactly how this relates, but I know it relates in some way. I was a journalist before I entered politics, and the paper that I worked with did a story several years ago about oral sex among 12-and 13-year-olds, and we sent actually teenage reporters out into the community and talked to them. The response that we got or our reporters got most frequently was they didn't consider that sex. This was just fun and games. It was no different than hugging.

So I wonder whether, when we talk about educating some of these programs starting in 7th grade, whether even that is early enough, whether the horse is out of the barn on this issue even by that time.

Dr. Weed?

2969

2970

2971

2972

2973

2974

2975

2976

2977

2978

2979

2980

2981

2982

2983

2984

2985

2986

2987

2988

2989

2990

2991

2992

Mr. WEED. We found, of course, lots of variety. are some places where 7th grade could be too late and other places where it wouldn't be. I think that the good programs really do take into account the cultural context in which

they are being delivered, and the program that might work 2993 l well in an inner city, high-minority, high-risk population, 2994 lots of broken families, might be a different kind of 2995 strategy than the one you would do in middle America where it 2996 2997 is pretty calm and peaceful. Mr. YARMUTH. My time is up. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2998 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Yarmuth. 2999 3000 Mr. Burton? Mr. BURTON. Dr. Fineberg, you talked about these 3001 studies. Have they ever included in these studies that you 3002 are referring to the Peers program in Indiana? 3003 Dr. FINEBERG. Not to my knowledge, Mr. Burton. The 3004 studies that I talked to were premised on peer-reviewed, 3005 published studies that were randomized or quasi-randomized, 3006 and so these other experiences would not have been included. 3007 Mr. BURTON. Gotcha. I understand. But you are not 3008 familiar with the Peers program in Indiana? 3009 Dr. FINEBERG. I am not. 3010 Mr. BURTON. The Peers program was started in 1994 by St. 3011 Vincent's Hospital in Indiana, and it is an abstinence 3012 I have been watching on television and listening to 3013 the debate on this issue. I just want to read you a little 3014 bit about this particular program that has been in effect 3015 3016 since 1994. "Does abstinence education really work?" This is one 3017

of their brochures. 'Compared to non-participants, the Peers project participants were four times more likely to have remained virgins. Seventy percent of peers program participants reported that they have remained committed to abstaining from sexual activity at the conclusion of a three-year, independent evaluation.''

Then the brochures go into some other details about it. Since 1994 nearly 15,000 peer mentors—they use students that they train, come in and work with them at St.

Vincent's—15,000 peer mentors have taught the Peer Educating Peers curriculum to 150,000 program participants throughout Indiana. Organizations and other States have replicated the Peers model.

The result in my Congressional District--they sent this to me--was in Miami County there was, for 15-to 17-year-olds between 2000 and 2005 there was a decrease in teen birth rates and sexually transmitted diseases by 34 percent. In Wabash County the decrease for that age group was 28 percent. So it has been very beneficial.

It was students talking to students after they had been made aware and trained in the Peers program. So abstinence programs do work. I know you can go across the Country and do these national studies and come up with these statistics, like my colleague was talking about, which make it sound like it is a waste of money to train and create abstinence

programs, but this is a fact in Indiana. This is my

Congressional District. It does work. I think that funding
these programs does create some real positive results.

I know some of my colleagues say we ought to just have a complete sex education program, we don't need abstinence training, but it does work, and it is helping in Indiana, and I think it is something that we ought to continue to fund.

Dr. Weed, you are moving around there. Did you have anything you would like to comment on that?

Mr. WEED. Well, a point that I think is relevant is that we have heard discussion about embedding abstinence and comprehensive sex education together, and that that may be more effective. But I think I have heard agreement, which I am encouraged by, that abstinence ought to be the central message and the major emphasis.

If you look, however, at the programs that claim to be abstinence-plus, the ratio of a contraceptive and condom education to abstinence education is about 9-to-1, so it is really not the major emphasis, it is kind of an afterthought. It is kind of stuck in there to meet, I think in some cases, the political correctness of yes, well, we teach abstinence.

If you look at the reality of the ratio, however, of what gets the most attention, that is not what is happening.

Ms. KNOX. Could I respond quickly, as well?

Congresswoman Foxx was talking about the statistics we use

and the studies that we use. The study that Mr. Weed is referencing I believe was a study that looked at how many times the word abstinence was mentioned on a page of comprehensive sex education curricula. Now, that is just the word abstinence. That is how they got that statistic.

When the Federal Government does their abstinence PSAs, public service announcements, they don't use the word abstinence. They use wait for sex until marriage. So I think that we have to re-look at the studies that we are using, and I just want to point that out there to correct the Congressional record.

Mr. BURTON. I think this has been a very interesting hearing. You know, when you represent 700,000 people, like we do, and you see some positive results in a program in your District, and it is irrefutable as far as the statistics are concerned in my District, it sounds like to me, at least in my District, and I think across the Country, as well, but at least in my District abstinence programs specifically designed for that do work. They have reduced by 34 and 28 percent the pregnancy rates and the rates of communicable diseases. I think that is something that we should continue to support.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Burton.

I am going to take my time.

My view is that if the local area wants to try something that they think is best, let them spend their money on it; but if we are going to use Federal dollars, I want to be sure those Federal dollars are being used for a program that works and is successful. If we have had studies showing they are not successful, as we have with the abstinence-only programs, then I think we ought to let the local governments decide whether they are going to pay for it.

Dr. Weed, there is one thing I wanted to ask you about. In explaining the evidence for some or these abstinence-only programs, you referred to them in your testimony as abstinence-centered programs. One of the studies has an abstract that states, 'The intervention is not an abstinence-until-marriage intervention. The target behavior is abstaining from sexual activity until later in life when the adolescent is more prepared to handle the consequences.'

Would a program that is not focused on abstinence until marriage qualify for Federal funding under the State-or community-based abstinence-only programs?

Mr. WEED. Would it qualify for funding if it did not target abstinence until marriage?

Chairman WAXMAN. Yes.

Mr. WEED. Well, of course, you know how the A3H guidelines are written, but I think one of the things that helps us in this area is that young people who are fairly

3118 | concrete--

3119

3120

3121

3122

3123

3124

3125

3126

3127

3128

3129

3130

3131

3132

3133

3134

3135

3136

3137

3138

3139

3140

Chairman WAXMAN. I am asking a very specific question, because my understanding is the answer would be no, that teaching abstinence until marriage is the sole and mandatory purpose of these programs. This illustrates some of the concerns I have with the current policy. It isn't just for a committed relationship or later in life, as valuable as I think that might be in and of itself. There are programs that appear to have real success, but they are being excluded from Federal funding because they don't meet this strict ideological test. It has to be until marriage, itself. Mr. WEED. Well, I quess I don't see that these other programs are being excluded because 68 percent of our school systems are using comprehensive and contraceptive education, as compared to 25 percent who get abstinence education, so I think it is probably a misunderstanding to think that abstinence-centered education is displacing and replacing all this other stuff. I think it is still there. Kids can--Chairman WAXMAN. It is certainly still there, but it is

Chairman WAXMAN. It is certainly still there, but it is being funded at the local level, while these abstinence programs are being funded exclusively at the Federal level with over \$1 billion.

Dr. Santelli, did you want to comment?

Dr. SANTELLI. Yes. I think Stan is absolutely wrong on that. I mean, the research we did, which was based again on

144 PAGE HGO114.000

national data between 1995 and 2002, showed that virtually 3143 every 15-to 19-year-old young woman in this society and the 3144 young men as well are getting abstinence education. They are 3145 getting it. What we found, though, was education about contraception declined sharply, so many fewer. So almost 100 percent of young people are getting abstinence education. 3148 may not be abstinence-only. We don't know whether it is abstinence-only, but they are getting the abstinence message, 3150 but only two-thirds are getting the message about 3151 contraception, and that is going down. 3152

Chairman WAXMAN. I appreciate that point.

3146

3147

3149

3153

3154

3155

3156

3157

3158

3159

3160

3161

3162

3163

3164

3165

3166

3167

Now, you were asked, all of you, a few minutes ago by Ms. Foxx to give a yes or no answer only to a more complicated question of whether you would support abstinence-only if evidence became available that it was successful, and you had to say yes or no. A number of you said no and you didn't have a chance to explain, but I presume that you would have said because it is not public health information, it is not the full story.

Dr. Blythe, is that accurate?

Dr. BLYTHE. I totally agree. It was, I felt, like a trick question almost. I think that none of us at this table deny the importance of abstinence as a major part of the message, but it is, again, including all that other information that will help young people develop healthy

3168 sexual lives.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thanks. I presume that was also--without responding, because I have very limited time already to go to other questions.

One of the major concerns of opponents of comprehensive sex education is that teaching teens about condoms and other contraceptives will encourage them to have sex. The suggestion is that teaching about contraception will delude or confuse an abstinence message.

Dr. Benjamin, is there any scientific evidence that comprehensive sex education encourages sexual activity?

Dr. BENJAMIN. The answer is to the contrary, that it does not.

Chairman WAXMAN. Dr. Weed, do you think it encourages sexual activity to talk about more comprehensive approach than just the abstinence-only?

Mr. WEED. I haven't seen evidence that addresses that directly. We are currently doing a study where both messages are combined in the classroom. It is very early, but the evidence looks like that the impact of the program gets minimized when the combination is in place.

Chairman WAXMAN. Okay. Well, let me ask the two young people, Shelby and Max. In your experiences now as young adults who speak with young people, what is your understanding? Does comprehensive sex education cause teens

146 PAGE HGO114.000

to have sex, or is this kind of education effective in encouraging teens to delay sexual activity?

Ms. KNOX. I would say once again umbrellas don't cause rain. Young people are smart enough to make responsible decisions when they are given all the information. Myself, the young people that I talk to, we actually are encouraged to make more responsible decisions when we understand about contraception, when we understand about using condoms, when we are not confused, when we don't have misinformation, then we are more likely to make responsible decisions.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. SIEGEL. I would assert that when we are being told that condoms and contraceptions do not work we are less likely to use them if we do choose to go about that path.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thanks.

Mr. Shays?

3193

3194

3195

3196

3197

3198

3199

3200

3201

3202

3203

3204

3205

3206

3207

3208

3209

3210

3211

3212

3213

3214

3215

3217

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry I was away. I was speaking on the floor of the House and then I was meeting with a mother whose daughter was raped allegedly by a Marine and then killed. I was meeting with that family, with her, talking about that issue.

I know Mr. Burton has one quick thing he wants to say and I will yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. BURTON. Real briefly, I think one of the reasons the 3216 Peer program in Indiana has been successful is they are

training students to work with students, and peer to peer I think really has a tremendous impact on the attitudes of these young people. I think that is why these statistics show some dramatic results.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SHAYS. What I am struck with is that young people learn from TV, the movies, the books they read, the magazines they read, they learn from the Internet, they learn things from their peers. I think that there is a natural interest on the part of young people to know about things about sex. They are going to learn it. The question is: are they only learning part of it, and what part are they learning?

Dr. Weed, where I have my problem is that you would object to them having the armor they need in the daily battle of life. You want to tell them one way, one kind of armor, but you don't want to protect them, it seems to me, in all the other ways.

Would you agree that some young people are going to not practice abstinence?

Mr. WEED. Yes. Some will not, and I would say that the armor is great, but if it is flawed armor we don't give them the kind of help you need.

Mr. SHAYS. You tell them it is flawed, but you tell them risks and you tell them information, so what you are doing is basically saying if you are going to abstain you are going to

be protected, but if you do anything else you are on your 3243 3244 It seems to me that that borders on cruelty, and the young man to your left dealing with HIV is one of the 3245 3246 outcomes. That is tragic. 3247 I just don't get it. I don't understand why it has to Why only? Tell me why only? be only. 3248 Mr. WEED. I think that maybe you weren't here when I 3249 mentioned this. I think that is a poor definition of 3250 abstinence education programs. 3251 Mr. SHAYS. It is an accurate one. 3252 Mr. WEED. No, it is not. Abstinence-centered is a very 3253 3254 different picture than abstinence-only. Mr. SHAYS. Let me just say why. You can't rest on the 3255 laurels of saying the States do it and someone else will tell 3256 you the rest of the story. The reason why my State chooses 3257 3258 not to be part of it is they think it is going to ultimately 3259 result in young people being deprived of knowledge that could save their lives. 3260 Mr. WEED. We do have a premise, sir, that if we give 3261 kids more and better information they are going to be better 3262 decision-makers. The recent research in the last five to ten 3263 3264 years on the adolescent brain makes us rethink that conventional wisdom. It is a whole different kind of picture 3265

Mr. SHAYS. Isn't it an interesting concept. Really what

that is happening with young people.

3266

3267

you are saying is abstinence-only works better if they don't 3268 know all the information, so we are going to deprive them. 3269 But you know what? Some of them are going to then try to 3270 find it on their own and it is going to be incomplete 3271 information, it is going to be from the wrong places. Ιt 3272 seems to me it would be better that they get the right 3273 3274 information from the right place. Mr. WEED. That is part of the misunderstanding, that 3275 abstinence-only, as we use that label, assumes that they 3276 don't learn anything else. The fact is they do. 3277 3278 Mr. SHAYS. Yes, but they learn it from the wrong places. Mr. WEED. I am saying within an abstinence program, a 3279 good abstinence program isn't that narrow kind of definition 3280 3281 that you--Mr. SHAYS. Is there anyone on the panel that would 3282 disagree with that? And tell me why? Do you agree that Dr. 3283 Weed is correct when he says that they are going to learn all 3284 3285 that they need to know--Mr. WEED. I didn't say all. I said that it is not 3286 narrow the way you have defined it. 3287 Mr. SHAYS. Well, if they are not going to learn all they 3288 need to know, then your comment to me is disingenuous. 3289 Mr. WEED. I don't think they are going to learn all they 3290 need to know in any program, including a comprehensive sex 3291 education program. And, as we have seen, as I have shared 3292

with you, we don't have any program yet that has shown a 3293 3294 reduction in STD rates that is a comprehensive education 3295 program. Mr. SHAYS. Well, even if that were true--3296 Mr. WEED. And it is. Yes. 3297 Mr. SHAYS. Even if it were true, I would say to you that 3298 at least we gave them the information. So if Mr. Siegel 3299 decides to do something and he takes risk, at least he did it 3300 with the knowledge that he was taking the risk and that he 3301 wasn't ignorant of it. 3302 Mr. WEED. And I think good abstinence programs do that. 3303 Mr. SHAYS. Well, all that I have read about it would 3304 3305 totally refute that. Mr. WEED. You know, I have been there in them. 3306 watched them. I have observed them. I have interviewed 3307 thousands of kids. It is not this narrow kind of--3308 Mr. SHAYS. Could I just make one more point. 3309 Mr. WEED.--perspective that we are hearing here. 3310 3311 Mr. SHAYS. If you are telling me that an abstinence-only program is compromised by telling them about other ways to 3312 3313 deal with the issue of sex and not having a pregnancy and not

having an illness, if you are telling me that that then

then you are telling me the program does it.

encourages them to do it, you have this conflict, because you

are telling me on one hand that that weakens the program, and

3314

3315

3316

3317

Mr. WEED. I am saying that you can do both if you do it 3318 right and if you do it well. But most of the time, as we 3319 have seen in a lot of these programs that are now on the CDC 3320 website as being effective and proven, the information that 3321 is in both programs I think is going to be harmful to kids, 3322 not helpful. 3323 Mr. SHAYS. Thank you. 3324 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. 3325 Mr. Souder? 3326 Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. 3327 Mr. Siegel and Ms. Knox, were the programs at your 3328 school funded by the Federal Government? 3329 Ms. KNOX. Yes. 3330 Mr. SIEGEL. I believe so. I am not certain. 3331 Ms. KNOX. I believe so. 3332 Mr. SOUDER. What years were they? 3333 Mr. SIEGEL. Sorry? 3334 Mr. SOUDER. What year were you in the program? 3335 Mr. SIEGEL. What year was I in the program? It must 3336 have been 12 years ago. I believe--3337 Mr. SOUDER. There was not abstinence education--3338 Ms. KNOX. I was in the program from 2001 to 2004, so it 3339 was within the funding. 3340 Mr. SOUDER. And you are sure that your school--3341 Ms. KNOX. I cannot say absolutely sure, but I can get 3342

3343 the information to find out.

Mr. SOUDER. And we would like that for the record, because a description that you had of your program, that a church came in, did an independent program, is not likely a Federal program.

Ms. KNOX. Can I just make the clarification? That was a secular program. It was done by a local pastor. He was operating within a secular capacity within the school. That was made sure of by the school district.

Mr. SOUDER. Because most likely that your two programs--you have both been very articulate, very passionate--but are mostly irrelevant to this debate, because, in fact, what you are advocating is what everybody on the Republican and Democratic side said is that these should be State and local decisions, and abstinence education programs coming out of Washington, abstinence-centered, which I agree with Dr. Weed, have to meet certain criteria. They go through certain bid process, and they generally aren't random at a local level. Most likely you are dealing with something that, were it done out of the Federal Government, you wouldn't have had the experiences that you had at your school.

In response to Mr. Jordan, one of the questions, if we are going to get into this, how much do we decentralize and wind up with all sorts of variations, or how much do we

centralize. This is an interesting debate back and forth, but for the most part your experiences, if they were Federal funded, none of us would have ever supported, and that really weren't relevant.

Further, you had a major factual error, Ms. Knox, and Chairman Waxman and I have been going around this. It is incorrect to say that the Federal Government funds no programs. The Federal Government plans—a statement that Dr. Weed made and was debated—12 times as much money goes into family planning. Not all of that goes into schools. I use the figure 2-to-1 into the schools. In addition, I know from my own home town that displacement of other funds go—for example, in safe and drug—free schools—if you get your money for drug—free schools from other programs, that you can then use the money for other health programs, which then they use for a comprehensive sex education and health care program in the schools with direct Government funding, because under our Education Committee rules, if you cover one category then it becomes fungible funding for the school.

It is absolutely false to assert that no Federal money is in. The only question is whether it is twice as much in the so-called comprehensive or twelve times as much, but clearly far more is spent of Federal dollars in this category, and it is important that the record shows that.

We are going to try to sort out exactly how that funding

3393 goes, but that is just not true.

Ms. KNOX. Can I ask you for a minute to respond, as well, about the--

Mr. SOUDER. There is not really a response to that.

And let me say one thing else, Mr. Chairman. We have six witnesses on the majority side and one on the minority side.

Dr. Weed, I would take you in any battle with me to do a course with six people, but this is as stacked a panel as I have ever experienced as a staffer or Member in the House to only have one person on one side and six.

Furthermore, this was represented as a scientific panel. Mr. Siegel and Ms. Knox have been very articulate, but they are not scientists. Out of the others, from what I can tell, Dr. Santelli is a scientist who has worked with it directly, but he is on, as he says in his testimony, he is a senior fellow at the Gutkmacher Institute, very tied in with Planned Parenthood. He clearly has a bias, just as others would have a bias.

It isn't clear to me, did you do field research yourself or were you summarizing studies, Dr. Santelli?

Dr. SANTELLI. I have worked in public health for 20 years. I worked in Baltimore for five and did a lot of field studies and I worked at CDC for 13 years and was involved in a whole bunch of studies.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, your charts did go to direct questions, while I may not agree with them, may not agree with your summary.

Dr. Fineberg clearly has summarized a group of studies, but did you do any of those yourself? Are you a scientist who has been out in the field and studied this issue?

Dr. FINEBERG. No.

Mr. SOUDER. And Dr. Blythe and Dr. Benjamin basically read ideological statements on the behalf and summarized other people's studies. But this was supposed to be a panel of scientists who were going to show us the true science debate that was occurring, and that has not happened today. It was false representation.

Dr. Weed, I happen to remember you from another life of mine three jobs ago when I was the Republican staff director on the Children and Family Committee, and I believe in the mid-1980s you did a study in Baltimore on teen pregnancy; is that correct?

Mr. WEED. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. That is how you more or less got started in this field, by showing some of the ineffectiveness of the teen pregnancy programs in Baltimore that was astounding and resulted in programs being put in in Baltimore because their teen pregnancy was totally--it was 90-some percent in some of the schools. I went up there and met with them. You are

3443 actually a field researcher.

Mr. WEED. Yes. All my work has been on the ground. I have interviewed thousands of kids. I have personally evaluated over 100 programs. I have data on 500,000 teenagers in my files.

Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair wants to indicate that the witnesses who are here were invited because either they have done the research or they represent organizations. I don't think it is fair to criticize them if they represent groups like the pediatricians or the OB/GYNs or the American Medical Association or the Institute of Medicine. I also think it is unfair to say that they are not only unbalanced because they represent medical organizations, but that they in some way lack credibility because they represent—and the American Health Association and others—because they represent these organizations. That is why they have been invited.

Secondly, we have accepted every witness that has been recommended to us from the Republican side of the aisle.

Matter of fact, we have never turned down a request from the Republicans on any witness at any hearing.

Thirdly, I just think that an attack on people's views by calling them ideological when they are scientists and they are medical professionals is trying to turn tables by calling them ideological when, in fact, I think that you are

3468 attacking them from an ideological perspective.

Do you want to say anything, since I have jumped on you?

Mr. SOUDER. I wasn't questioning the organizations. What
I was questioning is that you earlier stated this was a
scientific panel, and I was trying to establish that you only
have two people who appear to have done scientific research;
others were summarizing or giving their personal opinions.
In fact, Dr. Weed was criticized for being ideological. I
certainly criticized a number of people here for being
ideological--making the point again that this is not really a
scientific debate but a heavily ideological one.

Chairman WAXMAN. Okay.

Well, we have the positions set out.

Dr. Santelli, we are going to have to move on. We have a third panel waiting. Yes?

Dr. SANTELLI. I just spent two days, because I am here the third day missing part of the meetings. The American Public Health Association and the Academy of Pediatrics, I have served on committees on both of them, spend a lot of time trying to review scientific evidence. I mean, they also filter it through their clinical wisdom. Maggie is a great example of combining the two. All the professional medical groups in the Country are very attuned to the science and try to represent the best science.

Chairman WAXMAN. I think that is an important statement

3493 to make.

I want to thank all of you very much for your presentation to us and your willingness to answer questions from members of the Committee. Thank you very much.

Our third panel, I want to call forward Charles Keckler, who is the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy at Administration for Children and Families at the Department of Health and Human Services. His department coordinates the two largest Federal abstinence-only programs.

Dr. Marcia Crosse is the director for the Healthcare Group in the U.S. Government Accountability Office. She has been with GAO's Healthcare Group since 1996, and since then has led a variety of assignments on public health issues.

I want to welcome you to our hearing today. Your prepared statements will be in the record in full. We would like to ask if you would to limit your oral presentation to five minutes.

It is the policy of this Committee that all witnesses be sworn in before they testify, although it was pointed out to me that perhaps that didn't happen with the last panel, but I am not sure. But we will continue the practice with you two, if you would please rise and raise your right hand.

[Witnesses sworn.]

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

PAGE

3518

Mr. Keckler, why don't we start with you?

S519 STATEMENTS OF CHARLES KECKLER, ACTING DEPUTY ASSISTANT
SECRETARY FOR POLICY, ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND
FAMILIES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; AND
MARCIA CROSSE, PH.D., DIRECTOR, HEALTHCARE, U.S. GOVERNMENT
ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

STATEMENT OF CHARLES KECKLER

Mr. KECKLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to discuss abstinence education programs administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.

The Administration continues to support abstinence education programs as one among several methods to address the continuing problems created by adolescent sexual activity, the result of which includes unacceptably high rates of non-marital child-bearing and sexually transmitted diseases among America's youth. Remarkable progress has occurred in this area over the last 15 to 20 years. Pregnancy among 15-to 17-year-old girls declined over 20 percent since the early 1990s, although it remains above the rates for other industrialized nations.

Teenage sexual activity and non-marital child-bearing

have serious consequences for teens, their families, their communities, and our society. The two greatest risk factors for teen pregnancy and transmission of STDs are age at first onset and number of partners. In other words, if a teen delays the onset of sexual activity and reduces the number of partners, they are much less likely to become pregnant or get someone pregnant.

By definition, abstinence education programs aim to address these two risk factors. Abstinence is the only 100 percent effective method to prevent pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. Through education, mentoring, and peer support, abstinence education helps teens delay the onset of sexual activity and reduce the number of sexual partners they have. In addition to the serious risks of disease, early child-bearing often limits later opportunities for both the parents and the children involved, creating risks of a fragile family structure, poverty, and welfare dependence.

HHS' abstinence education programs are part of a broader strategy to combat teen pregnancy and STDs. Over the last five years, the Department estimates that it has expended billions of dollars towards this effort.

HHS funds a variety of interventions, both primary models, which include a risk avoidance message provided through abstinence education programs, as well as secondary models, which include a risk reduction message. These

interventions provide information about the risks of sexual activity and the ways to eliminate or reduce these risks, with the goal of altering adolescent attitude and behaviors in ways that lead to healthier outcomes.

Other interventions can provide direct health services to adolescents, including administering contraception and providing information about its proper use. Beyond abstinence education, the Department provides at least \$300 million annually to administer a variety of pregnancy prevention or STD/HIV prevention and awareness programs. Some of these programs may include information about abstinence or encouraging delayed sexual activity, but are not subject to the Title V, Section 510 A-H definition of abstinence education in the Social Security Act.

Curriculum often called abstinence-plus or comprehensive sex education could be supported under these funding streams. Additionally, the Department provides hundreds of millions annually in family planning services to adolescents through a variety of programs. Of the total Federal resources devoted to combatting teen pregnancy and STD prevention, abstinence education accounts for a fraction.

As a general matter, health education interventions have a record of mixed success. While the majority of studies have shown a limited impact on sexual behavior, some programs have shown evidence for effectiveness. This became

increasingly apparent during the 1990s, as studies showed certain programs had affects of delaying the age at first intercourse and sometimes reducing the frequency of sexual activity or the number of partners involved.

The use of abstinence education curricula as such has a shorter history of evaluation, but the results have been similar. Some peer reviewed research has shown an effect in delaying intercourse among program participants. Other studies have shown some affect on partner number, even if intercourse is not delayed.

We are using the results of these studies to identify the characteristics that distinguish effective from ineffective implementations. There is no strong evidence for a decline in the use of contraception as a consequence of these programs.

The Administration believes that the abstinence education program sends the healthiest message, as it is the only certain way to avoid out-of-wedlock pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. The great majority of American parents agree. A 2007 poll conducted by the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy found that 90 percent of teens age 12 to 19 and 93 percent of adults agree that it is important for teens to be given a strong message that they should not have sex until they are at least out of high school.

The Administration appreciates the opportunity to update 3615 the Committee on the progress we are making in this important 3616 area of adolescent health and remains committed to providing 3617 accurate information that effectively assists young people to 3618 make healthy and responsible choices as they mature toward 3619 adulthood. 3620 I would be pleased to take any questions that you may 3621 3622 have. [Prepared statement of Mr. Keckler follows:] 3623

******* INSERT ******

3624

3625	Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.
3626	Dr. Crosse?
3627	STATEMENT OF MARCIA CROSSE

Ms. CROSSE. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am pleased to be here today as you examine abstinence education programs.

My testimony is based on GAO's report on this topic that we prepared for you and other Congressional requesters in October, 2006, and we have updated certain information for today's hearing. You asked that we examine efforts to assess the scientific accuracy of materials used in abstinence education programs and efforts to assess the effectiveness of these programs.

I will also discuss a Public Health Service Act requirement regarding medically accurate information about condom effectiveness that may be relevant for abstinence education materials.

We reported 18 months ago that efforts by HHS and States to assess the scientific accuracy of materials used in abstinence education programs have been limited. At the time, HHS' Administration for Children and Families, or ACF, did not review its grantees' education materials for scientific accuracy in either the State-or the

community-based programs, nor did it require the grantees in either program to do so. Further, not all States that received funding from ACF had chosen to review the accuracy of their program materials.

In contrast to ACF, HHS' Office of Population Affairs, or OPA, had reviewed the scientific accuracy of its grantees' proposed education materials and any inaccuracies that were found had to be corrected before those materials were used.

The extent to which Federally funded abstinence education materials are inaccurate wasn't known, but both OPA and some States reported finding inaccuracies. For example, one State official described an instance in which abstinence education materials incorrectly suggested that HIV can pass through condoms because the latex used in condoms is porous.

To address concerns about the scientific accuracy of materials used in these programs, we recommended in our report that the Secretary of HHS develop procedures to help assure the accuracy of such materials. In response to our recommendation, ACF is currently implementing a process to review the accuracy of community-based grantees' curricula and has required those grantees to sign assurances that the materials they propose using are accurate. HHS reported to us that in the future State program grantees' will also have to sign written assurances and provide ACF with descriptions of their strategies for reviewing the accuracy of their

3673 programs.

3696 l

We also examined efforts to assess the effectiveness of abstinence education programs. At the time of our report, we found that HHS, States, and researchers had made a variety of efforts to assess effectiveness. For example, ACF analyzed national data on adolescent birth rates and the proportion of adolescents who report having had sexual intercourse.

Additionally, six of the ten States in our review worked with third party evaluators to assess the effectiveness of their programs.

However, the conclusions that can be drawn from these efforts are limited because most of the efforts to evaluate program effectiveness have not met certain minimum criteria, such as random assignment of participants and sufficient follow-up periods and sample sizes that are necessary for such assessments to be scientifically valid.

Further, the results of some efforts that do meet such criteria have varied. Since our report was issued, a key HHS-funded study has been completed which found few differences on a variety of measures of sexual activity between youth who participated in abstinence education programs and control group youth.

Finally, while conducting work for our 2006 report we identified a legal matter that required the attention of HHS. A section of the Public Health Service Act, Section 317 P,

requires certain educational materials to contain medically accurate information about condom effectiveness. At the time of our review, an ACS official reported that materials prepared by abstinence education grantees were not subject to this provision. However, we concluded that this requirement does apply to abstinence education materials prepared and used by Federal grant recipients, depending on their substantive content. In other words, for materials that meet the statutory criteria, HHS' grantees are required to include information on condom effectiveness, and that information must be medically accurate. Therefore, we recommended that HHS adopt measures to ensure that, where applicable, abstinence education materials comply with this requirement.

HHS has told us that they have accepted our recommendation. The fiscal year 2007 community-based program announcement provides information about the applicability of this requirement, and future State program announcements will also include information on this requirement.

In conclusion, when we reported to you 18 months ago on this topic we identified several concerns and information gaps in HHS' abstinence education programs and made recommendations to the Department. HHS has now begun to make changes in response to our recommendations which could improve the accuracy of the materials used in these programs.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks. I

3723	would be happy to answer any questions that you or other
3724	members of the Committee may have.
3725	[Prepared statement of Ms. Crosse follows:]
3726	****** TNSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much for your presentation to us and the hard work that you have done at our request.

Mr. Keckler, I have some questions about your characterization of the evidence on abstinence-only programs. You acknowledge that the data supports the effectiveness of teen sex education programs in delaying sex and reducing sexual frequency or the number of partners. You then said that 'the use of abstinence education curricula has a shorter history of evaluation, but the results have been similar.'

But this isn't the view of medical experts. The American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics have all looked at abstinence-only programs and found that they are not as effective as comprehensive sex education. Why is it what you are telling us is so different from the expert medical bodies? You are drawing one conclusion, and they look at the same evidence and draw a completely different conclusion.

Mr. KECKLER. Thank you for the question, Mr. Chairman.

Well, I think that we need to be, when we say one works better than the other, that comparison has never been done. We have a study ongoing that will compare the two treatments side by side. But some of these statements and some of the

collections of studies which were referred to earlier are something else. They are accumulations of studies of, on the one hand, studies that have been done of comprehensive sex education over the years, and some studies that have been done on abstinence until marriage.

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, OMB, for example, the Office of Management and Budget at the White House, does program assessments of different Government programs called part assessments.

Mr. KECKLER. Yes.

Chairman WAXMAN. In its assessment of the abstinence-only programs, OMB gave the program a very low score of 33 out of 100 for program results and accountability. The answer to, ''Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term goals' was small extent. The answer to whether the program achieves its annual performance goals was no, because the programs won't even set baselines until March, 2009, so basically we have no idea if individual programs are having any impact on participant behavior and health. Why are we continuing to fund programs where even OMB is saying there is virtually no evidence of effectiveness?

Mr. KECKLER. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the OMB part assessment, the part assessment ultimately of these programs was ranked as adequate with the conditions that we make

3778 l

making those changes, which include standardized reporting from CBA grantees on the outputs of their programs and, starting in the upcoming year, standardized survey of participants, which will include outcomes of the programs, including whether or not the participants are having sexual activity.

Chairman WAXMAN. Let me ask Dr. Crosse about that evaluation. Do you think the Administration is doing enough to establish baselines and other measurement goals for these programs so we can measure them and see whether they are succeeding?

Ms. CROSSE. Well, they are currently funding some well-designed studies, and the one study that I cited that had been completed since our report was issued was one of the studies that the Department funded that did meet the standards for a scientifically valid study that was a situation where they had random assignment.

I think some of our concerns are some of the measures that the Department has been using are ones that cannot be clearly linked back specifically to the program. The national rates of pregnancy is not something where you can say that the impact on that is specifically because of the program, because you don't have any information about the differences in the rates between those who have received that

3802 information and those who didn't.

Chairman WAXMAN. Let me get into another question.

Mr. Keckler, we know some teens are going to have sex. We can talk to them about abstinence until marriage, but let's say a young people comes to you and says, I put a lot of thought into it, but I am going to go have sex. I have reached a point that I am going to do this. The question comes to you, Should I use a condom? What would you say to him or her?

Mr. KECKLER. Well, I am not sure that my personal response to a teen in my life is germane, but I think--

Chairman WAXMAN. What do you think somebody running a program should say to that individual?

Mr. KECKLER. Well, I can tell you what they will say in the CBA programs, which is that if somebody is in need of other services, our grantees are asked and encouraged to give them referrals to other services. Our grantees, of course, are bound by the A through H requirements to focus on abstinence, but they will make referrals for other services, and that is what they would say.

Chairman WAXMAN. I find that nonsense, nonsensical. If somebody is coming to you and asking in one of these programs, admitting that they are going to be sexually active--which probably means they already are sexually active--to tell them, I am going to refer you to someone else

will probably mean that, if they go to someone else, it will be after they have already had enough sexual contact where they might have contracted HIV or some other sexually transmitted disease. That is one of the big problems I have with this separation. We can only talk about abstinence. We can't talk about the rest of the information that is pertinent.

I just know, if the Members will forgive me--and I will allow them a little extra time, as well--I know a lot of people have said over the years we ought to let States and local governments make the decision. Maybe we ought to just have a block grant. Let the States and local governments decide if they want an abstinence-only program or if they want to use the money for a broader comprehensive program. But here we have Washington, D.C., saying, We know what is best, and if you want money for sex education in the schools, you have to use abstinence-only funds.

When we hear about these other programs being funded, most of them are at the local level, and the others are extrapolations for saying all Medicaid funding for family planning services—they are not going to schools, they are not going to teenagers. Their funding for Title X clinics, well, they are clinics. They are not in the schools. They may have some relationship. The Indian Health Services and some of these others, I think that is being used to say we

have a lot more dollars going to these other programs. Well, they are not Federal dollars for the most part.

Is that an accurate statement, Dr. Crosse? Have you looked at the funding mechanisms?

Ms. CROSSE. My understanding is that the only Federal money that specifically is targeted for sex education programs is through these programs that we focused on, these three big programs at the Department--the State program, the community-based program, or CBA program, and the adolescent family life program. There may be small amounts in other areas, but the targeted areas for sex education are abstinence-only ones.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you.

I have used 7.4 minutes, but I am going to yield to the gentleman and each of the other gentleman on the panel eight minutes so we will be fair. They don't have to use it all, but each will get eight.

Mr. SOUDER. It won't be entirely fair because it is two against one again.

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, I haven't used the full eight.

Mr. SOUDER. First, let me say sometimes I get in trouble for this, and I have complained about a number of hearings that we have had here, including today, but I find the chairman very fair. We have a good personal relationship. It concerns some of my colleagues that I speak highly of him

many times, but, in fact, he attempts to be fair. Sometimes liberals have a tough time understanding our perspective enough to what we consider fair or not, but I believe he is genuine in his ability to desire to do that.

Chairman WAXMAN. Time's up.

[Laughter.]

3877

3878

3879

3880

3881

3882

3883

3884

3885

3886

3887

3888

3889

3890

3891

3892

3893

3894

3895

3896

3897

3898

3899

3900

3901

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Keckler, we have had a lot of discussion today about the Federal funding for sex education. I would appreciate your getting back to the Committee with the specifics here. You chose your words carefully. You said that the Federal Government funds money for Planned Parenthood, family planning, and other types of things. we really need here is how much of that actually goes to schools. Dr. Crosse picked her words very carefully there, said the dedicated stream. But, in fact, we all know these programs are in the schools, have been in the programs for many years. They are funded through the Federal Government, through the family planning that comes through. There are also health grants that come through that may not be in your area, but if you could break that out. I mentioned how safe and drug free schools because I wrote that section and allowed it to be fungible funding, and I know that in school districts people use it there. But we need some kind of a read with this, because this has, in my opinion, been a false track that we got off to. I think it is a legitimate debate

that the Chairman said should any be specifically dedicated.

That is a fair debate.

But partly what Dr. Crosse, whose recommendation seemed pretty reasonable, has suggested is that when we, the Federal Government, give the funds without any guidelines, then we get charges like came up from the two younger people here today that clearly those wouldn't have met Federal standards to do a program like that.

It would be very helpful if you can get us a funding stream, not only of this much goes in family planning, but to see if we can do a down-stream track of where that funding breaks out. I don't know whether this is a school survey working with the Department of Education, but I think it is very important for us to understand how these programs are funded in the schools.

[The information follows:]

3918 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Mr. KECKLER. I agree with you, Congressman, and the problem has been that, because the other forms of comprehensive sex education and prevention programs are folded into, sometimes they are block granted, they are folded in throughout the Department of Health and Human Services in a variety of ways, and some of them are also directed both to young adults and to adolescents in order to get a real apples-to-apples comparison.

There is some work that needs to be done with our budget people, but we will be happy to get you firmer estimates along those lines.

Mr. SOUDER. Because without that it is hard for anybody to allege scientific comparisons if, in fact, we don't even know what Federal funding is where. I support block grants, but I also have historically believed there should be accountability. We have run into huge problems with the No Child Left Behind with this, because then nobody likes the accountability measures and we argue over the accountability measures. But the fact is that if the Federal Government is going to be tasked with raising the taxes and spending the funding, we shouldn't dictate how a local district meets it, but there ought to be requirements that meet basic standards so that we know tax dollars are being spent.

If you are a Libertarian and don't want the Federal Government to do it, that is one thing, but if the Federal

Government is going to do it, in the day and age of the computer reporting system it seems like this would be not that hard to put a designation on a form for the data to come back of did this go into school, how many dollars went to the school, the schools to report back. I mean, they already deal with mounds of reports, and I understand that, but if we are going to have—how are people alleging scientific comparisons here, because there are controlled programs and non-controlled programs.

I heard data thrown out today not comparing, when they were comparing abstinence programs, comparing it to the universe rather than the schools around it, may have had an alternative program, which in science would have been mandatory. What is the universe? What is the comparison? What are the control groups?

One of the most famous early studies in the 1980s was in Minnesota, where a school that had a family planning program said they reduced teen pregnancy. A quick check showed that every other school in Minneapolis went down more, because there were cultural variables and other things happening in the community, not just that program. So you have to have multiple control groups.

We are having this debate today sounding like the science is in one direction when, as Dr. Crosse has pointed out, and I think fairly, that there should be factual

information in any abstinence program. They shouldn't be able to put out false information. There ought to be accountability to it.

One other question I had that was raised by--I forget her name, the young girl on the first panel--she said, as I understood her to say--Shelby--it was a secular program and a pastor came in as part of that. In these programs, are they allowed to invite guest speakers in? And if guest speakers come in, are they held to any accountable standards, which is something else that ought to be looked at. Did you look at that, Dr. Cross?

Ms. CROSSE. We did not look at the specifics of the structures. And our recommendations are to the general information that are distributed for the programs. There is certainly always the possibility that someone can come in and write something up on a blackboard that would not be under any kind of control or review.

Mr. SOUDER. Because when we are dealing with these social, controversial issues, often somebody will be invited in from a local church, or somebody will be invited in from the other side. If, in fact, it is a religious community they will invite somebody in from Planned Parenthood to present that. The question is: how fact-based are we going to have this? Is there an accountability procedure? But I would think we should at least know in the presentation of a

grantee whether they intend to do that, because otherwise it becomes hard. Do you know whether that is done now?

Mr. KECKLER. Well, there are a variety of methods. I think Dr. Fineberg talked about the great variety of methods that people are using, and we as a Department are going through this process to try to identify best practices, along with many other people in the field. So could somebody come in and speak? Yes. The grantee, however, is responsible under our current rules for ensuring medical accuracy, and when we make a site visit there, either because we think there are good practices there or we have heard some problems with the grantee, medical accuracy is looked at, as well. So it is their assurance and their responsibility to maintain medical accuracy.

Our efforts on that have been welcomed by all the grantees. They want to be medically accurate. They appreciate our help.

Mr. SOUDER. I need to get another factual question on the record here. We have heard about the 17 States opting out, 33 are in. Have you had a drop-off in application rates?

Mr. KECKLER. The CBA grants have not shown any particular drop-off in that program. There have been this year fewer States applying for the State funds.

Mr. SOUDER. But there is still more demand than there is

4019 money? Mr. KECKLER. Oh, yes. The CBA grants are probably the 4020 4021 most competitive grant program that is currently making 4022 grants in ACF. In the last three years--4023 Mr. SOUDER. You are saying of all the programs--4024 Mr. KECKLER. In ACF, all the grant programs. Mr. SOUDER. So the demand for this is huge. 4025 Mr. KECKLER. Right. We have funded between 8 and 14 4026 4027 percent of grant applications in the last three fiscal years, 4028 so there is tremendous unmet demand. Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Souder. 4029 Mr. Shays? 4030 Mr. SHAYS. Thank you. 4031 I don't intend to use my full eight minutes, given I 4.032 4033 missed a good chunk of this hearing, but I want to ask you an ethical question, both of you. I think it clearly matters if 4034 4035 a program is successful or not, and we determine success based on certain outcomes. I quess the first outcome, are 4036 4037 young people having premarital sex or not. The outcomes 4038 disease, pregnancy, emotional issues, as well. But the ethical question for me is let's just say that 4039 an abstinence program was equal to, in terms of outcome, as 4040 one that was more comprehensive. Let me even say it this 4041 way. Let's just say an abstinence program was even better. 4042

Don't young people have a right to know the truth? And it

4043

seems to me that we are almost suggesting that if we can just focus on abstinence-only and leave out the rest of the story, because if we leave out the rest of the story they may have more sex, so we leave out the rest of the story.

But it seems to me that is unethical. It seems to me maybe when you are talking to a 6th grade kid I don't know, but it seems to me by the time a young people is a junior in high school they just deserve to know the truth, whatever the truth is. And you try to have impact on their young minds to do what we as adults thinks is responsible.

The irony, I was speaking to some of my colleagues here and asked them if they had premarital sex. They said they did. And when they started to talk about it, it was almost like it was a good thing. I mean, the irony, the hypocrisy of this is kind of interesting, too. So I am just asking you about the ethics of denying people information. Do they not deserve to know it? Or if they do know it, do you think they are going to do the wrong thing, so they shouldn't have it?

Chairman WAXMAN. Before you answer that question I want to indicate for the record that the gentleman did not ask me that question.

[Laughter.]

Mr. KECKLER. Well, Congressman Shays, that is a very important question. Clearly, teens need to know the truth about their lives and about this area. The question, though,

is do they need to know it all at once and in the same place. The Department supports a risk avoidance message and a risk reduction message. There is important programmatic and practical reasons why we should have the capacity to be able to keep those messages distinct. There is a lot of jurisdictions and there is a lot of grantees that want to help and want to give the risk avoidance message but they don't want to be compelled to include with that a risk reduction message.

So being able to deliver those separately is useful from a programmatic context. There are hypotheses out there on both sides of whether it is more effective to deliver a focused, pure risk avoidance message or whether it might be more effective some way combining it. As I have mentioned, that direct comparison of whether it is better to put them together or keep them separate has never fully been done, but it is important that both messages be out there and that both messages be accurate.

Ms. CROSSE. Just for the record, GAO has no position on this, but I will answer your question in that I think it is important and it is ethical for students, teenagers to be given complete information. I think it is a policy question where they get that information. I think the heart of the ethical issue that we spoke to in our work is whether they be given any misleading information, and that clearly we have

taken a position would not be ethical, and certainly not that 4094 the Federal Government would be supporting the dissemination 4095 of the information that is not accurate to these teenagers in 4096 4097 the programs. Mr. SHAYS. I thank both of you. 4098 4099 Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, very briefly? Do you favor the same policy for cigarettes, that 4100 low-tar cigarettes, that we would show kids the level of 4101 4102 nicotine and tar in the cigarettes between the different 4103 brands so that, since a high percentage of them smoke anyway, 4104 we can give them better information on which cigarettes would 4105 be better to smoke? Mr. SHAYS. I would do this. I would make sure they had 4106 4107 total knowledge, because if a young person is going to smoke, then I want to make sure that they have a sense of the 4108 4109 degrees of harm they are causing themselves, so in that 4110 answer, yes, but I would be working overtime to have them understand that it would be a pretty bad thing to smoke. 4111 Chairman WAXMAN. Does the gentleman yield back the 4112 4113 balance of his time? 4114 Mr. SHAYS. I do yield back. 4115 Chairman WAXMAN. I thank you very much. I thank the two of your for your presentation. 4116 Without objection, we are going to keep the record open 4117 for an additional seven days so that Members may ask all the 4118

witnesses or any of the witnesses additional questions and
get a response in writing, and then others may be able to
submit additional information for the record.

Thank you very much. This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:50 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]