	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS MORRISON
3	HIF062040
4	
5	
6	BIOETHICS AND FETAL TISSUE
7	WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 2016
8	House of Representatives,
9	Select Investigative Panel,
10	Committee on Energy and Commerce,
11	Washington, D.C.
12	
13	
14	
15	The panel met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in Room
16	HVC-210 House Visitors Center, Hon. Marsha Blackburn [chairman
17	of the panel] presiding.
18	Members present: Representatives Blackburn, Pitts, Black,
19	Bucshon, Duffy, Harris, Hartzler, Love, Schakowsky, Nadler,
20	DeGette, Speier, DelBene, and Watson Coleman.
21	Staff present: March Bell, Staff Director; Mike Bloomquist,
22	Deputy Staff Director; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Rachel
23	Collins, Investigative Counsel and Clerk; Andy Duberstein, Press
24	Secretary; Chuck Flint, Counsel; Theresa Gambo, Admin/Human  NEAL R. GROSS

| This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
25	Resources; Jay Gulshen, Staff Assistant; Mary Harned,
26	Investigative Counsel; Peter Kielty, Deputy General Counsel;
27	Graham Pittman, Legislative Clerk; Frank Scaturro, Special
28	Counsel; Heidi Stirrup, Health Policy Coordinator; Matthew
29	Tallmer, Investigator; Zachary Baron, Minority Senior Counsel;
30	Paul Bell; Minority Communications Advisor; Jacquelyn Bolen,
31	Minority Professional Staff Member; Vanessa Cramer, Minority
32	Professional Staff Member; Matthew Henry, Minority Fellow; Karen
33	Lightfoot, Minority Communications Director; and Heather Sawyer,
3 4	Minority Staff Director.

Mrs. Blackburn. The Select Investigative Panel will come to order and the chair recognizes herself for 5 minutes for an opening statement.

I want to welcome to all the witnesses who are here today and I am going to introduce each of our witnesses in a moment.

And I look forward to hearing the testimony from each of on Bioethics and Fetal Tissue.

The last decade has produced tremendous change in medical research and therapies. We are in the middle of a Biotechnology Revolution. Certainly, in my home of State of Tennessee, this is evident and even today we have members of BioTennessee who are on the Hill.

Each week an announcement from this industry presents a new therapy, or a new tool, or a new possibility in the search for lifesaving cures for diseases and afflictions that cause untold pain and suffering. New words have entered our vocabulary: three-parent children, chimeras, CRISPR gene editing, and bioinformatics. Words like organ transplant or tissue rejuvenation seem like ancient history in favor of regenerative medicine, which might eventually reconstitute entire organs from adult stem cells. In a word, things are moving quite quickly.

Like all revolutions, ethical questions and moral challenges can lag behind but the new information and knowledge in medical science raises important questions. What does it mean? What are

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

4 the historic principles of do no harm? Promoting disinterested decisions by medical professionals and, very importantly, addressing the question of human dignity and personhood. Ours

decisions by medical professionals and, very importantly, addressing the question of human dignity and personhood. Ours is not the first era to face such questions. The Nuremburg Code produced a human rights-based ethics statement after horrible information was revealed about experimenting on humans without permission. We learned, years after it was underway, about prisoners in China forced to donate organs or killed for their organs. We learned about the horrors of forced abortion and testing drugs on the poor and unaware after it happened. We all remember the horrible reports about the syphilis studies on African Americas or forced sterilization of the mentally challenged years or even decades after it happened.

Last summer's videos revealed that something very troubling that is going on related to fetal tissue and research. The weak, the vulnerable, those with no voice harvested and sold. There is something going on and something that deserves investigating and it demands our best moral and ethical thinking.

This first hearing on ethics focuses our attention on procuring and transferring baby body parts and related matters. We will hear from professors who teach ethics, from medical practitioners, from those who do biomedical research, from those within America's faith traditions so that we as legislators might become informed about the ethical implications and issues for the

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
83	woman who terminates a pregnancy, for the researcher, for the
84	person who needs a cure, and for the baby.
85	This is then about bioethics. We did not invite our guests
86	here to debate election year politics, or journalism ethics or
87	whether this Select Panel should be funded. I ask my colleagues
88	to join me in focusing on bioethics so that we might hear the best
89	testimony our witnesses have to offer.
90	I welcome each and every one of you and I look forward to
91	hearing from you.
92	[The opening statement of Mrs. Blackburn follows:]
93	

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 1\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mrs. Blackburn. At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the ranking member, Ms. Schakowsky of Illinois.

Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to make two key points. First, fetal tissue research has saved millions of lives and has the potential for saving millions more. And that is why many Republicans have long supported and should continue to support the use of fetal tissue for research purposes.

Second, today's hearing is not part of a serious investigation into fetal tissue research or anything else. Twelve states, three congressional committees and a grand jury in Texas have already investigated and found no evidence that Planned Parenthood is seeking to profit from the sale of fetal tissue. Indeed, the only criminal acts uncovered in the course of these investigations have been those of anti-abortion extremist David Daleiden, who is now under indictment in Texas for his role in manufacturing the deceptively edited videos that have fueled the Republicans' latest attacks on women and their doctors.

Faced with these facts, the Select Panel should have disbanded. Instead, the chair has embarked on a partisan and dangerous witch hunt. Her actions are put into privacy and safety of Americans at risk.

Over the repeated objection of the Democratic members of the panel, the chair has sent dozens of document requests to academic

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 119 institutions, medical schools and healthcare providers across the 120 She has already issued three unilateral subpoenas 121 demanding the names of individual researchers, graduate students, 122 medical students, doctors, and clinic personnel and is 123 threatening to issue more. There are no rules in place to protect 124 these names from public disclosures. In fact, the chair's staff 125 has made it perfectly clear that any name turned over to the panel 126 may be released to the public. 127 There is no reason to create such a database. And the 128 chair's abuse of her position as chair to compel this information 129 is, frankly, reminiscent of Senator Joe McCarthy's abusive 130 tactics. 131 We live in a world where researchers who use fetal tissue 132 133 134 135

are compared to Nazi war criminals and extremists have tried to burn clinics to the ground. We live in a world where women have to face a gauntlet of harassment to get healthcare and where there are threatening Web sites that identify reproductive healthcare providers, their families, and maps of the location to their clinics and homes.

On the day after Thanksqiving, a gunman drove 60 miles to a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs, killed three people, injured nine others, and terrorized doctors and patients. And when arrested, he uttered the words, "no more baby parts," a phrase that many of my Republican colleagues have invoked both

136

137

138

139

140

141

before and after these murders and in connection with this panel's investigation.

Linking individual names to an investigation that the Republicans describe as examining, "the harvesting" of "baby body parts" and the "horrific" practice of abortion providers puts people in danger. Our words and our actions matter.

The chair has refused to explain why she needs a database of names. As the Washington Post Editorial Board asked just a few weeks ago, "How is the name of a graduate student who 5 years ago was an intern at a lab relevant to anything?" There is no apparent reason for this, other than harassment and intimidation. Republicans may not like the fact that abortion is legal and, therefore, safe for women in this country but that is no excuse for putting students, researchers, women and doctors at risk.

The Democratic members of this committee have repeatedly asked the chair to stop demanding that information. We have proposed reasonable rules that would prevent collection of certain information and otherwise protect the information that we do receive. So far, the chair has ignored our request. Nonetheless, I want to make this very clear to the entities that are under threat of subpoena or contempt from the chair and to every researcher, doctor, and woman in America, Democrats will continue to fight to keep them safe.

The unfortunate truth is that this partisan pursuit of the

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
167	manufactured false allegations of anti-abortion extremists is
168	putting Americans in harm's way and it must stop. It is time to
169	turn our attention to ensuring, not attacking critical medical
170	research and women's access to healthcare.
171	With that, I request unanimous consent to enter into the
172	record the February 21, 2015 Washington Post editorial, The
173	Planned Parenthood Witch Hunt. And I yield back the balance of
174	my time.
175	[The information follows:]
176	

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
178	Mrs. Blackburn. And your entry is made, without objection.
179	The gentlelady yields back her time.
180	Mr. Nadler. Madam Chairperson?
181	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman is recognized.
182	Mr. Nadler. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Madam Chair.
183	Mrs. Blackburn. Parliamentary inquiry. State your
184	inquiry.
185	Mr. Nadler. Madam Chair, my colleague, the ranking member,
186	noted in her opening remarks our concerns about your dangerous
187	and sweeping demands for the names of individual researchers,
188	graduate and medical students, doctors, and clinic personnel.
189	Can you explain what rules govern these demands?
190	Mrs. Blackburn. The answer to your inquiry, we are entitled
191	to the information and we are going to take the necessary
192	Mr. Nadler. Under what rules are you entitled to the
193	information is my question?
194	Mrs. Blackburn. We are under the jurisdiction of the Rules
195	of the House of Representatives and the Rules of the Committee
196	on Energy and Commerce.
197	Mr. Nadler. Very well. Further parliamentary inquiry.
198	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman will state his inquiry.
199	Mr. Nadler. If we are under the Rules of the Committee on
200	Energy and Commerce, Rule 16 of the Rules of the Energy and
201	Commerce Committee requires that "The chair shall notify the <b>NEAL R. GROSS</b>

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 11 202 ranking minority member prior to issuing any subpoena under such 203 To the extent practicable, the chair shall consult 204 with the ranking minority member at least 72 hours in advance of 205 a subpoena being issued under such authority. The chairman shall 206 report to the members of the committee on the issuance of a 207 subpoena as soon as practicable but in no event later than 1 week 208 after issuance of such subpoena." 209 Those rules require three things, Madam Chair. They require 210 you to notify the ranking member in advance; they require you to consult with the ranking member and to do so 72 hours before 211 212 issuing a subpoena; and they require you to report within a week 213 to the committee. 214 On Friday, February 12th, you told Ranking Member Schakowsky 215 during votes on the House floor that you would be issuing subpoenas 216 the next week. We immediately asked for a meeting to discuss this 217 and for a copy of the subpoenas so that we could see what we were 218 requesting. Those requests were refused. You then issued the 219 subpoenas on the 16th of February, 4 days after that conversation, 220 and have yet to report on their issuance. 221 Madam Chair, can you explain what constitutes consultation 222 and reporting within the meaning of Energy and Commerce Rule 16? 223 Mrs. Blackburn. Energy and Commerce Committee requires a conversation on the committee's plans, which I did. And I will 224

remind the gentleman the resolution establishing this panel,

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
226	House Resolution 461, stated that Rule 11 of the House of
227	Representatives and the Rules of the Committee apply to this
228	panel. Further, the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce
229	do not require subcommittees. And this panel, the functional
230	equivalent of a subcommittee, are not required to first meet or
231	organize before conducting business.
232	Mr. Nadler. Madam Chair, further parliamentary inquiry.
233	Mrs. Blackburn. State your inquiry.
234	Mr. Nadler. Whether what you have described is a
235	long-standing practice, the fact is we made a direct the ranking
236	member made a direct request to discuss these particular subpoenas
237	and have a copy of them. The flat refusal even to communicate
238	with Democratic members has unfortunately been commonplace since
239	the outset of this investigation and violates the duty under the
240	rule to consult.
241	With regard to reporting, we have yet to receive any report
242	on the issuance of these subcommittees, including, and this is
243	critically important, exactly what information entities are
244	refusing to produce and how that information is pertinent to this
245	investigation.
246	Contrary to your public claims that these entities had not
247	cooperated with the panel, they have in fact done so. They have
248	turned over hundreds of document and to the extent there remains
249	any disagreement, it appears to be over your demand that they turn

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
250	over the names of students, researchers, doctors, and clinic
251	personnel. To date, you have refused to explain how this
252	information is pertinent to the investigation. The recipients
253	of your demands are entitled to this information, as are your
254	Democratic and Republican colleagues. It is incumbent on you,
255	certainly prior to moving to issue or enforce a subpoena to show
256	how the information you demand is pertinent to the matters we are
257	investigating.
258	Madam Chair, will you explain how the names of individual
259	medical or graduate students, researchers, healthcare providers,
260	and clinic personnel are pertinent to this investigation, please?
261	Mrs. Blackburn. No, sir, I am not going to do that. But
262	I will let you know, Mr. Nadler, that copies of all the document
263	requests have been made available to the minority. Copies of the
264	subpoenas have been made available. And the requirements have
265	been met.
266	And at this point, we are going to move on and introduce our
267	first
268	Mr. Nadler. No, Madam Chair, I have one further
269	parliamentary inquiry, which I would
270	Mrs. Blackburn. State your inquiry.
271	Mr. Nadler. I will state at the outset I disagree with the
272	assertion that we need to compile a database of names to get
273	answers that we can easily get from institutional

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
274	representatives, persons who are akin to 30(b)(6) witnesses under
275	the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. You have refused to inform
276	the subcommittee, to consult with the subcommittee. You should
277	drop the demand for names and adopt the rules that we have
278	proposed, which will ensure a more balanced and a fair
279	investigation. If not, we should at least if you will not
280	change the rules, we should at least obey our current rules. We
281	cannot proceed in flagrant violation of the rules, nor should we
282	proceed with dangerous subpoenas that endanger the lives and
283	physical safety of patients, providers, and researchers in a way
284	that could make this committee complicit with any physical
285	assaults on these people or any murders of these people.
286	I, therefore, move to quash the subpoenas.
287	Mr. Pitts. Madam Chair.
288	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman is recognized.
289	Mr. Pitts. I move to quash the motion.
290	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to
291	table the motion. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has moved to
292	table the motion. The question occurs on approving the motion
293	to table.
294	All those in favor of signifying to table the motion will
295	say aye.
296	All opposed say no.
297	The ayes have it.

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
298	Mr. Nadler. Roll call vote.
299	Mr. Pitts. Roll call.
300	Mrs. Blackburn. Roll call is requested.
301	The Clerk. Mr. Pitts.
302	Mr. Pitts. Aye.
303	The Clerk. Mr. Pitts, aye.
304	Mrs. Black.
305	Mrs. Black. Aye.
306	The Clerk. Mrs. Black, aye.
307	Mr. Bucshon.
308	Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
309	The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon, aye.
310	Mr. Duffy.
311	Mr. Duffy. Aye.
312	The Clerk. Mr. Duffy, aye.
313	Mr. Harris.
314	Mr. Harris. Aye.
315	The Clerk. Mr. Harris, aye.
316	Mrs. Hartzler.
317	Mrs. Hartzler. Aye.
318	The Clerk. Mrs. Hartzler, aye.
319	Mrs. Love.
320	Mrs. Love. Aye.
321	The Clerk. Mrs. Love, aye.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

nittee's website as soon as it is available.
Ms. Schakowsky.
Ms. Schakowsky. No.
The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, no.
Mr. Nadler.
Mr. Nadler. No.
The Clerk. Mr. Nadler, no.
Ms. DeGette.
Ms. DeGette. No.
The Clerk. Ms. DeGette, no.
Ms. Speier.
Ms. Speier. No.
The Clerk. Ms. Speier, no.
Ms. DelBene.
Ms. DelBene. No.
The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, no.
Mrs. Watson Coleman.
Mrs. Watson Coleman. No.
The Clerk. Mrs. Watson Coleman, no.
Mrs. Blackburn.
Mrs. Blackburn. Aye.
The Clerk. Mrs. Blackburn, aye.
Mrs. Blackburn. The clerk will report.
The Clerk. Mrs. Chairman, on that vote there were eight a

 $\parallel$  This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
346	Mrs. Blackburn. The motion is tabled. At this time, we
347	will introduce our first panel. I will ask that our panelists
348	please move to the table as they are called forward.
349	First, Ms. Paige Comstock Cunningham. She is the Executive
350	Director of the Center for Bioethics and Human Dignity. She is
351	a fellow at the Institute for Biotechnology and the Human Future
352	and a trustee of Taylor University.
353	Dr. Gerald Donovan. Dr. Gerald Kevin Donovan is Senior
354	Clinical Scholar at the Kennedy Institute of Ethics at Georgetown
355	University. He is also Director of the Pellegrino Center for
356	Clinical Bioethics and Professor of Pediatrics at Georgetown.
357	Professor Alta Charo. Professor Charo is the Warren P.
358	Knowles Professor of Law and Bioethics at the University of
359	Wisconsin at Madison, where she is on the faculty of the law school
360	and the Department of Medical History and Bioethics at the Medical
361	School.
362	I want to welcome each of you. And at this point, I would
363	like to make certain that as you are here, you are aware that the
364	Selective Investigative Panel is holding an investigative hearing
365	and will take testimony under oath.
366	Do you have an objection to testifying under oath?
367	Dr. Donovan. No.
368	Mrs. Watson Coleman. No.
369	Ms. Charo. No.
I I	NEAL & LEGIST

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
370	Mrs. Blackburn. The chair then advises you that under the
371	rules of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, you are
372	entitled to be advised by counsel. Do you desire to be advised
373	by counsel during your testimony today?
374	Dr. Donovan. No.
375	Mrs. Watson Coleman. No.
376	Ms. Charo. No.
377	Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you. If each of you will stand to
378	be sworn in for your testimony.
379	[Witnesses sworn.]
380	Mrs. Blackburn. You are now under oath and subject to the
381	penalties set forth in Title 18, Section 1001 of the U.S. Code.
382	You may have 8 minutes to make a written summary to provide
383	a statement summary of your written testimony and we thank each
384	of you for providing that. I am going to ask that you make sure
385	that your mike is on before you give your testimony and then that
386	you will turn the mike off when you finish, and you will turn it
387	back on when we move to the question portion.
388	And Dr. Donovan, we will begin with you for your testimony.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 19 TESTIMONY OF GERALD KEVIN DONOVAN, M.D., M.A., DIRECTOR OF THE PELLEGRINO CENTER FOR CLINICAL BIOETHICS AND PROFESSOR OF PEDIATRICS AT GEORGETOWN; PAIGE COMSTOCK CUNNINGHAM, J.D., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR BIOETHICS AND HUMAN DIGNITY; AND ROBIN ANNE (ALTA) CHARO, J.D., WARREN P. KNOWLES PROFESSOR OF LAW AND BIOETHICS, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MADISON. TESTIMONY OF GERALD KEVIN DONOVAN Well, thank you. Chairman Blackburn and Dr. Donovan. members of the panel, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present testimony regarding the bioethical considerations in the harvesting, transfer, and use of fetal tissue and organs. I am a physician trained in both pediatrics and clinical bioethics. I have spent my entire professional career always been concerned about the most vulnerable patients, those who need others to speak up for them, both at the beginning and at the end of life. I also have significant familiarity with research ethics, having spent 17 years as the rightness and the wrongness of medical research in order to protect human subjects. We took this aspect of our duties so seriously that I renamed our IRB the Institutional Research Ethics Board. Four years ago I was called by my mentor, Dr. Edmund Pellegrino, to take his place as Director of the Center for Clinical Bioethics at Georgetown University. Our duties include ethics education for medical students and resident physicians, ethics consultation for patients and doctors at the hospital, as well as the promulgation of scholarly papers and

We focus on both clinical ethics, that which directly involves the good of patients, as well as addressing normative questions, those which involve right and wrong.

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

This is what we want young physicians to know: medicine is a moral enterprise. Our actions have consequences that can be good or bad for patients and we must always focus on the patient's good and avoid doing harm. So what does this mean for the topic at hand? We're talking about bioethics and the fetus. In order to make any moral judgments, we would have to be clear on the moral status of the fetus. Obviously, this is an area in which society has not reached a consensus, but that does not mean we cannot make sound judgments on the topic.

In a question of biomedical ethics, it is good to start with solid science. What do we know about the fetus with certainty? Well, first of all we know that it is alive, that it represents growing, developing, cells, tissues, and organs, all of which develop increasing complexity and biologic sophistication, resulting in an intact organism, a human baby.

Of course, this growth and development does not cease with the production of the baby, but continues for many years afterwards. As can be seen by this description, the fetus is not only alive, but is demonstrably human. I'm not talking about a potential human in the way that some parents talk about their teenagers as potential adults. I am referring to the scientific fact that a fetus constitutes a live human, typically 46XX or 46XY, fully and genetically human. In fact, it is the irrefutable humanness of these tissues and organs that have made them be of interest to researchers and scientists.

So, if a fetus is clearly both alive and human, can we justify taking these tissues and organs for scientific experimentation? If so, under what circumstances and what sort of consent or authorization should be required?

In the past century, medicine has made incredible progress resulting from scientific studies involving human tissues and organs, resulting in the development of medications, vaccines, and the entire field of transplantation medicine. Is there any difference between these accomplishments and those that would require the harvesting of body parts and tissues from the fetus? First, we would have to admit that not all scientific experimentation has been praiseworthy. Studies done by Dr. Mengele in Germany and by American researchers in Guatemala and Tuskegee were morally abhorrent and any knowledge gleaned from these would be severely tainted. No one would want to associate our current scientific studies involving the human fetus with such egregious breaches of research ethics. All that it takes to avoid such a comparison is a consensus on the moral status of the fetus.

Those who have proceeded with experimentation and research on embryonic and fetal cells, tissues, and organs

may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 21 437 typically have obtained them as the result of an abortion. 
It is this stark fact that makes such scientific endeavors 438 controversial, because they have proceeded without the aforementioned consensus on the moral status of the fetus. 439 Because we know that the fetus is alive, and human, we must find some explanation for why it should not be 440 treated with the same dignity that we accord all other human lives. The most frequent argument offered is that, 441 although it is a human life, it is not a human person. Various criteria are offered for a definition of personhood but 442 none have been found universally acceptable. We, thus, have a standoff between those who would protect this early 443 vulnerable human life and those that would deny that it deserves protection. 444 In order to resolve such an ethical dilemma, the guiding principle is this: one is morally permitted to take such 445 a life once you can demonstrate with moral certainty that the life is not fully human. 

It is a concept that can be 446 exemplified by the situation faced by a hunter when he sees a bush shaking. He may sincerely believe that it is a deer in 447 the bush but if he kills it, prior to determining with certainty what it is that he is killing, he will be morally responsible, as 448 well as legally, if he has in fact killed the farmer's cow, or worse yet, the farmer. 449 As we can see, two deeply held but opposing viewpoints need not be resolved unless someone intends to act 450 Then, the one who intends to take the action resulting in the death of the disputed entity must not do so upon them. 451 unless they can first show with moral certainty that their perception of its moral worth is irrefutable. Those who would 452 not disturb the normal progression of its life bear no such burden. 453 It's my contention that such proof does not exist and deliberate fetal destruction for scientific purposes should 454 not proceed until it does. Moreover, without disputing the arguable necessity of research on fetal tissues, an arguable 455 necessity, I would also point out that harvesting it in such a way is unnecessary. Not only do cell lines already exist that 456 were produced in such a fashion, but new cell lines could be obtained from fetal tissues harvested from spontaneous 457 miscarriages. This is not a theoretical alternative. Georgetown University has a professor who has 458 patented a method of isolating, processing, and cryopreserving fetal cells from second semester, meaning 16- to 20-week 459 These have already been obtained and are stored in Georgetown freezers. gestation, miscarriages.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

Moreover, the present practices of obtaining fetal tissues and organs would seem to go against the procedures

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
461	that have been approved for others who harvest tissues and organs donated for transplantation. First, we follow a strict
462	rule, the dead donor rule. It states that vital unpaired organs cannot be obtained unless the donor has died a natural
463	death. This, obviously, is not the case in an induced abortion.
464	Moreover, such tissues or organs cannot be harvested without consent of the patient or their proper surrogate.
465	In pediatrics, parents are considered the normal proper surrogate. However, this interpretation rests on the
466	presumption that the parent is acting in the best interests of the individual child. It is difficult to sustain such an
467	interpretation when it is the same parent who has just consented to the abortive destruction of that individual fetus from
468	whom those tissues and organs would be obtained.
469	Finally, we are at a difficult time in our nation's history. We demonstrate much moral ambiguity in our
470	approach to the human fetus. We have decided that we can legally abort the same fetus that might otherwise be a
471	candidate for fetal surgery, even using the same indications as justification for acts that are diametrically opposed. We
472	call it the fetus if it is to be aborted and its tissues and organs transferred to a scientific lab. We call it a baby, even at the
473	same stage of gestation, when someone plans to keep it and bring it into their home.
474	Language has consequences, but it can also reflect our conflicts. We are a nation justly proud of the progress
475	and
476	achievements of our biomedical research but lifesaving research cannot and should not require the destruction of life for
477	it to go forward. If we cannot act with moral certainty regarding the appropriate respect and dignity of the fetus, we
478	cannot morally justify its destruction. Alternatives clearly exist that are less controversial and moral arguments exist that
479	support our natural abhorrence at the trafficking of human fetal parts.
480	Surely we can, and surely we must, find a better way.
481	Thank you.
482	[The prepared statement of Dr. Donovan follows:]
483	
484	**************************************

Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you.

485

486

Ms. Cunningham, you are recognized.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

## TESTIMONY OF PAIGE COMSTOCK CUNNINGHAM

Ms. Cunningham. Madam Chair Blackburn, Ranking Member Schakowsky, and members of the Select Investigative Panel, thank you for the opportunity to speak about the ethics surrounding the use of fetal tissue for research.

My argument, which is expanded in my written testimony is three-fold. First, respect the fetus. The fetus is a human being, who entitled to the protections of modern guidelines for medical research. The foundational principles of respect for persons should apply to unborn children without distinction.

Second, you cannot take a life and then give away the body. Participants in elective abortion, including the mother, are morally disqualified from consenting to donating the body, organs, or tissue of the now dead fetus for research purposes.

And third, there are better, more ethical options.

First, at the core of our concern is the fundamentally important question: Who or what is the fetus? The biological facts are clear. The fetus is an organism in charge of her own integral organic functioning, enduring and developing over time, through all the stages of human existence. First, embryo, fetus, infant, adolescent, and adult. Rather than being a distinct and lesser form of human life, the fetus is a distinct human being at a particular stage of development. She is not a potential

human being but an actual human being. No one has the right to take her life by force.

Those who are responsible for her death have failed to recognize the fundamental principle of human dignity. They have no moral claim to donate or assign her body, organs, or tissues to others. Even more, others should not profit from this wrongful act, whether for monetary gain, scientific reputation, better health, or even to claim these cures are so wonderful, how could anyone oppose this research.

The regulatory scheme of protection for human subjects of medical research has continued to expand protection for research subjects to ensure that their participation is voluntary and fully informed and that the research is for their benefit, or if not, causes no more than minimal harm and that they may have access to the benefits of the research. Protections have been explicitly extended to most vulnerable populations but not to the fetus to be aborted. If she were being treated in utero for her own benefit, the HHS Policy for Protection of Human Subjects provides heightened protection for her well-being. That same HHS policy also provides special protections for prisoners but not for the fetus to be aborted.

Some have argued that we all share a moral obligation to contribute our organs or bodies after death for the good of society. Others claim the principle of proximity, the view that

we would want to help those most like us. In her analysis of fetal tissue transplantation, Kathleen Nolan elaborates on a problem with this view. And I quote, "In the setting of elective abortion a cruel irony thus emerges: fetuses that have been excluded from membership in the human community by a societally sanctioned maternal decision to abort now have obligations to that same community because of membership in it." We reject this cruel irony.

Now, federal law does attempt to erect a barrier of sorts between the decision to abort and the decision to donate. For example, the procedure must not be altered in any way to accommodate researcher's needs. And elements of informed consent for tissue donations should include telling the donor's family if the tissue will be used outside the U.S.; whether it will be modified into a commercial product; the distinction between the for-profit and non-profit entities involved; and that she be given a copy of the form she signed.

Is the woman contemplating donation made aware of the specific body parts that will be harvested? The request may be for the unborn child's eyes, his brain, his kidneys that might be transplanted into a rat, his thymus, or pancreas. But the greatest demand might be for his liver. Women might find this factual information relevant to their decision.

So, how is effective informed consent accomplished in the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

27
setting where there is no established institutional oversight to ensure compliance with this regulation, as the vast majority of abortions take place in clinics that are outside the ordinary.

ensure compliance with this regulation, as the vast majority of abortions take place in clinics that are outside the ordinary system of healthcare and the accreditation requirements that exist in hospitals and ambulatory surgical centers? Further, abortion clinic owners vigorously resist health standards that are imposed on all other ambulatory surgical centers.

The history of the use of human bodies and parts in medical education and research reveals a disturbing pattern of first seeking access from the most disadvantaged in society. One national commission noted that there have been "instances of abuse in the area of fetal research and that the poor and minority groups may bear an inequitable burden as research subjects." It would be enlightening to know whether that abuse continues and the demographic profiles of women who are solicited to donate.

There is yet another reason to oppose the current practices of fetal tissue research. It is unnecessary. Alternative, ethically-derived sources of cells exist and they are working. My written testimony addresses this more fully and I will defer to other witnesses to speak to this more directly.

A just society has no moral or other claim on electively aborted fetal bodies, organs, or tissues. Unborn children scheduled for termination by induced abortion are among, if not the most vulnerable members of the human family. As has been said

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
583	by many leaders in many ways, a society will be judged by how we
584	treat our weakest, most vulnerable members.
585	Curbing the current practices of fetal tissue research would
586	be a small but very significant step toward honoring the dignity
587	of all our members.
588	Thank you.
589	[The prepared statement of Ms. Cunningham follows:]
590	
591	**************************************

Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Ms. Cunningham.

Professor Charo, you are recognized for 8 minutes.

592

$_{ m I}$ This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements wit	hin
may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speak	er.
A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on	the
Committee's website as soon as it is available.	30

TESTIMONY OF ROBIN ANNE (ALTA) CHARO

Ms. Charo. Thank you, Madam Chairman, Ranking Member
Schakowsky, and members of the Selective Investigative Panel.
Thank you for allowing me to address you today on the question of fetal tissue research.

My name is Alta Charo. I am a member of the National Academy of Medicine, and was a member of the National Bioethics Advisory Commission from 1996 to 2001.

At present, I am the Warren P. Knowles Professor of Law and Bioethics, on the faculties of both the Law School and the School of Medicine & Public Health at the University of Wisconsin. But I would like to note for the record that I am not here to represent the University of Wisconsin or any of its units and that I have used my own personal funds in order to attend the hearing.

Madam Chair, fetal tissue has been used in research in this country since the 1920s, and NIH has funded it since the 1950s. It has been deemed ethical by federal review bodies going back half a century, and has been specifically authorized for funding by Congress for funding for over a quarter-century precisely because it has saved the lives of countless people, including children and infants. It continues to be ethical and it will continue to save lives.

In my view, supporting this research represents a

commitment to helping today's patients and tomorrow's infants. I say this for three reasons. First, this research serves a compelling public health purpose. Second, it operates with in a framework of state and federal law. And third, support for it need not depend on one's views about abortion.

First, any discussion about fetal tissue must begin with its unimpeachable claim to have saved the lives and improved the health of millions of people. Indeed, almost every American has benefitted from this research in the form of vaccines for whooping cough, tetanus, chicken pox and German measles. Diseases do not discriminate, and the beneficiaries of this research come from every place on the political, religious, geographic and economic spectrum. You, yourselves, and those whom you love are undoubtedly among those who have benefitted from this research and whose lives have been made better.

When work began, nearly century ago, no one knew precisely where the research would lead but, over time, it led to a Nobel Prize for developing a polio vaccine using cell lines from fetal tissue. Today's scientists also cannot say precisely which disease will benefit or when but HHS says that fetal tissue continues to be a critical resource for developing vaccines against dengue fever, HIV and Ebola, and for research on devastating diseases such as Huntington's chorea and Alzheimer's.

And as of this year, Zika virus is also on that growing list.

I would note for your attention that the CDC has posted information on its Web site on how to provide fetal tissue, including neurological tissue, preferably with the architectural structure intact, specifically for the purpose of studying and managing the Zika virus to prevent devastating birth defects in tomorrow's infants. Now some people may find the dispassionate, technical language used by professionals to be startling but one should never mistake that for callousness, particularly when talking about men and women who have devoted their lives to improving all of our lives through medicine and science. And the use of cadaveric tissue and organs, ranging from mature hearts from adults to fetal tissue, can make some people uncomfortable about benefitting from material whose origins lie in complex situations but it does not prevent us from accepting this life-saving gift.

Critics have overwhelmingly partaken of the vaccines and treatments derived from fetal tissue and give no indication that they will foreswear further benefits. Fairness and reciprocity alone would suggest they should support the work or at least not thwart it.

Second, the use of fetal tissue in research has been, specifically protected under American law for over 50 years, beginning in the 1960s with the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act, which was drafted specifically to include a provision allowing fetal tissue to be donated just as other cadaveric tissue is donated.

And in 1974, President Ford had a commission that looked specifically at fetal tissue research and that commission also found that it is ethical.

In the 1980s, President Reagan created the Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel, chaired by the late Arlin Adams, a Republican, a retired federal judge, an opponent of abortion rights, and the author of a book entitled A Nation Dedicated to Religious Liberty. Like the earlier Ford commission, the Reagan panel found the research to be ethical, declared there was no evidence that fetuses were ever killed for the purpose of obtaining tissue and no evidence that it ever had any effect on decision-making or on the number of abortions performed in this country.

However, to guard against even that hypothetical possibility, current practice follows those recommendations and discussion about donation takes place only after a woman has definitively decided to terminate her pregnancy. Indeed, the Reagan panel explicitly considered the question of whether the woman, herself, should be the one who gives consent and concluded that she was the party most interested in this topic and in this outcome and, therefore, she retained the moral authority to make this decision. They viewed any alternative to be even more problematic.

Fetal tissue research is subject to local oversight

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 34 690 committees, state law, laboratory, tissue bank regulations, and 691 various federal laws addressing everything from the consent 692 process, to collection and storage, to confidentiality of 693 records. 694 Two separate GAO investigations have found no violations, 695 and found no sale of tissue, but only legally permitted 696 reimbursement for expenses and no violations have been found in 697 any current investigations at either the federal or state level. 698 Third, support for fetal tissue transcends the debate about 699 abortion rights. Federal review has repeatedly found that the 700 option to donate tissue has no effect on whether a woman will 701 choose to have an abortion. That is one reason why the Congress passed by overwhelming, bipartisan margins that codified the 702 703 recommendations of the Ford and Reagan committees, authorization 704 to fund this research in particular. Some of the most passionate supporters of that research 705 706 recognized the difference between opposition to abortion rights 707 and opposition to research using fetal tissue. Senator John 708 McCain, for example, was quoted as saying "My abhorrence for the 709 practice of abortion is unquestionable. Yet, my abhorrence for 710 these diseases and the suffering they cause is just as strong." 711 In this country, women have a constitutionally-protected 712 right to safe and legal abortion services. They make their

decisions for their own reasons. And after that, some of them

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
714	choose to donate the cadaveric fetal tissue to research. We gair
715	nothing when we turn our back on the benefits of that research
716	for people who are sick today, or will be sick tomorrow, to say
717	nothing of the irony of halting research that improves our chance
718	of preventing miscarriages, preventing birth defects, and of
719	saving infant lives.
720	Thank you very much for your attention.
721	[The prepared statement of Ms. Charo follows:]
722	
723	**************************************

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
724	Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Professor Charo.
725	And I will note that both of our female panelists came in
726	with time to spare. And I think that is off to a great start.
727	I yield myself 5 minutes for questions, as we begin our
728	question round. And again, I thank you all. I am kind of going
729	to do a lightening round on questions, if you will. So, let us
730	just, we will be, Dr. Donovan, with you in responses and then just
731	go right down the line.
732	So, first question. Do you think any business or clinic
733	should sell fetal tissue for a profit?
734	Dr. Donovan. No.
735	Ms. Cunningham. I do not.
736	Mrs. Blackburn. Keep your mikes on, please.
737	Ms. Cunningham. I do not.
738	Ms. Charo. It is against the law.
739	Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you all.
740	Number two, do you think that fetal organs should be grown
741	and harvested for transplant?
742	Dr. Donovan. No.
743	Ms. Cunningham. If they can be grown ethically but not from
744	the fetus itself.
745	Mrs. Blackburn. Okay.
746	Ms. Charo. I apologize but I am not sure I understand
747	exactly what you mean by grown. Are you talking about getting
	NEAL DIODOC

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
748	pregnant deliberately in order to donate tissue? No, I would not
749	think that that is appropriate. And in fact, the Reagan panel
750	specifically worried about so-called directed donation and
751	recommended that that be forbidden and it is, under the law.
752	If you are talking about the creation of synthetic organs,
753	which is currently under investigation and is something I believe
754	my colleague Dr. Goldstein might even be talking about in the next
755	panel, then I think that is something that needs a closer look
756	and, without further information, I couldn't say but it is
757	probably a very good alternative.
758	Mrs. Blackburn. Okay, thank you.
759	Question number three. Do you think fetal tissue should be
760	used for cosmetics, cell lines to do taste tests for food, or for
761	experiments that combine human and animal DNA?
762	Dr. Donovan. No matter how they are obtained, I would find
763	these distasteful.
764	Ms. Cunningham. I agree with Dr. Donovan.
765	Mrs. Blackburn. Okay.
766	Ms. Charo. I think fetal tissue should be used in the same
767	ways we use tissue from adults who have died and that includes
768	a wide range of uses. Some of the ones you mentioned are certainly
769	not the ones that are the most compelling but they are within the
770	law at this time.
771	Mrs. Blackburn. Okay.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 38
772	Number four, if an alternative source of tissue to form cell
773	lines exist, such as spontaneous miscarriages, do you think that
774	is a more ethical approach?
775	Dr. Donovan. It does exist and it is more ethical.
776	Ms. Cunningham. Yes, and panels have found that to be the
777	case.
778	Ms. Charo. It can be used but it was found to be insufficient
779	as a substitute for tissue from fetuses that were electively
780	aborted. That was specifically considered by the Reagan panel
781	and has been the subject of investigation since then, due to the
782	kinds of causes that underlie miscarriages and often change the
783	nature of the tissue. But certainly, it would be less
784	controversial if one could find tissue that does not raise
785	questions about the abortion debate. And avoiding controversy
786	is preferable when it is possible but not simply in order to avoid
787	controversy at the expense of public health.
788	Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you.
789	And the fifth question: If vaccines exist that do not rely
790	upon fetal tissue or cell lines, should consumers be given a
791	choice?
792	Dr. Donovan. Actually, for the most part, those vaccines
793	do exist. There are a few still left over from the cell lines
794	started in the '60s to which there is no alternative. Many people
795	have asked that an alternative be developed. That wasn't a yes

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
796	or a no, was it?
797	Mrs. Blackburn. That is an answer and that is perfectly
798	fine.
799	Dr. Donovan. Thank you.
800	Mrs. Blackburn. I appreciate that and I will take that
801	elaboration.
802	Ms. Cunningham. I think parents and patients should be
803	aware of the source of the vaccines they are using. At least,
804	it should be available for their information for them to make their
805	own choice about whether to use one that is derived ethically or
806	unethically.
807	Ms. Charo. That information is available on the internet.
808	I have no problem with the idea of saying that people have the
809	right to have as much information as possible and to make choices
810	for themselves.
811	I would note in passing that with regard to the vaccines that
812	have no current alternatives, the Vatican has said specifically
813	that although they would wish that there would be other
814	alternatives available, that parents who wish to protect their
815	children by using vaccines that were derived using fetal tissue
816	should feel free to go ahead and do so and put their children's
817	interests ahead of all other concerns.
818	Dr. Donovan. Madam Chairman?
819	Mrs. Blackburn. Yes?

	Committee's website as soon as it is available. 40
820	Dr. Donovan. Could I offer a correction to that one? I
821	hesitate to have Ms. Charo corrected on the interpretation of
822	Vatican statements but, in fact, that isn't what the Vatican said.
823	What they actually said was because the danger to pregnant women
824	would be so great and their fetuses that children could be
825	immunized with this; not so much for the protection of the children
826	themselves from getting rubella but from spreading it to pregnant
827	women and their babies.
828	Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. Professor Charo, did you have
829	anything else to add?
830	Ms. Charo. No. I am happy to accept the notion that their
831	concern was not for the child who is getting vaccinated but for
832	the future children who might be affected when pregnant women get
833	infected from the unvaccinated child.
834	Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. Dr. Donovan, anything else?
835	Dr. Donovan. It wasn't a lack of concern for children
836	getting vaccinated. Vaccines, all us pediatricians think
837	vaccines are wonderful things and everybody ought to get lots of
838	them but, in fact, the reason that such a moral change could occur,
839	such an exception could be offered was because it was truly life
840	or death for the pregnant woman's baby and that is who needed the
841	protection and, therefore, the exception could be made.
842	They still are quite in favor of other vaccinations.
843	Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you. My time has expired.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

At this time, I yield 5 minutes for questions to Ms. Schakowsky.

Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. The Los Angeles Times reporter and columnist Michael Hiltzik wrote in September of last year that, it "would be a moral outrage" if fetal tissue research became "collateral damage in the campaign against Planned Parenthood."

He also quotes you, Professor Charo, as saying "we have a duty to use fetal tissue for research and therapy and that duty includes taking advantage of avenues of hope for current and future patients, particularly if those avenues are being threatened by a purely political fight."

So, let me ask you, can you explain, Dr. Charo, the view that there actually is an affirmative duty to use available avenues of research. And if you could, please address how this might come into play with the Zika virus and research to understand and find a solution to what the World Health Organization has classified as a "public health emergency of international concern."

Ms. Charo. Thank you, Ms. Schakowsky, for the question.

The United States health policy is directed at improving the quality of public health. It is considered a compelling purpose under every possible regime of both law, legislative and judicial. And in this particular instance, this research has proven itself capable of preventing millions of diseases and has shown tremendous promise across a range of illnesses.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

From my perspective, if we are dedicated to improving the health and welfare of our population, this means pursuing avenues of research that might improve our resistance to disease or our ability to manage or even cure diseases. Now, that is always balanced against other interests. And I understand and appreciate the depth of concerns about abortion that are expressed here at this table and by many other Americans. But because this research in no way affects the number of abortions, it seems to me that we are balancing a compelling public health need against what is simply a gesture of sentiment, respect, political position, or other kind of non-concrete affect against the possible cure for diseases.

Now with regard to Zika, I think it brings it really into focus because right now, we are struggling to understand exactly how the Zika virus operates, how it is that it can be transmitted through the placenta to the fetus, how it is that it can affect fetal development at different stages of gestation and how we can understand what kinds of outcomes it will have. For that, we need to actually look at the tissue available after every stage of gestation where there actually has been a termination of pregnancy, whether through miscarriage or through elective abortion.

If we don't do that, we are facing, as you said, a global emergency in which pregnant women will be forced to choose between

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  43
892	risking the birth of a child with devastating effects or, in fact,
893	terminating her pregnancy; irony being that the absence of this
894	fetal tissue research might lead to more pregnancy terminations
895	than anybody has ever contemplated up until now. I think we need
896	to look very hard at the unintended effects of restricting this
897	research.
898	Ms. Schakowsky. So, are you saying then that without fetal
899	tissue research we can't really understand the effect on fetuses?
900	Ms. Charo. Because I am not a research scientist, I don't
901	want to answer definitively but I can say that looking at the NIH
902	Web site, looking at the CDC Web site, and looking at the
903	information put out by other national governments, it seems clear
904	that there is a global consensus it is very important to study
905	exactly how the virus operates, both at the earliest and latest
906	stages of pregnancy in order to understand how we might either
907	stop it or treat it.
908	Ms. Schakowsky. Let me also ask you if the remains of the
909	fetus are not used for fetal tissue research, what happens to it?
910	Ms. Charo. The tissue is discarded. There are a variety
911	of methods; some involve burial, others involve cremation. There
912	are a few states that have very specific legislation about the
913	management of fetal remains. But they are not used in any way
914	that is helpful to anybody outside of the possibility of using
915	them for this research.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  44
916	Ms. Schakowsky. And let me ask you a question. Since we
917	are talking about ethics, is the fact that fetal tissue research
918	is now under at attack and at risk of being shut down warrant our
919	moral outrage?
920	Ms. Charo. I am outraged at the idea that we would sacrifice
921	valuable research and that we would gamble with the lives of
922	patients today and tomorrow, gamble with our own lives and gamble
923	with the lives of the people in our family and in our communities
924	because we are trying to fight a deeper battle about our common
925	view on the moral and legal status of the fetus. Again, I can
926	only say again and again the number of abortions in the United
927	States will be unaffected by the outcome of this discussion about
928	whether to use the remains for research.
929	The only thing we know is that we will lose the benefit of
930	the research for people who do in fact get sick.
931	Ms. Schakowsky. I thank you so much.
932	And Madam Chair, I seek unanimous consent to enter into the
933	record the Los Angeles Times article that I have been discussing
934	titled Planned Parenthood and the Cynical Attack on Fetal Tissue
935	Research.
936	[The information follows:]
937	
938	**************************************

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  45
Mrs. Blackburn. So ordered.
Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you.
Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back. At this time,
I recognize Chairman Pitts, 5 minutes.
Mr. Pitts. Thank you, Madam Chairman.
First of all, Dr. Charo's written statement that the success
of fetal tissue is "unimpeachable" is not completely accurate.
The Nobel Prize given to Enders, Weller, and Robbins in 1954 was
for showing that polio virus could be grown in fetal tissue in
the laboratory, not for developing the polio vaccine. In fact,
the original Salk and Sabin vaccines were raised in monkey
tissues, not human fetal tissue.
And she conflates the use of fresh aborted fetal tissue with
the use of fetal cell lines. And while a few cell lines which
did originate from an abortion were used in the past for production
of some vaccines, only a few modern vaccines utilize these old
fetal cell lines and none use fresh aborted fetal tissue. In fact
the CDC and other leading medical authorities have noted that "no
new fetal tissue is needed to produce cell lines to make these
vaccines now or in the future." The new successful vaccine

So, Dr. Donovan, looking at modern vaccines, do you see any

against Ebola virus announced last summer was made using monkey

tissue, not fetal tissue or fetal cell lines.

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the  Committee's website as soon as it is available.  46
963	need for use of fresh aborted fetal tissue for vaccine production?
964	Dr. Donovan. I think your statement was absolutely
965	accurate, that yes, these have been of use in the past. There
966	are other cell lines. There are other means of producing
967	vaccines. And so, there is no need to use fetal tissue to produce
968	new cell lines for vaccine production.
969	Moreover, I think it may be a bit disingenuous to say that
970	millions of lives have been saved because these vaccines were
971	produced in the past. Millions of doses have been given and
972	millions of infections have been prevented. Most of those, would
973	not have resulted in serious injury to the person immunized or
974	death, certainly. That doesn't mean we shouldn't still be
975	immunizing.
976	Mr. Pitts. Thank you.
977	Dr. Donovan. Thank you.
978	Mr. Pitts. Thank you. At what point and you can
979	continue, Dr. Donovan. At what point in human development does
980	science show one is a human being and why is this?
981	Dr. Donovan. Well, we really have to go back to one's
982	definition. If we are talking about is it human in terms of having
983	a full complement of cells that develop continually into fully
984	grown adults, that happens at the zygote stage.
985	Mr. Pitts. Well, let me go a little further. Is there a
986	point in the baby's gestation at which researchers most want fetal

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  47
987	tissue for research and why is this?
988	Dr. Donovan. And that I am not sure that I can answer
989	accurately. So, I won't.
990	Mr. Pitts. All right. Is there any scientific evidence
991	that unborn babies at a later stage feel pain and should the
992	knowledge of a baby's ability to feel pain by certain points in
993	development affect the ethics surrounding fetal tissue collection
994	from induced abortion?
995	Dr. Donovan. I think the evidence for fetal pain is very
996	strong and we are seeing good evidence at 18 to 20 weeks of
997	gestation that fetuses can respond with pain responses. And I
998	think no matter how you feel about a fetus, you can accept it is
999	humanity, you can reject it is humanity, but we wouldn't allow
1000	kittens and puppies to be harmed or put to sleep without keeping
1001	them out of pain. I don't think we should do that for fetuses
1002	either.
1003	Mr. Pitts. Ms. Cunningham, did you want to add something
1004	to that?
1005	Ms. Cunningham. No, thank you.
1006	Mr. Pitts. All right. Well, I appreciate your testimony
1007	about unborn children are the most vulnerable in the human family
1008	and they are deserving of respect and protection. Yet, we see
1009	they are legally they are destroyed in abortions and either
1010	thrown away or traded like a commodity and it is our duty to protect

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  48
1011	them, not facilitate the market for their case.
1012	My time has expired. Mrs. Chairman, I yield back.
1013	Mrs. Blackburn. And at this point, I yield 5 minutes to Ms.
1014	DeGette for questions.
1015	Ms. DeGette. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.
1016	I want to thank all the members of the panel for coming and
1017	presenting your different perspectives because I think talking
1018	about ethics in these situations is important.
1019	Dr. Donovan, I believe you testified and I only have 5
1020	minutes so yes or no will suffice most of the time I believe
1021	you testified that you are not a research scientist. Is that
1022	correct?
1023	Dr. Donovan. Although I have been
1024	Ms. DeGette. No, a yes or no will work. You are not a
1025	research scientist.
1026	Dr. Donovan. Yes.
1027	Ms. DeGette. Thank you.
1028	And Ms. Cunningham, you are an ethicist. Is that correct?
1029	Ms. Cunningham. Yes, in the most part.
1030	Ms. DeGette. Yes. Now, Dr. Donovan, I believe that you are
1031	philosophically opposed to abortion. Is that correct?
1032	Dr. Donovan. Yes.
1033	Ms. DeGette. And Ms. Cunningham, you are also
1034	philosophically opposed to abortion, right?
	NFALR GROSS

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  49
1035	Ms. Cunningham. Yes.
1036	Ms. DeGette. Now, Dr. Donovan, do you believe that fetal
1037	tissue research should be banned in this country? Yes or no?
1038	Dr. Donovan. It depends on where you get the tissue. No.
1039	Ms. DeGette. So, you don't believe it should be banned.
1040	Okay, what about you, Ms. Cunningham?
1041	Ms. Cunningham. I can't give a yes or no answer to that.
1042	Some should be banned.
1043	Ms. DeGette. Some should. Well, which should be banned?
1044	Ms. Cunningham. That that is unethically derived that
1045	uses unethically derived tissue.
1046	Ms. DeGette. Okay, tell me which fetal tissue research is
1047	ethically derived.
1048	Ms. Cunningham. That which uses fetuses that are donated
1049	after an ectopic pregnancy is removed or a stillbirth or a
1050	miscarriage.
1051	Ms. DeGette. Okay. So do you think that fetal tissue
1052	research from abortions should be banned?
1053	Ms. Cunningham. In its current practice, yes.
1054	Ms. DeGette. And Dr. Donovan, thank you for helping me
1055	clarify. Do you think fetal tissue from abortions should be
1056	banned?
1057	Dr. Donovan. Yes.
1058	Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Now, Dr. Donovan, you testified
	NEAL R. GROSS

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1059	that we have cell lines that have been developed over the last
1060	50 years from fetal tissue research. Correct?
1061	Dr. Donovan. Correct.
1062	Ms. DeGette. Is it your position, since those cell lines
1063	were developed from aborted fetal tissue 50 years ago, that since
1064	it was so long ago, it is okay to use that research now? Is that
1065	what you were trying to tell us?
1066	Dr. Donovan. In the absence of alternatives, then it can
1067	be acceptable when it is far removed.
1068	Ms. DeGette. So, because the abortions were a long time ago,
1069	it is okay that we use that tissue now. Correct?
1070	Dr. Donovan. It is a little more complex than that.
1071	Ms. DeGette. I see. Now, you also testified that well,
1072	actually, I believe, yes it was you who talked about the Tuskegee
1073	and the Mengele experiments. Do you make fetal tissue research
1074	from abortions equal to those experiments?
1075	Dr. Donovan. I think that we need to be very careful that
1076	we don't do that.
1077	Ms. DeGette. Do you think that they are equal? Yes or no?
1078	Yes or no?
1079	Dr. Donovan. Maybe.
1080	Ms. DeGette. Thank you.
1081	Now, I want to talk with you, Ms. Charo, for a minute. You
1082	testified about your view of the ethics of fetal tissue research
	NEAL D. CDOCC

may A A li	is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. nk to the final, official transcript will be posted on the ittee's website as soon as it is available.
from	abortions. You mentioned the NIH panel on human fetal
tran	sportation research during the Reagan administration. Is
that	correct?
	Ms. Charo. Yes, I believe it was HHS and not NIH
spec	ifically, but yes.
	Ms. DeGette. Okay, HHS. And in fact, that Blue Ribbon
Pane	l unanimously endorsed the position that fetal tissue
rese	arch is not only ethical but should proceed. Is that correct?
	Ms. Charo. I believe the vote was 19 to zero.
	Ms. DeGette. Yes, it was unanimous. And the chair of that
comm	ission was actually opposed to abortion. Is that correct?
	Ms. Charo. Yes.
	Ms. DeGette. And the reason was, as you testified a minute
ago,	because abortion is legal in this country and so people
thou	ght we should be able to give the opportunity to people who
had r	made that legal choice to have an abortion to then donate that
tiss	ue to help save other lives. Is that correct?
	Ms. Charo. Yes.
	Ms. DeGette. Because as you testified, the alternative when
some	body chose to have an abortion, if they did not donate that
tiss	ue, was the tissue would be destroyed as medical waste. Is
that	correct?
	Ms. Charo. Yes, it is.
	Ms. DeGette. And that, in fact, is why many people do make

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 52
1107	the ethical choice to donate the tissue. Is that right?
1108	Ms. Charo. I believe so.
1109	Ms. DeGette. Now, I wanted to ask you one more thing, which
1110	is from an ethical standpoint, do you think that it makes any
1111	difference when cell lines were developed, whether it was 50 years
1112	ago or last year from tissue from abortions?
1113	Ms. Charo. In this circumstance, I do not think so because
1114	the prospect of research in the future or the existence of research
1115	in the past is equally indifferent to the question of whether a
1116	woman would decide to have an abortion. That decision is not
1117	affected by the research or the prospect of it.
1118	Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.
1119	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.
1120	At this time, I recognize Mrs. Black for 5 minutes.
1121	Mrs. Black. Thank you, Madam Chair and I want to thank all
1122	the panelists for being here today.
1123	I want to begin by saying that I spent my entire career as
1124	a nurse. I worked in the emergency room most of that time. And
1125	it was my responsibility when I was in the emergency room, before
1126	we had the organ procurement organizations, to come and talk with
1127	the family members, it was my responsibility when someone was
1128	deceased to look them in the eyes and ask them if they would
1129	consider donating their family member for research or
1130	transplantation. It was a very sensitive time. And I have got
	NEAL D. ODOGG

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1131	to tell you that as I think about those times, I can actually see
1132	the eyes and the people that I asked this of. And one of the things
1133	that I will always remember is the dignity and the respect for
1134	those family members.
1135	Families, actually, there was a report done in Office of
1136	Inspector General and if I may, insert this into the record, that
1137	looked at informed consent in tissue donation and what the
1138	expectation and the realities were of these family members.
1139	[The information follows:]
1140	
1141	   ********COMMTTTEE INSERT 7*******

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

54

Mrs. Black. And here are the things that were found in there and I don't think it will surprise any of us because if we have someone we love that dies either expectedly or unexpectedly, it is a very traumatic thing: What organs will be procured? Will the body be treated with respect? And special care to ensure that the gift is used for the stated purpose. Those are the three main things that were found in both this report and also my experiences.

Very tender times and, as I say, a dignity of life and respect for that. I am curious that we don't have that same dignity and respect for the life of what we call tissue and fetus and embryo. This is a baby. I think Ms. Charo mentioned these are the remains. Tissue is discarded. This is not tissue. This is a baby. You don't get a brain, a liver, a kidney, all of these organs from a tissue. It is a baby. It is not a blob of tissue.

Now, what I want to go to is if we could put up an Exhibit  ${\sf F.}$ 

In these documents, documents were produced to the panel by a leading university to show that a researcher sought from a tissue procurement business, quote a first trimester human embryo, preferably around 8 and up to 10 weeks of gestation. And I think you all may have that in front of you but the document is Exhibit F and this is what it looks like. It actually says Doctor, and the name of the doctor is blacked out, at the University of, would request a first trimester human embryo, preferably 8 to 10 weeks

may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 55 1166 of gestation. We have ordered tissue before, so our information 1167 should be on file. Please let us know if this tissue is available. 1168 This is not dignity. This is not dignity. This is not 1169 respect for human life. I want to ask the panelists have we 1170 reached a point in our society where there effectively is an 1171 amazon.com for human parts, including entire babies. And I would like to ask our panel for their opinion on this email and the notion 1172 1173 of obtaining potentially entire embryos on demand. 1174 Dr. Donovan, would you like to address this? Dr. Donovan. I, personally, find that it shocks my 1175 1176 conscience and I think it should shock the conscience of the 1177 I think you are absolutely right, we have commodified nation. 1178 what have been referred to the products of conception, meaning 1179 babies and baby parts. And yes, they are for sale, supposedly 1180 just to cover one's costs but those costs seem to be quite 1181 But even if they were given away free, it is shocking 1182 to be ordering what you want. Can I have a boy fetus or a girl 1183 fetus, or a brain, or a heart, or a liver? This is totally in 1184 distinction to the honorable transplantation industry that is 1185 lifesaving and shows great respect for the donors. 1186 Mrs. Black. Ms. Cunningham? 1187 Ms. Cunningham. I think what we need to pay attention to 1188 here is not is this somehow increasing abortion. My concern is 1189 that researchers have come to count on induced abortion for their

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1190	research. And one of the articles that I cited in my written
1191	testimony shows that they say that liver from induced abortions
1192	is widely available and is a promising source. What have we come
1193	to where researchers need induced abortion to do their research?
1194	Wouldn't it have been better if we had banned this at the beginning
1195	and use the creative minds that we have to find ethical
1196	alternatives?
1197	Mrs. Black. Ms. Cunningham, I hate to cut you off. Thank
1198	you.
1199	And I just have one brief comment to make because my time
1200	is going to end here in just a second. I believe that we should
1201	give the same information and dignity to these young women that
1202	are making these decisions and I believe that it should be a more
1203	informed and educational decision that they are making and I don't
1204	believe that is happening currently.
1205	I yield back the balance of my time.
1206	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.
1207	Ms. Speier, you are recognized for 5 minutes.
1208	Ms. Speier. Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you all for
1209	your participation today.
1210	You know today I feel like a time traveler, not a member of
1211	Congress. Perhaps we have been transported back to 1692 to the
1212	Salem witch trials, where fanatics persecuted and murdered
1213	innocent people who had committed no offenses. Or maybe we have
	NEAL D. CDOSS

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

57

been transported back to the Red Scare, where at least 10,000 Americans in many professions around this country lost their livelihoods due to the reckless and disgraceful actions of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the infamous Senator Joseph McCarthy who eventually went after an Army General Counsel, Mr. Welch. And Mr. Welch finally put down Senator McCarthy by saying "Have you no decency?"

Unfortunately, this time, those being burned at the stakes are our scientists, who hold future medical breakthroughs in their hands. They are joined by brave women's healthcare providers who are simply trying to care for their patients. Meanwhile, David Daleiden and his associate, Sandra Merritt, fraudulently created the Center for Medical Progress and they were indicted in Texas by a grand jury for actual illegal activities. They are the reason why we are here today. Illegal conduct by two people, they have now been indicted, and that has been the creation of this committee.

And I have here a poster that shows what they have been indicted for. They have been indicted for two felonies for tampering with government records. In California, they are being investigated for any number of felonies, including misrepresentation of one's company to the IRS, felonies for fraud in creating fake drivers' licenses, and credit card fraud identity. And a judge in California has made this statement in

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1238	granting a motion for a preliminary injunction by saying
1239	defendants engaged in repeated instances of fraud, including the
1240	manufacture of fake documents, the creation and registration with
1241	the State of California of a fake company, and repeated false
1242	statements in order to infiltrate and implement their Human
1243	Capital Project. The products of that Project achieved in
1244	large part from infiltration thus far have not been pieces of
1245	journalistic integrity, but misleadingly edited videos and
1246	unfounded assertions.
1247	So my question to you, Dr. Donovan is this. You are an expert
1248	on ethics, as is Ms. Cunningham and Ms. Charo. Do you think it
1249	is appropriate to conduct oneself in that manner? Is that
1250	ethical? Is that moral? Yes or no?
1251	Dr. Donovan. Most ethical and moral questions are not yes
1252	and no questions.
1253	Ms. Speier. Well, we have been asking yes and no questions
1254	this morning.
1255	Dr. Donovan. I have noticed that. I have noticed that. It
1256	doesn't always help one unpeel the onion in order to get to the
1257	truth. So, if you want a yes or no, I am not quite sure how to
1258	answer that as a yes or no.
1259	Where is the greater damage? I am not an expert on
1260	journalistic ethics and I am certainly not an expert on the law.
1261	I am glad that carrying a false driver's license isn't a felony

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  59
1262	everywhere or many college students would end up in jail.
1263	Ms. Speier. Do you think committing fraud is ethical?
1264	Dr. Donovan. Of course, fraud is not ethical.
1265	Ms. Speier. All right.
1266	Dr. Donovan. Neither is what was being investigated.
1267	Ms. Speier. Ms. Cunningham.
1268	Ms. Cunningham. And the specific question?
1269	Ms. Speier. Is committing fraud ethical?
1270	Ms. Cunningham. As a broad statement, one would say it is
1271	not ethical but I am not answering the specific question about
1272	the conduct of David Daleiden.
1273	Ms. Speier. So, you think Mr. Daleiden is ethical?
1274	Ms. Cunningham. As Dr. Donovan said, that is a very broad
1275	statement.
1276	Ms. Speier. All right, thank you.
1277	Ms. Cunningham. I can't answer it in the way that you are
1278	asking.
1279	Ms. Speier. Professor Charo?
1280	Ms. Charo. I think the attempt to deliberately create
1281	distorted videos for political purpose and to tarnish and
1282	organization that helps millions of women was profoundly
1283	unethical and destructive.
1284	Ms. Speier. I thank you and I yield back.
1285	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.
	NEAL R. GROSS

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 60
1286	At this time, Dr. Bucshon, you are recognized for 5 minutes.
1287	Mr. Bucshon. Thank you. First of all, I just want to say
1288	I was a practicing cardiovascular and thoracic surgeon for 15
1289	years prior to coming to Congress. And thank you, all the
1290	witnesses, for being here.
1291	I also want to say it is totally appropriate to reevaluate
1292	and examine ethical issues that have been examined in the past.
1293	Times do change. And so I know some of the narrative has been
1294	that in the past people have looked at these issues and come to
1295	conclusions but in healthcare, particularly, I think, it is
1296	important that we occasionally reexamine these issues.
1297	The other thing is, is based on some of the comments of my
1298	Democratic colleagues, I am not sure what everyone is so afraid
1299	of because this type of discussion about ethics is totally
1300	appropriate and we don't have a preconceived outcome.
1301	And I would also just remind everyone in the crowd that
1302	charges and indictments don't mean convictions and guilt.
1303	So, with that, I would like to go to Exhibit B-1 and go over
1304	some emails and you may have those. And the first is a customer
1305	this is between a tissue technician and a customer. I am going
1306	to walk you through this.
1307	We are now ready to include the skull. So, if you would
1308	please include that in our order for tomorrow, that would be great.

If there is a case tomorrow, could you please have someone contact

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 61 me with the condition of both the long bones and the calvarium, which is the head, and I will be happy to let you know if we would like one or both. Then 4 minutes later, the technician responds I would be happy to do that. Exhibit B-2, the customer replied a day later: I just wanted to check in and see if there were any cases within our gestational range for today. The technician responded 4 minutes later: There is one case currently in the room. I will let you know how the limbs and calvarium look to see if they are able to take them, which means they are discussing actively during the abortion itself. Then 3 minutes later, the client said great, thank you so much. Exhibit B-3, after the abortion is performed, the technician tells the customer the calvarium, the head, is mostly intact with a tear up the back suture line but all pieces look to be there. The limbs, one upper and one lower are totally intact, with one upper broken at the humerus, which is the upper arm bone, and one lower limb broken above the knee. Please let me know if these I will set them aside and will await for your are acceptable. reply; 5 minutes later, the customer replies that sounds great. We would like both of them. Please send them our way. Thanks

The technician says limbs and calvarium will be there at 3:30

again.

1310

1311

1312

1313

1314

1315

1316

1317

1318

1319

1320

1321

1322

1323

1324

1325

1326

1327

1328

1329

1330

1331

1332

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 62
1334	to 4:00.
1335	And we will hear later in testimony and there is evidence
1336	to show the technicians are partially paid by the number of body
1337	parts that they could get.
1338	So, given that, do these emails raise any ethical issues?
1339	And if so, what are they? Dr. Donovan.
1340	Dr. Donovan. Once again, I think that what we are seeing
1341	is a total lack of respect for the dignity of the human body, in
1342	this case, because as we have already pointed out, not only are
1343	these humans but these are human body parts. Otherwise, no one
1344	would be interested in them. But to order them piece by piece
1345	like you would order a McDonald's hamburger, I find discouraging
1346	and shocking.
1347	Mr. Bucshon. Ms. Cunningham?
1348	Ms. Cunningham. I do find a number of serious ethical
1349	problems. One being, apart from the question of abortion itself,
1350	I think this completely fails to isolate abortion from the
1351	decision about the fetal tissue and consent to use the fetal
1352	tissue. In what we see here, there is no indication of consent
1353	prior to this procedure or for these specific parts to be excised.
1354	Mr. Bucshon. And in fairness, that could have occurred
1355	earlier, I guess.
1356	Ms. Cunningham. It could. I just said there is nothing
1357	here to indicate that.

$_{\parallel}$ This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements wi	.thin
may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the spea	ıker.
A link to the final, official transcript will be posted or	n the
Committee's website as soon as it is available.	63

Mr. Bucshon. Ms. Charo?

Ms. Charo. I would just like to add a little bit of context because exactly the same kind of language would be used if we were talking about people ordering tissue from adults who had died and were now having their bodies used for tissue and organ recovery. It is the same kind of clinical dispassionate language that is deeply upsetting to many of us who are not in that world and are not familiar with that. As you, as a physician, have said, there is a world of difference in how we talk about things. And —

Mr. Bucshon. Okay, my time is running. I appreciate that.

Ms. Charo. Yes, and there is a world of tissue transplantation and tissue research with adult tissue out there that is enormous and is very little different from what we are seeing here. So, just a little context of how this all works.

Mr. Bucshon. Sure. And I would like to say, as a physician, during my training I spent a lot of time on transplantation both talking to recipients and also family members of people who were in an unfortunate situation making a decision on behalf of their loved one to donate organs.

But you know I think that talking about a human being like this, just the mere fact that the arm was broke and the leg was broke, and they are talking about the head separately of a human being is something to me that is pretty hard to take, as a physician.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
I yield back.
Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.
Ms. DelBene, you are recognized for 5 minutes of questions.
Ms. DelBene. Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you to all
the witnesses for being with us today.
I would like to start by dispelling any misconceptions about
this hearing and this committee's investigation. You know it is
definitely not objective or impartial in any way. This
taxpayer-funded committee was created by Republicans more than
4 months ago, after a group of anti-choice extremists made a series
of false, unsubstantiated allegations about Planned Parenthood.
Since that time, four different congressional committees and a
grand jury tried and failed to uncover any evidence of wrong-doing
and their anti-choice accusers have been indicted on felony
charges.
Meanwhile, the majority has deliberately ignored this
growing body of evidence and has clearly decided to continue
spending taxpayer dollars to attack women's health and intimidate
healthcare providers across the country.
Now, in the committee's first hearing, the majority would

Now, in the committee's first hearing, the majority would like our constituents to believe we are conducting an objective hearing on medical research and that couldn't be further from the truth. What we are really doing is reopening a long-settled debate about research to further a broader political agenda

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  65
1406	against a woman's right to choose. And if their attacks on
1407	science succeed, then we will all pay the price because nearly
1408	every American has benefitted from research conducted with fetal
1409	tissue. That is how we developed the first ever polio vaccine.
1410	It is how we make vaccines for rubella, chicken pox, and shingles.
1411	It is how scientists are pursuing new treatments for heartbreaking
1412	diseases like Alzheimer's and HIV. And it is all done in full
1413	compliance with the high ethical standards recommended by
1414	President Reagan's Blue Ribbon Panel in 1998, which were passed
1415	by Congress with broad bipartisan support.
1416	So, as someone, I started my career doing medical research
1417	and I know that research using all human tissue is subject to
1418	ethical and legal standards. Professor Charo, do you agree with
1419	that?
1420	Ms. Charo. I do.
1421	Ms. DelBene. And Professor, do you think it is appropriate
1422	to use ideology about women's rights to shape the roles that guide
1423	scientific research? And why or why not?
1424	Ms. Charo. No, I am very, very unhappy at seeing a debate
1425	around abortion turn into a debate around scientific research.
1426	That is not to say I am happy about the debate about abortion either
1427	because I also find it really offensive to imagine that women are
1428	incapable of making their own decisions about whether to have
1429	abortion and whether or not to donate the tissue.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

But for sure, while that is going on, scientific research ought not be halted or hindered simply as an attempt to demonstrate one's opposition to abortion rights in an either political or public relations manner. It doesn't change anything and I don't think that the public should be made a victim of those abortion wars.

Ms. DelBene. Can you speak a little bit about the role of Institutional Review Boards in providing oversight on the use of human tissue in research? How do they help ensure that research is compliant with ethical and legal standards?

Ms. Charo. So, like Dr. Donovan, I have been a member of an Institutional Review Board off and on for many years. And those Boards look at a variety of things, starting with how it is that people are first approached and asked about whether or not they would like to participate in research or, in this case, to donate materials. It looks at the nature of the conversation that will be had, the documentation because of course what is on paper is not the extent of the conversation, it is simply the minimum number of items that need to be documented as far as the consent form goes.

It look at whether or not, in the end, there has been compliance. There are often research monitors that will observe a certain number of interactions in order to ensure compliance. There is annual review that is required for each research protocol

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1454	and sometimes reviews are done more frequently, depending upon
1455	the protocol.
1456	The Institutional Review Board is made up of a variety of
1457	people from both scientific and clinical and non-medical
1458	backgrounds, including law, ethics, religious studies, and
1459	members of the community who can reflect the local community
1460	culture in those discussions.
1461	Ms. DelBene. And that has been something that also the Blue
1462	Ribbon Commission looked at and made sure that those boards were
1463	appropriate and that was part of that debate that they had and
1464	decision they had from the commission.
1465	Ms. Charo. Yes, Institutional Review Boards are actually
1466	required by law. It begins with the use of federal funds that
1467	will trigger such a requirement or the research and two things
1468	that are regulated by the Food and Drug Administration but most
1469	major research institutions now have extended that review beyond
1470	the legal requirements in order to give what is called a
1471	federal-wide assurance of all research at that institution,
1472	complying with these same rules, even where not legally necessary.
1473	Ms. DelBene. Thank you so much. I yield back, Madam Chair.
1474	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.
1475	Dr. Harris, you are recognized, 5 minutes.
1476	Mr. Harris. Thank you very much. You know I am a physician
1477	and I was a physiology researcher. I actually did fetal research
	NEAL D. CDOSS

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  68
1478	but it was of fetal sheep of cerebral blood flow. And I also was
1479	a human principle investigator who actually had to file IRB
1480	applications.
1481	I don't intend to litigate the use of fetal tissue because
1482	I suspect you all agree about this. And I am just going to, Dr.
1483	Donovan and Ms. Cunningham, when you said the question about fetal
1484	tissue, I assume you support fetal tissue research from
1485	spontaneously aborted fetuses. Correct?
1486	Dr. Donovan. Correct.
1487	Mr. Harris. Correct?
1488	Ms. Cunningham. Yes.
1489	Mr. Harris. Okay, so we all agree. Let's all agree this
1490	is not litigating fetal tissue research. We all agree it should
1491	be done.
1492	Now, Dr. Donovan, let me just say I was fascinated by your
1493	because what we are talking about here is consent and whether
1494	IRB consent, and patient consent, whether that is all adequate.
1495	The idea that when you are a guardian of someone that you are
1496	qualified to give consent because you have the global best
1497	interest of that person in mind has to be brought into question
1498	when it is an elective abortion. I mean it just has to be.
1499	And with regards to the millions of people saved by fetal
1500	tissue research, we are all talking about the back scenes, the
1501	two cell lines. One cell line, interesting a female child aborted

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1502	because the family was too big. I would proffer that that mother,
1503	that if you gave that child and that child could somehow give
1504	consent, they would never consent to that abortion. The second
1505	one is a male which was aborted for, quote, psychiatric reasons.
1506	Now, when I had to get IRB approval on a patient, I had to be careful
1507	about approaching a patient with psychiatric illness because a
1508	lot of people feel they don't have the ability to give consent.
1509	So, it was a very good point you made.
1510	Let me just talk a little bit about an IRB question,
1511	specifically for you, Dr. Donovan. Is the source of fetal tissue
1512	or how it is acquired a valid question that an IRB should have
1513	answered before they approve a project?
1514	Dr. Donovan. It is not only a valid question it is asked
1515	and has to be answered. Some institutions would absolutely
1516	forbid its use.
1517	Mr. Harris. So, that if there were an instance where the
1518	application was, let us say, massaged a little bit, so that it
1519	was a little unclear what the source was, in an attempt to bypass
1520	that, that would really bypass the intention of an IRB. Is that
1521	right? For instance, if you didn't call it exactly what it was
1522	or what could be readily identified as the source.
1523	Dr. Donovan. Yes, you clearly know what you are talking
1524	about. And in fact, would that occur, the investigator would be
1525	in trouble with the IRB. They would be called in an questioned
	NEAL R GROSS

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 70
1526	about it.
1527	Mr. Harris. Sure. Let's look at Exhibit A-3, which is a
1528	commonly used form for fetal tissue donation that was uncovered
1529	through discovery by the committee.
1530	Ms. Cunningham, when I had to get consent from patients
1531	because we obtained human tissue at a cesarean section, human
1532	uterine tissue, we normally exactly described the tissue and then
1533	really kind of exactly described what it was going for. It could
1534	be global. It could be okay, in this case, it was to study uterine
1535	myocytes and their effect on preterm labor. Do you find anywhere
1536	on that form where it I will tell you I don't see anywhere where
1537	it asks specifically what tissue it is. In the case brought up
1538	by Dr. Bucshon, I assume that in that abortion, they didn't go
1539	to the mother before and say oh, by the way, we are going to collect
1540	an arm and a leg and we are going to do it for this kind of research.
1541	Is that something you think part of informed consent ought to be
1542	that you actually know where this tissue is going and for what?
1543	Ms. Cunningham. Yes and I am not the only one. If you look
1544	at elements of fetal tissue donation consent in other context,
1545	it is quite specific on what is being discussed with the
1546	prospective donor or their family.
1547	Mr. Harris. Absolutely.
1548	Ms. Charo?
1549	Ms. Charo. I

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1550	Mr. Harris. You point to the gentlelady no, I have to
1551	ask the question.
1552	Ms. Charo. Oh, I am sorry.
1553	Mr. Harris. To the point from the gentlelady from
1554	Tennessee, when my wife passed away a year and a half ago, I got
1555	a call from the Medical Examiner's Office requesting donation of
1556	her brain. It was a tough call but they specified one tissue and
1557	they specified what was going to be done with it.
1558	Now, you look at Exhibit A-3 and then you look at Exhibit
1559	C-1 and $C-2$ , which are actually what various anatomical donation
1560	forms used by states, it is strikingly different, strikingly
1561	different.
1562	Do you think that it really ought to be included when you
1563	ask someone, a woman, to donate the fetal tissue that you perhaps
1564	suggest specifically what it is going for and what the specific
1565	tissues to be used are going to be, if the person knows or should
1566	they make a best effort to know?
1567	Ms. Charo. I am not sure. I think
1568	Mr. Harris. Thank you very much. I yield back.
1569	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.
1570	Mrs. Watson Coleman, you are recognized for 5 minutes for
1571	questions.
1572	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I have a
1573	question for Dr. Donovan and for Ms. Cunningham and I would
	NEAL D. ODOGO

may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
appreciate yes or no.
I need to understand. Are you suggesting that it is mor
moral and more ethical to discard fetal tissue that is availabl
even after an abortion that a woman decided to have, rather tha
use it for medical research purposes. Is that a yes or a not
Dr. Donovan. That is not a yes or a no.
Mrs. Watson Coleman. Is that a yes or a no? Do you believ
that let me ask it this way. Do you believe that fetal tissu
that has been derived from a woman's decision to abort should be
used for medical purposes or not? Is that a year or a no, sir
Dr. Donovan. That is not a yes or no question.
Mrs. Watson Coleman. Ms. Cunningham, do you agree or
disagree that fetal tissue that is available as a result of a woma
deciding to have an abortion should be used or discarded; use
for medical research purposes or discarded?
Ms. Cunningham. I am sorry, what am I
Mrs. Watson Coleman. What is it that you all don't
understand? I understand
Dr. Donovan. Would you like an answer to your question?
Ms. Cunningham. Yes or no can't answer used or discarded
I am sorry.
Mrs. Watson Coleman. Used for medical research purposes o
discarded and not used for any purpose, eliminated, trashed,
thrown away, as opposed to used for medical research purpose t
1

II This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 73
1598	find whether or not a cure could be found for Zika, a cure could
1599	be found for some other disease. Do you believe that it is moral
1600	to discard that tissue rather than use it? Is that a clear enough
1601	question?
1602	Ms. Cunningham. Thank you. Because I am under oath, I
1603	cannot answer yes or no question. What I can say is that it is
1604	currently being practiced. I do not believe it is ethically
1605	possible to do so.
1606	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Dr. Charo, may I please have your sort
1607	of sense of what you just heard from both of these individuals
1608	with regard to the use or discarding of fetal tissue that is a
1609	result of a woman's decision to have an abortion?
1610	Ms. Charo. I will stand corrected because I am speaking for
1611	other people but I think I heard that they are uncomfortable with
1612	both outcomes. But given only those two choices, they would
1613	discard rather than use for fetal tissue, for a variety of reasons
1614	having to do with why they oppose fetal tissue research.
1615	But I have to say I have to yield to you to explain what it
1616	is that you actually meant to say.
1617	Dr. Donovan. Thank you.
1618	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Well, I wouldn't mind hearing that,
1619	if you could say it succinctly because I do have a number of
1620	questions.
1621	Dr. Donovan. I am as succinct as I can be. You asked one

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1622	of the most complex ethical questions. What do we do with the
1623	information or products of medical research when we think the
1624	research itself is tainted?
1625	Mrs. Watson Coleman. That is not what I asked.
1626	Dr. Donovan. That is what you asked, whether you realize
1627	it or not.
1628	Mrs. Watson Coleman. I simply asked no, sir. No, I know
1629	what I asked. I asked do you think that it is better to discard
1630	the tissue that would result from an abortion that a woman made
1631	a decision to abort as opposed to a spontaneous abortion, an
1632	ectopic pregnancy aborted, do you think it is moral to throw it
1633	away, rather than use it for purposes of discovering cures,
1634	discovering treatments, et cetera? And if you can give me a yes
1635	or no, I will take it. If not, I want to move on to the next
1636	question.
1637	Dr. Donovan. Few questions, moral questions, are yes or no
1638	questions. That one certainly is not.
1639	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Thank you very much.
1640	Professor Charo, we have heard about what has happened as
1641	a result of those videos that had been released. We know what
1642	has happened with regard to Daleiden and those videos. And we
1643	know that it has created harassment and fear and whatnot.
1644	As a matter of fact, the dean of your school of medicine said

that his faculty has been compared to Nazi war criminals because

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1646	they use fetal tissue for research. Does it surprise you that
1647	the researchers have come under attack and that healthcare
1648	providers and doctors also were under attack? And could you give
1649	me a close yes or no?
1650	Ms. Charo. It does not surprise me.
1651	Mrs. Watson Coleman. And what do you feel about that
1652	comparison?
1653	Ms. Charo. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to say
1654	something I have wanted very much to say. My family was
1655	personally touched by the Holocaust. I lost a grandparent in the
1656	camps. I grew up in a neighborhood where people wore tattoos on
1657	their arms that represented the years in the camps. These were
1658	people who were alive and were aware and were suffering for the
1659	years that they were in those camps. I am profoundly, profoundly
1660	distressed and, frankly, offended
1661	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Thank you, Dr. Charo.
1662	Ms. Charo at the thought of comparing that to the
1663	experience of loss of an embryo or fetus.
1664	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Professor, I just thank you very much.
1665	Madam Chair, may I have 30 seconds?
1666	Mrs. Blackburn. Yes.
1667	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Thank you very much. Because I simply
1668	wanted to say, Madam Chair, that we believe your efforts compile
1669	this database of names is very dangerous. We believe that linking

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1670	people to this investigation is very dangerous and we think that
1671	the characterization of the unlawful sale of baby body parts is
1672	very dangerous and we are disappointed that Republicans tabled
1673	our motion and that you would not answer Mr. Nadler's question
1674	when he asked you why you thought this was important. Thank you.
1675	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady's time has expired.
1676	At this point, I recognize Ms. Hartzler for 5 minutes.
1677	Mrs. Hartzler. Thank you, Madam Chairman.
1678	I would just say, based on the comments that were just made
1679	that just a reminder that babies who are aborted are normally
1680	buried or cremated. It is not discarded. And so to follow this
1681	premise, you would be saying that to bury a loved one, rather than
1682	donating to science is immoral. And I clearly, clearly reject
1683	that we have to treat these babies with the dignity that they
1684	deserve and I think the logic is flawed to say just because
1685	you don't donate a loved one to science it is immoral.
1686	But I want to talk a little bit about the consent. I was
1687	a former teacher for many years, working with teenagers, some that
1688	had a time in their life when they had an unexpected pregnancy
1689	and these are very difficult issues. So, I would like to put up
1690	Exhibit E excuse me, start with Exhibit D.
1691	And so this question will start off with Ms. Cunningham. The
1692	Secretary of HHS issued the Belmont Report, which says that
1693	consent is valid only if voluntarily given. And that,
	NEAL D. ODOGG

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 77
1694	"inducements that would ordinarily be acceptable may become undue
1695	influences if the subject is especially vulnerable."
1696	So, if you could put up Exhibit A-3, the consent form that
1697	is used in some of these clinics, I would like to ask you, in your
1698	view, does this form violate our government's own guidance in its
1699	inducement to women considering abortion, especially with the
1700	promise and the statement in the very first opening of the consent
1701	form says: "Research using the blood from pregnant women and
1702	tissue that has been aborted has been used to treat and find a
1703	cure for such diseases as diabetes, Parkinson's disease,
1704	Alzheimer's disease, cancer, and AIDS?"
1705	I will say I lost my mother last year with Alzheimer's. I
1706	am not aware that there is a cure out there. This was news to
1707	me. So, Ms. Cunningham, do you think that this consent form
1708	complies with HHS's mandate against inducement?
1709	Ms. Cunningham. It would be interesting to know from the
1710	women's perspective if this does induce her to sign the form, this
1711	idea of the promise of cures, which is a very powerful motivator.
1712	The concern I have is that the standards that we have
1713	typically for fetal tissue donation are just absent here. And
1714	so in addition to the voluntariness, there is just the
1715	thoroughness of the consent seems to be missing in this form.
1716	Mrs. Hartzler. I would concur with the HHS informed consent
1717	checklist itself that is online. A couple of other requirements
	NEAL R. GROSS

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1718	that are supposed to be of consents is a statement describing the
1719	extent, if any, to which confidentiality of records identifying
1720	the subject will be maintained. I see no such statement in this
1721	exhibit. It also says that: "Research, Rights or Injury: An
1722	explanation of whom to contact for answer to pertinent questions
1723	about the research and research subjects' rights."
1724	If I was a teenage girl in a crisis situation there being
1725	presented with this form, I don't see it there. Do you see it
1726	on the form?
1727	Ms. Cunningham. I do not.
1728	Mrs. Hartzler. Okay, Ms. Charo, last August, speaking about
1729	fetal tissue research while at a NARAL conference, you were quoted
1730	as saying: "Now remember, this is not about using an actual
1731	embryo or an actual fetus. This is leftover tissue after the
1732	fetus is long-dead."
1733	Please put up Exhibit E. In this email, the tissue
1734	procurement manager of a tissue business described to a university
1735	research the immediacy of obtaining tissue from aborted fetuses.
1736	The manger wrote that after, quote, the doctor determines the
1737	abortion is complete, the procurement technician is allowed to
1738	begin procurement. This take a couple of minutes.
1739	So, given these comments from the tissue procurer, how can
1740	you contend that tissue procurement occurs "after the fetus is
1741	long-dead?"

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 79
1742	Ms. Charo. I don't recall speaking at a NARAL conference
1743	last August but there was a conference I spoke at considerably
1744	longer ago, speaking of length of time, and I believe that that
1745	comment was being made in the context of the cell lines, which
1746	really are from fetuses that were aborted a very, very long time
1747	ago. But I don't have a transcript of my own remarks with me.
1748	Thank you.
1749	Mrs. Hartzler. Okay. Dr. Donovan, isn't the tissue
1750	harvested immediately after the cells are they still alive,
1751	the cells are still alive?
1752	Dr. Donovan. Absolutely. They want fresh cells.
1753	Mrs. Hartzler. Okay, very good. I yield back. Thank you.
1754	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.
1755	Mr. Nadler, you are recognized 5 minutes for questions.
1756	Mr. Nadler. Thank you, Madam Chair.
1757	Ms. Charo, I should first say that I find most of this
1758	discussion irrelevant because it relates to the morality of
1759	abortion. Opinions differ, obviously, on the morality of
1760	abortion. I, for one, think abortions are perfectly moral but
1761	that is not the question. Abortion is legal and, as a
1762	consequence, safe for women in this country.
1763	The law already prohibits initiated a pregnancy for the
1764	purpose of donating tissue. A hypothetical concern is we have

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

never heard of this actually happening. The question before is

about fetal tissue research. But if the abortion was going to happen anyway -- now, Mr. Harris, or Dr. Harris pointed out, Dr. Donovan agreed that we all agree that fetal tissue research is valuable and the disagreement may be over the source. But if the abortion was going to happen anyway, even if you don't like that fact, how can it be immoral to save lives by use of fetal tissue from an abortion that would have happened anyway, tissue that would otherwise be thrown away? What makes the use to save lives instead of throwing it away immoral, Ms. Charo?

Ms. Charo. There has been a great deal of conversation about the notion of complicity with an underlying act one considers to be immoral and it is at this point, I think, it is helpful to take an example of an act that I think is universally understood to be immoral and not one that is debated, which is the case of aborted. If we talk about the murder of an adult, which we all consider to be immoral and is also a criminal act, so it is also not legal, there is no question that we use those tissues and organs from murder victims for organ transplantation, for tissue transplantation, and for organ and tissue research without in any sense feeling complicit. We don't encourage murder by virtue of using those tissues. We may not condone it but we certainly don't view it as something that should be abandoned because we don't want any connection with an underlying act of which we disapprove.

So, I find the arguments about complicity to be unpersuasive.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 81
1790	Mr. Nadler. So by the same logic, whether you think abortion
1791	is immoral or not, use of fetal tissue that would be there in any
1792	event for moral purposes is no more moral or immoral than use of
1793	tissues from a murder victim?
1794	Ms. Charo. That was the reasoning of the panel that was led
1795	by Judge Adams for President Reagan and that is a kind of reasoning
1796	that does not appear to have been affected by events in the last
1797	30 or 40 years. Science changes but that particular analysis
1798	seems to have persisted.
1799	Mr. Nadler. Let me quote from Ms. Cunningham's testimony.
1800	And she said, and this is a sub-quote from a book by Robert George
1801	and Christopher Tollefsen. It is "morally impermissible to
1802	engage in any research for any purpose that involves the
1803	destruction of human beings at any stage of their lives, including
1804	the embryonic stage, or in any condition however weak or
1805	dependent."
1806	Ms. Cunningham continues: "Those who are responsible for
1807	terminating the life of a fetus have failed to recognize this
1808	fundamental principle of human dignity and, thus, have no moral
1809	claim to be able donate or assign the body, organs, or tissues
1810	of the fetus to others, regardless of the nobility of purpose."
1811	Dr. Donovan said something to the same effect.
1812	In other words, Ms. Cunningham, Dr. Donovan, Mr. George who
1813	wrote the article, believe that they have a superior moral claim

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

to that of the mother to make this decision. I find this incredibly arrogant. Because of their view of the morality of abortion, they would deprive the mother of her moral agency. Having decided to have an abortion, which is her right under the law, which some of regard as moral and some people regard as immoral but it is her decision under the law, they would deprive her, therefore, of the right to make a decision to use the fetal tissue that would otherwise be thrown out for morally good purposes to help save lives. And they would deprive the mother of this moral right because they have a superior moral right.

Would you comment on that, Ms. Charo?

Ms. Charo. Yes, this was exactly the concern that was raised again and again by the Reagan panel, which did a fairly thorough report on a lot of these things. And they looked specifically at whether there is anybody else who is in a superior position to give consent. That could be scientists, it could be physicians. It could be that the material is used without any kind of consent at all and considered abandoned property. And in the end, they concluded that there was no one and no entity and no rule of law that had superior entitlement to make this decision than the woman herself.

Mr. Nadler. Thank you. I have one final question. Dr. Bucshon noted that it is legitimate to reexamine these issues. We had panels a couple of decades ago. We can reexamine the

issues. He is right, of course, on that. We can always reexamine an issue. And he said what are we afraid of?

Here is what we are afraid of. We also note that an employee at one of the entities that the chair has subpoenaed, someone who is also identified in connection with the deceptively edited and false videos has been the victim of a death threat posted online, suggesting that he or she should be hung by the neck using piano wire and propped up on the law in the front of -- on the lawn, I assume he meant, in the front of the building with a note attached. That is what we are afraid of, that this kind of proceeding that we are doing with the kinds of obnoxious and illegal and, frankly, subpoenas I think designed to endanger the lives of people who engage in abortions, that is the danger.

Ms. Charo, would you comment on that? And that is my last question.

Ms. Charo. It is a documented danger. We also saw, as was noted earlier on, the deaths in Colorado immediately following some of these tapes being released. I can say from personal experience not related to this topic but other topics I have written on, I have also received threatening calls and it is incredibly disturbing and it is a way to intimidate and chill research in the United States.

Mr. Nadler. And make this committee complicit in further acts of violence, if they occur. Thank you very much.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 84
1862	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired.
1863	Mrs. Love for 5 minutes.
1864	Mrs. Love. Thank you.
1865	Across the United States, current federal law prohibits
1866	minors under the age of 18 from serving in the military, entering
1867	into financially binding contracts, purchasing nicotine, being
1868	tried as an adult, getting married, or voting. We have a number
1869	of laws in place that protect our minors. This includes
1870	prohibiting minors to go into certain movies without a guardian
1871	or a parent being around. And all of this is to protect that minor
1872	because their brains are not fully developed and they lack the
1873	ability to fully comprehend long-term repercussions of their
1874	decisions.
1875	So, my question, Ms. Cunningham, do you think that ethical
1876	guidelines should be in place to protect a minor when they are
1877	giving consent to a clinic to perform an abortion and what kind
1878	of guidelines do you think should be in place?
1879	Ms. Cunningham. Are you thinking about the abortion
1880	procedure itself or the specific issue of consent to donate?
1881	Mrs. Love. I am not talking about tissue donation. I am
1882	talking about when they are going in and actually giving consent
1883	to even have an abortion performed.
1884	Ms. Cunningham. Well I think, first of all, there should
1885	be great care exercised because, as the United Kingdom Human Fetal

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  85
1886	Tissue Authority noted that the time of deciding about abortion
1887	is a very emotionally stressful time for a woman. And I have been
1888	in a number of conversations with physicians involving informed
1889	consent and it is really helpful to have the second person there
1890	taking notes and really paying attention to what is said. My own
1891	husband didn't remember what the oncologist said to him but I took
1892	notes and I was able to help him go through the informed consent
1893	process.
1894	So, I think great care would need to be taken in any kind
1895	of informed consent proceeding but especially with a minor.
1896	Mrs. Love. Okay, Mr. Donovan, with all of this being said,
1897	do you think it is important for us to have different consent forms
1898	for minors versus adults?
1899	Dr. Donovan. Well, in fact, in medical research, children
1900	cannot give consent. They are allowed to give what we refer to
1901	as assent but they also require the permission of the parent
1902	involved as well.
1903	Mrs. Love. Okay, given what we know today with current laws
1904	governing consent from minors, what do you think would be an
1905	appropriate age for someone to get an adult consent form as opposed
1906	to a minor that is given consent for an abortion?
1907	Dr. Donovan. Well at least in research under the law, at
1908	18 they can start signing a consent form, although human
1909	development specialists suggest that maybe sometime around the

age of 24, teenagers actually do grow up.

Mrs. Love. I want to actually concentrate a little bit now on the tissue donation. I have a 14-year-old child. I am not a physician. My expertise is in real life in the real-life aspect. I have this 14-year-old, who is a straight A student and makes decisions, great decisions, generally, most of the time and under normal circumstances, I actually asked her to look at this exhibit and try and figure out whether she can fill that form out. My very smart child kept coming back to me asking for explanation, clarification. And those are normal circumstances.

So, let me ask you this question. What kind of emotional duress do you think a minor is under in anticipation of an abortion procedure? Just your thoughts. I mean I can imagine what I would go through. Either one, Ms. Cunningham, this is a great question for you. What kind of duress do you think a minor would be under before, having to go under, having to have a procedure, an invasive procedure like an abortion?

Ms. Cunningham. Well having raised a daughter who has survived adolescence but who has been with her in physician consultations, there is stress over dealing with a sprained arm. There is great stress over going through an x-ray, after she fainted. There must be even greater stress in an event that she may wishing to conceal from others.

Mrs. Love. Okay. So, imagine that 14-year-old going into

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1934	a clinic to undergo a very invasive procedure without someone
1935	there that she trusts to walk her through, to make sure that she
1936	is not being taken advantage of, to make sure that she is making
1937	the right decision. How can anyone be sure that that minor, under
1938	difficult circumstances, fully understand the long-term
1939	repercussions behind their decision when the current law wouldn't
1940	even allow that minor to get behind the wheel of a vehicle?
1941	Dr. Donovan. You are pointing out a real discrepancy
1942	between the way we deal with the teenagers in our country. I
1943	wouldn't be able to take that child and do a procedure on them
1944	without the mother or father being there and giving their consent
1945	as well. If I did, that would be assault and battery.
1946	Mrs. Love. Thank you.
1947	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back. Mr. Duffy,
1948	you are recognized for 5 minutes.
1949	Mr. Duffy. Thank you, Madam Chair and welcome, panel.
1950	I want to be clear, Ms. Charo, on your testimony and that
1951	is that there is, I think you said there is a compelling public
1952	interest in research on fetal tissue. Is that right?
1953	Ms. Charo. Yes, I said that.
1954	Mr. Duffy. And this is about saving lives, correct?
1955	Ms. Charo. That is what I said.
1956	Mr. Duffy. Okay, now I think I heard you correctly when the
1957	chair asked you in the first round of questions about whether there
J.	

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1958	is any ethical violations in regard to using fetal tissue for taste
1959	tests, cosmetics, or human and animal DNA testing. And I think
1960	Mr. Donovan and Ms. Cunningham expressed concern but you did not.
1961	So, could you explain to me the compelling public interest
1962	and the lifesaving research that takes place when we use fetal
1963	tissue for taste tests and cosmetics?
1964	Ms. Charo. First, I am referring to the full range of uses,
1965	which includes all of the basic science research that you hear
1966	about
1967	Mr. Duffy. No, no, no. I am reclaiming my time because this
1968	was very specific.
1969	Ms. Charo. No actually the question was whether I thought
1970	there was a compelling public interest.
1971	Mr. Duffy. I am reclaiming my time.
1972	Ms. Charo. And I am talking about the full range.
1973	Mr. Duffy. Ms. Charo, the question came specifically from
1974	the chair about taste tests and cosmetics and human and animal
1975	DNA testing. And you didn't express any concern.
1976	So, do you have a compelling public interest that saves lives
1977	in regard to taste tests and cosmetic research using the fetal
1978	tissue? Yes or no?
1979	Ms. Charo. I am going to take a page from you and say I can't
1980	say yes or no because that is not actually what I said. I did
1981	not express no concern. I said those are probably more frivolous

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1982	but they are among the many uses for tissue.
1983	Mr. Duffy. So, let me ask you this. Do you think there is
1984	a compelling public interest in saving lives if we use fetal tissue
1985	for taste tests and cosmetics?
1986	Ms. Charo. Believe it or not, for taste tests there might
1987	be because it actually the loss of taste neurologically can
1988	actually lead to devastating problems.
1989	Mr. Duffy. And how about cosmetics?
1990	Ms. Charo. It depends on which cosmetics you are talking
1991	about. A lot of those skin grafts are considered aesthetic but
1992	they are also very, very helpful.
1993	Mr. Duffy. Is there anything, any research that you think
1994	is inappropriate using fetal tissue?
1995	Ms. Charo. Well, using any tissue, fetal or adult, I find
1996	the cosmetic uses in Hollywood sometimes to be so frivolous, I
1997	would be perfectly happy to see us abandon them.
1998	Mr. Duffy. I want to be clear because it seems that you are
1999	here advocating, you are advocating on behalf of fetal tissue
2000	research and stem cells, you have also consulted with companies
2001	that are involved in those activities. And in the CV you provided
2002	in preparation for your testimony, in 2002 you were on the
2003	Scientific Advisory Board of WiCell. And in their Web site it
2004	shows that it does stem cell research. In 2012, you were a
2005	consultant to Cleveland BioLabs. And in their SEC filings,

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
2006	Cleveland BioLabs says it uses proprietary stem cell lines in its
2007	products. And in 2006, you were a consultant to Stem Cells, Inc.
2008	That firm's Web site says that it uses "human neural stem cells"
2009	in medicine. A leading university told the panel that it
2010	"receives a proprietary stem cell line derived from fetal tissue
2011	that was supplied by Stem Cell, Inc."
2012	So, you do have a vested financial interest in the boards
2013	that you serve on the research of fetal tissue. Correct?
2014	Ms. Charo. I receive no funding from WiCell. I did receive
2015	consulting funding from Cleveland and Stem Cell, Inc. Those were
2016	not embryonic stem cells, by the way, that we were talking about.
2017	Mr. Duffy. So, you do have a financial interest in
2018	Ms. Charo. Not at present, no.
2019	Mr. Duffy. But you have in the past?
2020	Ms. Charo. I have.
2021	Mr. Duffy. Okay.
2022	Ms. Charo. And by the way, every dollar of that was donated.
2023	You can look at my IRS tax returns.
2024	Mr. Duffy. Okay. So, I want to go to another few issues.
2025	So, let us say, and if we could go to Exhibit A-1, if we have someone
2026	who works for a tissue procurement business and they are
2027	corresponding with an abortion clinic technician and they are
2028	providing a wish list of items that they are going to want to
2029	purchase, things like a liver, thymus, skin to be shipped by FedEx

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 91 overnight, whether to Harvard or UMass. So, you have a wish list, a shopping list being sent from the tissue provider to the abortion technician. And if we could also go to Exhibit A-2, here is a procurement compensation schedule. So, we see the technician gets paid per And the more specimens you provide, the more money you And just a side note, I thought that there was no profit motive here. I don't think that per specimen the cost goes up but the more you provide, the more money you make above your hourly wage, Exhibit 2-A. And then if you go to Exhibit A-3, you have a consent form that the technician brings out to the mom to garner consent for I would just note that if the panel would just look at their Exhibit A-3, anywhere in there does it say that the technician has a financial interest where they obtained \$35 per specimen up to 10 specimens and \$45 per specimen for those from 11 to 20? Does a financial incentive, is that shown in Exhibit A-2 -- or I am sorry A-3, if you look at that quickly? Dr. Donovan. No, it is not there. Mr. Duffy. Okay. Does that concern you that we have the technician who is receiving the shopping list from the business and it is also the person that is going to go in and obtain consent from the mom and the financial component to it? Mr. Donovan, does

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that give you any pause or concern ethically?

2030

2031

2032

2033

2034

2035

2036

2037

2038

2039

2040

2041

2042

2043

2044

2045

2046

2047

2048

2049

2050

2051

2052

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 92
2054	Dr. Donovan. Well, I think that you have correctly shown
2055	that this would never pass muster for an IRB.
2056	Mr. Duffy. Ms. Cunningham?
2057	Ms. Cunningham. Yes, it has ethical problems.
2058	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired.
2059	Mr. Duffy. My time has expired. I am getting gaveled down.
2060	I yield back.
2061	Mrs. Blackburn. I thank the gentleman. I want to thank our
2062	first panel for being with us today.
2063	We are ready to move to our second panel. And as the first
2064	panel departs, I want to provide unanimous consent, so ordered,
2065	to Mrs. Black for her request to enter the Department of Health
2066	and Human Services Office of Inspector General Report on Tissue
2067	Donation into the record. So ordered.
2068	As our first panel leaves, we will introduce the second
2069	panel, as they take their places, Dr. Lee, Dr. Schmainda and Dr.
2070	Goldstein.
2071	And I would like to introduce the members of this panel, Dr.
2072	Patrick Lee is the John N. and Jamie D. McAleer Professor of
2073	Bioethics and the Director of the Center for Bioethics at
2074	Franciscan University of Steubenville. Dr. Kathleen M.
2075	Schmainda is Professor of Radiology and Professor of Biophysics
2076	at the Center for Imaging Research at the Medical College of
2077	Wisconsin. And Dr. Lawrence Goldstein is Distinguished
	NEAL R. GROSS

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
2078	Professor, Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine,
2079	Department of Neurosciences at the University of California San
2080	Diego School of Medicine.
2081	You are aware that the Select Investigative Panel is holding
2082	an investigative hearing and will take your testimony under oath.
2083	Do you have any objection to testifying under oath?
2084	The chair then advises you that under the rules of the House
2085	Committee on Energy and Commerce, you are entitled to be advised
2086	by counsel. Do you desire to be advised by counsel during your
2087	testimony today?
2088	If you will stand to be sworn in.
2089	[Witnesses sworn.]
2090	Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you. You may be seated.
2091	You will each have 8 minutes for your opening statement. Dr.
2092	Lee, you may proceed.

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  94
2093	TESTIMONY OF PATRICK LEE, PH.D., JOHN N. AND JAMIE D. MCALEER
2094	PROFESSOR OF BIOETHICS AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR
2095	BIOETHICS, FRANCISCAN UNIVERSITY OF STEUBENVILLE; KATHLEEN M.
2096	SCHMAINDA, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF RADIOLOGY AND PROFESSOR OF
2097	BIOPHYSICS, THE CENTER FOR IMAGING RESEARCH AT THE MEDICAL COLLEGE
2098	OF WISCONSIN; AND LAWRENCE S.B. GOLDSTEIN, PH.D., DISTINGUISHED
2099	PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF CELLULAR AND MOLECULAR MEDICINE,
2100	DEPARTMENT OF NEUROSCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO
2101	SCHOOL OF MEDICINE.
2102	
2103	TESTIMONY OF PATRICK LEE
2104	Mr. Lee. Thank you, Chairman.
2105	Mrs. Blackburn. Microphone, please.
2106	Mr. Lee. Thank you, Madam Chairman Blackburn and thank you,
2107	distinguished members of the committee. And thank you for this
2108	opportunity for speaking on bioethics and fetal tissue.
2109	My name is Patrick Lee. I am a professor of bioethics at
2110	Franciscan University of Steubenville and I have submitted my
2111	written testimony. I will just give a brief summary of some of
2112	the arguments there.
2113	In Roe v. Wade, Justice Blackmun claimed that the Court would
2114	not settle the question of whether the fetus is a human being or
2115	not. And yet, as a practical matter, the Court denied two human
2116	fetuses the equal protection of the law and so treated them as

in fact, outside the class of human beings.

In fact, however, as the standard text of embryology, developmental biology, and genetics assert, a human embryo or fetus from conception on is a distinct whole human individual. The evidence for this is quite clear. We know that a human embryo or fetus is a human being, a human organism in basically the same way we know the 6-week-old infant is a human organism. Looking at a 6-week-old infant, we can see that, first, she is a distinct being not a part of a larger organism. She is a complete being, although at an immature level of development, since even though she cannot now perform many of the actions that are typical of human beings, she is growing. She is actively developing herself to the point where she will do so.

In a similar way, it is clear that a human embryo or a fetus is a distinct being, since she grows in her own distinct direction. She is, obviously, human, since she has the genetic structure that is characteristic -- she has the genetic structure in her cells that is characteristic of humans. And she is a whole human being, as opposed to something that is functionally apart, such as a human cell or human tissue. For, unlike a cell or a human tissue, she has within her structure, within her genetic and epigenetic structure all of the internal resources needed to actively develop herself to the mature stage of a human being. This shows that she already is a whole human organism only at the earliest stage

of development.

So, the same kind of facts that show a 6-week-old infant is a human being also show that a human embryo or fetus is a human being, a human organism. And since what we are are human organisms, bodily beings, it follows that she is the same kind of being as you or me, only at an earlier stage of her lifecycle. Just as you and I once were adolescents, and before that children, and before that infants, so we once were fetuses and we once were embryos.

Moreover, since what makes you and me intrinsically valuable as subjects of rights is what we are, our fundamental nature, it is wrong intentionally to kill us and it would have been wrong to kill us when we were embryos or fetuses. All human beings, unborn as well as born, no matter at what age or size are created equal and are endowed by their creator with fundamental unalienable rights. Therefore, it is gravely unjust to provide protection of the law to born human beings but to deny it to unborn human beings.

Since what is killed in abortion is a human being, the further act of governmentally funding and endorsing abortion providers is an additional injustice. By subsidizing abortion providers, the government, unlike the Court in Roe v. Wade, cannot even make a pretense of being neutral on the question of whether what is killed in abortion is a human being. To subsidize and encourage

the killing of human fetuses is to presuppose in that act that what is killed in abortion is not a human being.

Furthermore, the donation of organs after death requires prior authoritative consent from -- in general requires authoritative consent from the person who dies or, if a minor, In the case of fetal organs or tissues, parental from her parent. consent would be required. This seems permissible in the case of spontaneous miscarriages or ectopic pregnancies. However, that is not the case with relying on the consent of the parent of an elective abortion. Parental authority over children is based on the special connection of parents to their children, a connection that creates a special responsibility of parents to their children, responsibility to care for them and to be devoted to their well-being. Grave abuses of that relationship or actions indicating that a parent no longer has the child's interest at heart, cause the parent to lose that parental authority. But the choice to have the child killed, even if done in confusion and with mitigated responsibility, is incompatible with a willingness to act in the true interest of the child. the practice of allowing or encouraging the use of fetal tissue obtained from elective abortions relying, as it does, on the mother's consent, treats the bodily parts of the fetus as if they were parts of the woman's body. The practice makes no sense, unless the fetus is assumed to be something other than a human

2165

2166

2167

2168

2169

2170

2171

2172

2173

2174

2175

2176

2177

2178

2179

2180

2181

2182

2183

2184

2185

2186

2187

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  98
2189	being.
2190	Therefore, governmental funding of abortion providers and
2191	the use of fetal tissue from elective abortions involve profound
2192	dehumanization of unborn human beings and are grave injustices.
2193	Thank you.
2194	[The prepared statement of Mr. Lee follows:]
2195	
2196	**************************************

Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Dr. Lee.

2197

2198

Dr. Schmainda, you are recognized, 8 minutes.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

TESTIMONY OF KATHLEEN M. SCHMAINDA

Ms. Schmainda. Distinguished Chair Blackburn and honored members of the panel, thank you for the opportunity to offer my testimony in defense of infant lives and, specifically, in opposition to research using fetal tissue derived from induced abortions.

As background, I was trained in the disciplines of engineering and medicine, receiving a Ph.D. degree in medical engineering jointly awarded by Harvard University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I am currently a Professor of Radiology and Biophysics, serving as Vice Chair of Radiology Research at the Medical College of Wisconsin. I have participated in medical research for nearly 25 years. I have served on grant review panels for the National Institutes of Health for nearly 15 years, including a 4-year term on the developmental therapeutics study section.

I serve on national advisory committees for clinical trials and have founded two start-up companies. Most importantly, I am a wife and a mother.

The views expressed are my own and do not represent the official views of the Medical College Wisconsin.

I am firmly opposed to research using fetal or embryonic tissue from induced abortions or procedures such as in vitro

fertilization. I am compelled to create awareness amongst the community and my colleagues as to why the use of such tissue is both unethical and unnecessary.

Let me begin by defining terms. The terms embryo, fetus, baby, or infant each refer to different stages in the continuum of the developing child. When cells are extracted during the earliest stages, these are typically human embryonic stem cells, which are obtained by destruction of the human embryo. When I speak of fetal tissue research, I am referring to cells, tissues, or organs that are harvested from an aborted fetus. While this is the focus of my testimony, my arguments apply to the continuum of the developing child.

Proponents of research using fetal tissue make several claims. The first claim is that without fetal tissue, many of the life-saving treatments we have today would not have been possible. Second, it is argued that without continued access to fetal tissue, we are preventing the discovery of new therapies. And third, it is alleged that proper ethical guidelines are already in place to avoid the connection between abortion and fetal tissue research. I will speak to each of these claims.

First, it needs to be made clear that there are no current medical treatments today that have required use of fetal tissues for their discovery or development. While the often-cited polio vaccine was developed using fetal tissue cells, the developers

later testified that initial studies were also successful using cells that were not of fetal origin. Though most vaccines today offer ethical alternatives, not all are available in the U.S. and some, such as chicken pox and Hepatitis A currently do not have ethical alternatives. Yet, let me make it clear there have never been a scientific reason requiring cell lines for vaccine development.

Testimony given to the FDA dated May 16, 2001 underscores this point. The developer of two common fetal cell lines, HEK 293, human embryonic kidney, and Per C6, isolated retina from a fetus, stated that his motivation for developing these cell lines from aborted fetuses was simply to see if it could be done in comparison to what had already been done with animal cells. Since then, use of these cell lines has become widespread and the manufacturers have no motivation to invest the time or money necessary to produce ethical replacements.

Due to lack of transparency, scientists can unknowingly become entrenched in using these cell lines. For example, the HEK 293 cell line is often offered as part of a standard kit available from biotechnology companies and branded under various names. Only upon specific request are alternatives provided. This lack of transparency is devastating for scientists who have ethical objections to use of this tissue and amounts to moral coercion.

Second, I refute the claim that without continued access to fetal tissue, the discovery of new therapies will be prevented. The evidence is overwhelming to the contrary. For example, insulin for diabetes is produced in bacteria. Chinese hamster ovary cells have been used for the development of Herceptin for breast cancer and TPA for heart attack and stroke. There are more 70 successful treatments developed using adult stem cell sources. Over one million bone marrow transplants, which are essentially adult stem cell transplants, have been performed to date.

Still, some continue to claim that fetal cells unequivocally provide the best option because they divide rapidly and adapt to new environments easily. But, alternative tissue and cells sources are available for research without ethical concerns and are demonstrating more versatility than originally thought. Examples include stem cells from bone marrow, circulating blood, umbilical cord, and amniotic fluid, as well as induced pluripotent stem cells and even neural stem cells from cadavers. Adult stem cells have already been used for the development of new treatments, have been proven in clinical trials, and resulted in the formation of new companies, which have successfully brought to market treatments that are routinely benefitting patients today.

There is still no viable medical use for embryonic stem cells. Yet, the argument continues that keeping this avenue of

research open may someday offer the only hope for a child with a devastating disease or a person with spinal cord injury.

In 1997, in The New York Times, it was reported the nation's first transplant of fetal tissue into a person with spinal cord injury. The study required five to eight fetal spinal cords for each adult recipient but showed no significant therapeutic benefit. Many more studies followed with none showing significant therapeutic benefit; yet, with each continuing to claim great promise. The promise without benefit continues today at the cost of many human lives.

So, let me address this claim from another perspective. Consider the possibility that a treatment is discovered using fetal tissue transplants and it is the only option for a certain disease. Consider just one disease, like Parkinson's, which affects up to one million people in the U.S. alone. Based on a clinical trial in Sweden, cells from at least three to four fetuses are needed to treat each Parkinson's patient. So, four million babies would need to be aborted to treat this one disease, not to mention the number needed to treat patients worldwide.

Imagine the magnitude of the demand for fetuses to cure yet another disease like Alzheimer's, which affects 44 million people worldwide. Do we really want a world where the most vulnerable, those with no voice, are subject to the whims, desires, and perceived needs of others? Clearly, we will have created

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 105 industrialized harvesting of pre-born babies, a crime against the human race. Third, the repeated assurances that proper ethical guidelines are in place to avoid the connection between abortion and subsequent research are entirely inadequate. By purchasing fetal tissue products, the researcher is not far removed from the act of abortion. As recently described in the journal Nature, one researcher continues to pay \$830 for each fetal liver sample, a purchase he must repeatedly make. A few years ago, before the recent media coverage, it was quite easy to go to the Web site of a biotechnology company and put almost any fetal body part in one's shopping cart and submit for a purchase. So, independent of whether a researcher is at the bedside of the one choosing an abortion or using a fetal cell line created decades prior, by purchasing these fetal tissue products, scientists are helping to create a market that drives the abortion-biotechnology industry complex. Mrs. Blackburn. Dr. Schmainda, please wrap up. Your time has expired. Ms. Schmainda. So, finally, I conclude with what is first and foremost. Each and every human life is sacred with the fundamental dignity that does not depend on his or her development stage or abilities. This value belongs to all, without

distinction from the first moment of existence. Each and every

2319

2320

2321

2322

2323

2324

2325

2326

2327

2328

2329

2330

2331

2332

2333

2334

2335

2336

2337

2338

2339

2340

2341

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
2343	human life is unique and unrepeatable, created by our loving God
2344	in his loving image and likeness.
2345	Nothing, no person, no argument, not even a scientific
2346	discovery or cure can diminish the fact that using human embryos
2347	or fetuses as objects or means of experimentation constitutes an
2348	assault against the dignity of human beings who have a right to
2349	the same respect owed to every person.
2350	Thank you.
2351	[The prepared statement of Ms. Schmainda follows:]
2352	
2353	***********

$_{ m II}$ This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements with	hin
may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaked A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on	er.
A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on	the
	107

2354 Mrs. Blackburn. I thank you. And Dr. Goldstein, you are recognized for 8 minutes for an opening statement.

TESTIMONY OF LAWRENCE S.B. GOLDSTEIN

Mr. Goldstein. Good morning -- actually, good afternoon, Chairwoman Blackburn, Ranking Member Schakowsky, and other members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you this afternoon about the important and potentially life-saving research being done with fetal cells and fetal tissue. And I will give you three brief examples for the potential impact of this work.

My bio is in your written materials. I will just summarize a few key points. My early faculty career was spent at Harvard University, where I became a tenured professor. I then moved to the University of California, San Diego in 1993 and I am currently a distinguished professor in the Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine and the Department of Neuroscience there.

I served as Director of the U.C. San Diego Stem Cell Program,
Scientific Director of the Sanford Consortium for Regenerative
Medicine and Director of the Sanford Stem Cell Clinical Center.
I have received numerous honors and awards for my work.

I have been a practicing scientist for 40 years, most recently using all types of stem cells to understand and treat Alzheimer's Disease, spinal cord injury, ALS, and more recently, kidney disease.

Today, I represent myself and the International Society for

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 109 Stem Cell Research, the American Society for Cell Biology, and 2380 2381 the Coalition for Life Sciences, which together, represent in 2382 excess of 60,000 practicing life scientists and physicians. 2383 My message is very simple. Fetal tissue and cells that would 2384 otherwise be discarded play a vital role in modern, cutting-edge These fetal tissues and cells cannot be 2385 biomedical research. 2386 easily replaced by embryonic stem cells, reprogrammed stem cells, 2387 or adult stem cells. Let me give you three examples. 2388 In the first example, we are using fetal astrocytes in the 2389 study of Alzheimer's disease. This devastating disease affects 2390 5.3 million Americans and costs us in excess of \$200 billion to 2391 \$300 billion a year. It killed my own mother. This number 2392 doesn't reflect the real and terrible hardship that families face. 2393 We don't have a cure. No cure is obviously in sight and we really 2394 do have to find a way to treat this terrible disorder. 2395 Now, in my own lab, the approach we are taking is to use 2396 reprogrammed stem cells to make Alzheimer's-type brain cells in 2397 the dish. That is, to generate Alzheimer's disease in a dish and to try to understand what is going wrong and to develop drugs that 2398 2399 curtail the problems that happen biochemically. 2400 Now, a type of cell that is very valuable in this work is 2401 called an astrocyte. And this is a type of cell that is a support 2402 cell in the brain. We use fetal astrocytes, which are vital to

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

these investigations. These fetal astrocytes provide growth

factors that keep the nerve cells healthy, that help them establish connections, and to be honest, they produce factors that we do not yet have fully defined that help maintain the viability of these cultures and are proving important to us to make new discoveries.

It is possible to make astrocytes from stem cells. And you can write the label astrocytes on those stem cells but they are not identical in their behavior and properties to fetal astrocytes, which arguably remain the gold standard to which we compare astrocytes made from stem cells. And we cannot yet use astrocytes made from stem cells to replace fetal astrocytes. These astrocytes are vital to our investigations and I remain hopeful that they will help us conquer the scourge of this terrible disease.

In the second example, in the Center that I direct, the Sanford Stem Cell Clinical Center, we are using fetal neural stem cells in clinical trials for spinal cord injury in human patients. In animal versions of spinal cord injury, these fetal neural stem cells have previously been shown to have really remarkable properties and animals so treated exhibit tremendously greater performance after treatment than before. What seems to happen is that these fetal neural stem cells, when implanted at the site of the injury, make new neurons that form a relay across the site of the injury, enabling these animals to regain function.

Now, as a result of the work in animals, we have FDA approval to test these fetal stem cells in human patients. Physicians and surgeons in my center have initiated an FDA-approved phase 1 clinical trials of these cells and have implanted them in four patients within the past year. I will tell you that these surgeries are very arduous and the human volunteers are courageous in the face of uncertainty about their future. Thus far, the trial is a success. We have learned that, at minimum, the surgery is safe. The fetal cells are safe and we will be tracking these patients over the next few years looking for signs of recovery, as these cells are given the opportunity to develop and positively impact the paralysis.

We hope in the next year to begin transplanting patients with cervical spinal cord injuries, which will give us a more sensitive test bed, we think. This trial and others like it, this is not the only such trial, others are pursuing analogous investigations with different sorts of cells, but these trials are vital to pushing medical science forward and to helping to rescue people who are afflicted with spinal cord injuries, which is a terrible affliction.

I will just mention that these same fetal neural stem cells that we are using for spinal cord injury are also being used in phase 1 and soon-to-be phase 2 clinical investigations for ALS or Lou Gehrig's disease at NIH-sponsored centers around the

In a third and final example, I chair the executive committee of a group of NIH-funded scientists who are trying to learn whether it is possible to build new kidneys from stem cells. This goal is significant because we have 93,000 Americans on waiting lists for kidney transplants and we recognize that the goal of building a functional kidney is audacious but audacious goals build audacious dreams and projects and progress and I believe that we can attain these goals with hard work, determination and time. It won't happen instantly, but it is something I think we can achieve.

Fetal tissue that would otherwise be discarded is vital to the future of this investigation, as it is only be examining fetal tissue that we are able to deduce and learn what the signals are that cells use to tell each other which cells are going to become kidney, which are going to become other parts of the body and so on.

So, our ability to examine the very earliest stages of human development are ultimately vital to our understanding and our ability to treat many diseases in the future, including diseases of pregnancy, diseases of the placenta, and diseases of children and adults. Development of many of these therapies depend upon our learning what the normal signals are by studying the earliest stages of development and without this type of research, we will

country.

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
2476	be dramatically slowed down and people who would have therapies
2477	sooner will wait and suffer needlessly longer.
2478	So, let me close by stating once again, that in my opinion,
2479	research with fetal tissue and cells that would otherwise be
2480	discarded is ethical, valuable, and vital to ongoing biomedical
2481	research projects.
2482	I want to thank the committee for your time and I am prepared
2483	to answer questions that you may have.
2484	[The prepared statement of Mr. Goldstein follows:]
2485	
2486	**************************************

Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Dr. Goldstein.

We will move to questions. And on our side, I am going to reserve my time and Joe Pitts, Chairman Pitts, will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Pitts. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thanks again to the witnesses for coming today.

Let me just say something for the record that wasn't covered in the last panel. The issue of undercover journalism was raised but I just want to put this quote on the record. The indictment was alarming enough for two pro-abortion scholars at Cornell to write an opinion piece defending undercover journalism.

Professors Sherry Colb and Michael Dorf said: "We are pro-choice, and we support the important work of Planned Parenthood, but we find the prosecution of these citizen journalists, however self-styled, deeply disturbing.

Undercover exposes play a vital role in informing the American public of important facts that would otherwise remain hidden."

We are all familiar with local TV station I-teams and undercover exposes using hidden cameras, sometime false narratives. Mike Wallace was -- famous journalists have gone undercover to expose shoddy conditions at the VA hospitals. Nick Kristof of The New York Times posed as a customer to reveal the darkness of sex trafficking in Cambodia, and you can go on and on. So, for the record, I will put that.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 115
2511	Now, let me go to this question. The gentleman mentioned
2512	Harvard. I think using, whether fresh, fetal tissue is vital to
2513	cures is an open question. Presently, Harvard has 8,000 medical
2514	research projects underway, only 10 use fresh fetal tissues; 10
2515	out of 8,000.
2516	Now, some defend the practice of defend the practice of fetal
2517	tissue collection from aborted babies because the fetal tissue
2518	supposedly contributes to life-saving research today. First,
2519	can you tell us what deadly disease have been cured or can now
2520	be treated thanks to modern day collection of human fetal body
2521	parts, anyone? No?
2522	And secondly
2523	Mr. Goldstein. No, I think
2524	Mr. Pitts. I am sorry?
2525	Mr. Goldstein. I would like to respond because I think the
2526	case of vaccines is appropriate. The fact is, that is how those
2527	vaccines were developed.
2528	Mr. Pitts. Which vaccines?
2529	Mr. Goldstein. Polio and the other long list that Professor
2530	Charo gave us. And it is so easy to look in the rearview mirror
2531	at research and say well, now that we know everything we know,
2532	it would have been so much easier to do it a different way. You
2533	didn't have to do it this way but the fact is, as you well know,
2534	research is a slow, tough, enterprise.

Mr. Pitts. Yes, reclaiming my time. The simple fact that
the vaccine for polio was developed using monkey tissue, not human
fetal tissue.
Let me go on to my question and it has to do with conflict
of interest. Suppose a tissue procurement business makes
financial contributions to an abortion clinic from which the
company harvests tissue. What ethical issues exist if the clinic
notifies the company in advance that the clinic has particular
abortions scheduled that would be good for acquiring particular
organs or tissue? Dr. Lee.
Mr. Lee. Can you help me with who is making the contribution
to whom again?
Mr. Pitts. The procurement business
Mr. Lee. Is making the contribution to the abortion clinic?
Mr. Pitts. Yes.
Mr. Lee. Okay. Well, I think there is a conflict of
interest in that there is not the separation. I think in all of
these organ transplant cases, we want to have a different set of
team making the decisions about how to proceed, how to treat a
patient and then a different set of team from that on talking to
the family about whether to make a donation. And it seems to me
it is the same team here that is working on aborting this baby
that is also trying to get the consent from the woman, which I

think is questionable whether it has authority there, but getting

2558

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 117
2559	consent from that woman to use the fetal body parts.
2560	So, I think there is a conflict of interest there, yes.
2561	Mr. Pitts. Dr. Schmainda?
2562	Ms. Schmainda. Yes, there is definitely a conflict of
2563	interest and I would like to also add with regard to the
2564	procurement of tissue, I oversee a tissue bank for brain tumor
2565	tissue and spinal cord tumor tissue. And our procedure is such
2566	that we have to have someone constantly on-call with a pager and
2567	they have to be there in the OR, ready to go 30 minutes from tissue
2568	removal. And if you don't get that tissue within 30 minutes of
2569	removal, it is no longer useful for research, especially the more
2570	advanced research like genomics and proteomics.
2571	So, it is very difficult to see how there can be a separation
2572	between the research and the requirements of the scientific
2573	community and the act of procuring that tissue.
2574	Mr. Pitts. My time has expired. Thanks.
2575	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired. Ms.
2576	Schakowsky, you are recognized for 5 minutes for questions.
2577	Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you.
2578	Ms. Schmainda, you oppose the use of fetal tissue in
2579	scientific research, right?
2580	Ms. Schmainda. Yes.
2581	Ms. Schakowsky. Is the position your university has?
2582	Ms. Schmainda. I represent my own views. I am not
	11 - 11 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 118
2583	representing my university.
2584	Ms. Schakowsky. In fact last September, Dr. John Raymond,
2585	the President and CEO of your university testified in opposition
2586	to a Wisconsin State Senate bill that would prohibit researchers
2587	in the State from using fetal tissue in their research.
2588	Dr. Goldstein, so my colleagues have used documents, emails
2589	from researchers seeking fetal tissue and I don't know, maybe it
2590	is in an effort to shock us, but what is your feeling about asking
2591	for, for example, it may not sound great, but a liver or a thymus,
2592	that kind of thing, if you have specific research going on? Do
2593	you see anything unethical about that?
2594	Ms. Schmainda. Absolutely.
2595	Ms. Schakowsky. No, I am asking Dr. Goldstein that.
2596	Ms. Schmainda. Oh, excuse me.
2597	Mr. Goldstein. No, I don't see anything unethical about
2598	asking for specific regions. When we get brain tissue from our
2599	Alzheimer's disease brain bank, we will request the hippocampus
2600	or a part of the cortex, or a specific part of the brain as part
2601	of the normal procedure for obtaining post-mortem tissue.
2602	Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. So, I wanted to ask you, there
2603	has been concerns about recent outbreak of Zika, of course, and
2604	it had led to renewed focus on infectious diseases that have the
2605	potential to rapidly spread. As you know, there seems to be a
2606	strong link between Zika virus infection during pregnancy and the

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
2607	congenital microcephaly, a devastating birth defect. And at this
2608	point, there is no treatment or vaccine for Zika.
2609	Given the majority's insistence on calling this panel the
2610	Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives, it would seem
2611	important to focus on potential ways to improve infant lives, like
2612	finding a way to prevent or cure the Zika virus and the potential
2613	for microcephaly. In fact, the CDC has recently released
2614	guidance on the collection and submission of fetal tissue for Zika
2615	virus testing. They recognize that the study of this tissue is
2616	the means through which we can understand the virus.
2617	So, Dr. Goldstein, how are we expected to learn and
2618	understand the implications of the Zika virus without studying
2619	the fetal tissue?
2620	Mr. Goldstein. I think that if you want to understand the
2621	Zika virus, the most efficient place to start is with the fetal
2622	tissue that is infected. That just seems self-evident to me.
2623	Ms. Schakowsky. Isn't it imperative that researchers have
2624	access to brain tissue to study the differences between the
2625	healthy neurological cells and those potentially infected with
2626	microcephaly?
2627	Mr. Goldstein. Well and in particular for figuring out
2628	which cell types are infected. It is often forgotten that the
2629	brain is made of dozens, if not more kinds of cells. We don't
2630	know which cell type is being infected by the virus and it is only

| This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 120
2631	by surveying the landscape that we will get any clues.
2632	Ms. Schakowsky. The World Health Organization has now
2633	labeled the Zika virus as a public health emergency of
2634	international concern. What is your view of preventing the use
2635	of fetal tissue research to study and hopefully stop this growing
2636	public health emergency?
2637	Mr. Goldstein. I think that would be sticking your head in
2638	the sand.
2639	Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. Would not having fetal tissue
2640	as a resource in this study potentially delay finding a cure?
2641	Mr. Goldstein. It would absolutely delay it. I think you
2642	have to go to the source if you want to understand what is going
2643	wrong.
2644	Ms. Schakowsky. Going back to the name of this committee,
2645	this type of research could lead to treatments and cures that
2646	benefit infant lives, could it not?
2647	Mr. Goldstein. That would be the hope. You know there is
2648	never any guarantee with research that we are going to get to where
2649	we want to go, but we are going to give it a good solid try and
2650	we have to have appropriate tools.
2651	Ms. Schakowsky. Beyond Zika virus, fetal tissue is
2652	important for research and to other conditions that impact infant
2653	and fetal development. Is that correct? And I am wondering if
2654	you could name what else we might be investigating.
J	

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  121
2655	Mr. Goldstein. Well, another interest in my lab is in a
2656	disorder called Niemann-Pick type C1, which is a devastating
2657	cholesterol transport disorder that kills kids in their first or
2658	second year of life. We use fetal astrocytes in our investigation
2659	of that disorder as well. We have recently discovered what I hope
2660	will be two drugs that may be effective. We need to get into
2661	clinical trials to find out but it is the sort of thing that you
2662	could imagine doing on multiple occasions down the line.
2663	Again, research is not a guarantee but we have to go through
2664	the door and look in order to find out.
2665	Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you and I yield back.
2666	Mrs. Blackburn. Mrs. Black, you are recognized for 5
2667	minutes.
2668	Mrs. Black. Thank you Madam Chair and I thank the panelists
2669	for being here. I think it is really ironic that we sit here and
2670	talk about how we will benefit children and at the same time, we
2671	are talking about how it is okay to abort a baby and to dissect
2672	it and take out its body parts and use that for research but at
2673	the same time, we talk about how this will save babies. So, it
2674	is very ironic. Do we want to save babies or do we not want to
2675	save babies. But that is not my question.
2676	My question I want to go to are babies that are born alive

 $_{\mid\mid}$  This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

in these abortion clinics. And just last week, there was a

20-week-old child that was born alive in a Phoenix abortion

2677

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 122
2679	clinic. There was a fire department that was close and had to
2680	transport the baby to the hospital.
2681	Since sometimes these children are born alive, either during
2682	or right after the abortion, should abortion clinics have neonatal
2683	care equipment in those clinics to help to save those babies? Dr.
2684	Lee, do you have a thought on that?
2685	Mr. Lee. Yes, I mean I think that if we were treating someone
2686	that we really genuinely recognized as a human being and as having
2687	intrinsic dignity, we would say that we need to have available
2688	the kind of care that is needed if something goes wrong. And we
2689	would not fight every inch of the way when the government, whether
2690	it is state or federal level, tries to require protection for
2691	babies who are born alive.
2692	So, yes, I think neonatal care, access to ambulance care,
2693	I think that is a minimum, I think.
2694	Mrs. Black. Dr. Schmainda, do you have a thought on that?
2695	Ms. Schmainda. I can't imagine it because when you have the
2696	neonatal care unit, you are recognizing that this is a human
2697	person. And I think absolutely it must be because it is a human
2698	person, it would be wonderful if it existed.
2699	Mrs. Black. How about you, Dr. Goldstein, do you have a
2700	thought on that?
2701	Mr. Goldstein. I am not an expert on the sort equipment that
2702	should be present at an abortion clinic and it would be

	Committee's website as soon as it is available. 123
2703	inappropriate for me to speculate.
2704	Mrs. Black. Well, can I ask you do you think it is wrong
2705	to let a child die that is born in an abortion clinic and needs
2706	medical assistance?
2707	Mr. Goldstein. I think it is wrong to let a child die.
2708	Mrs. Black. Thank you.
2709	The second question that I have along these lines, should
2710	the mother be told as a part of that consent form that there is
2711	a chance that your baby will be born alive and that our clinic
2712	will give you baby the best care? Ethically, what do you think
2713	about that, Dr. Lee?
2714	Mr. Lee. Well, I think it is hard to say when you are talking
2715	about percentages and it is a difficult question to answer because
2716	the premise of it is that we are talking about asking someone full
2717	consent for something that I think if they genuinely understood
2718	and had a moral outlook, a just outlook, they would not really
2719	want to consent to that.
2720	So, it is kind of a I find it difficult to answer that
2721	question. But I would say that I think, in general, there is not
2722	enough information given to the woman about the nature of what
2723	it is that is being killed in an abortion. Sometimes it is ever
2724	hidden from her that anything is being killed, that there was ever
2725	something alive. So, if we could just get even just general
2726	really good informed consent about the nature of that procedure

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

124

is that we are talking about, that would be a first step. And then yes, I think the other things should be brought in, when you

that we are talking about, that would be a first step. And then yes, I think the other things should be brought in, when you are talking about the possibilities. Even if it is a remote possibility, it is such a horrific possibility and it also, I think, bears on the question that she should be asking about well what kind of procedure is this.

Thank you. With the little bit of time that Mrs. Black. I have left, Madam Chairman, I am not so sure after we complete our investigations and our information that we will receive as a result of this committee that there shouldn't be another Blue Ribbon Commission. We talked about this Blue Ribbon Commission that was under President Reagan, it was done back in 1984. We are 30 years down the road. There is so much medical science advancement here, at that point, the viability, I was still young out of nursing school, the viability was around 36 weeks. And you know if we had a baby that was born at 36 weeks or less, we really didn't have a lot of medical advancements for saving that child. But I think that this whole issue really needs to be revisited and, rather than going back and looking at a Blue Ribbon Commission that was done some 30 years ago, that may be one of the recommendations that we have.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.

Ms. DeGette, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2727

2728

2729

2730

2731

2732

2733

2734

2735

2736

2737

2738

2739

2740

2741

2742

2743

2744

2745

2746

2747

2748

2749

to the final, official transcript will be posted on the tee's website as soon as it is available.
s. DeGette. Thank you, Madam Chair.
s with the last panel, I would appreciate yes and no answers,
sible.
y first question, Dr. Lee, you are a professor, a doctor
losophy, correct?
r. Lee. Right.
s. DeGette. And Dr. Schmainda, you have a Ph.D. in medical
ering. Correct?
s. Schmainda. Correct.
s. DeGette. And the first line of your biography on the
l College of Wisconsin's Web site says your primary focus
r lab is the development of MRI methods to assess brain
. Is that correct?
s. Schmainda. That is definitely a focus, yes.
s. DeGette. Now, Dr. Goldstein, you are an actual
ased researcher and you run a lab. Is that correct?
r. Goldstein. Yes.
s. DeGette. So, I am going to talk to you, since of all
x witnesses we have had today, you seem to be the only one
xperience in being able to talk about fetal tissue research
kperience in being able to talk about fetal tissue research

from before and from a long time ago, when they were used for

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
2775	vaccines and other purposes; those should still be sufficient.
2776	Do you believe that existing fetal cell lines are sufficient or
2777	do you think it is important to develop new fetal cell lines?
2778	Mr. Goldstein. I think that as methods improve, you
2779	generally are going to want to revisit the question of developing
2780	new cell lines with superior methods.
2781	Ms. DeGette. Now in the three studies you talked about your
2782	in testimony, are you using new cell lines or some of the existing
2783	cell lines from before?
2784	Mr. Goldstein. The fetal neural stem cells, those are cell
2785	lines that have been in existence for some time and have been
2786	through substantial expansion. The fetal astrocytes are earlier
2787	stage primary cultures but they are also established.
2788	Ms. DeGette. Okay. And my next question and related to
2789	that is Dr. Schmainda said that there is no actually she said
2790	in her testimony it is clear that no current medical treatments
2791	exist that have required using fetal tissues for their discovery
2792	or development. Is that a correct statement, yes or no?
2793	Mr. Goldstein. I think that is an incorrect statement.
2794	Ms. DeGette. Okay. Now, there is a number of new research
2795	studies, including the ones that you and your facility are
2796	investigating that are using fetal cells. Is that correct?
2797	Mr. Goldstein. That is correct.
2798	Ms. DeGette. And several of the witnesses today have
	NEAL R. GROSS

 $\parallel$  This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  127
2799	testified that the cell lines are all interchangeable so that to
2800	do your research and this other research, you would not need to
2801	have fetal cells. Is that correct?
2802	Mr. Goldstein. I don't agree with that. In my experience,
2803	cell lines are simply not interchangeable.
2804	Ms. DeGette. And I know there is a number of new types of
2805	cell lines out there. I have done a lot of work, as you know,
2806	on embryonic stem cell research but there is a lot of different
2807	kinds of cells. There is iPS cells, there is human mesenchymal
2808	stem cells, there are some nasal astrocytes that are being used
2809	in other types. Can they all just be slotted in for each other
2810	or do you need all different types of cells to do research?
2811	Mr. Goldstein. So, I will make two comments about that.
2812	One is we need all different types of cells to do research because
2813	we don't know what is best. And second, in order to find out what
2814	is best, we have to do comparative studies and compare each against
2815	the other to figure out what is actually going to turn out to be
2816	superior for the medical application.
2817	Ms. DeGette. So, it is not like the iPS cells are the same
2818	thing as these fetal tissue cells?
2819	Mr. Goldstein. No. No, no, they are different.
2820	Ms. DeGette. Okay. Now, there was also some testimony from
2821	several different of the witnesses, none of them cell researchers
822	like you that we don't need fetal tissue from induced abortions

 $\parallel$  This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 128
2823	because we can just use fetal tissue from miscarriages. Have you
2824	heard testimony like that today and before?
2825	Mr. Goldstein. I have heard that statement made.
2826	Ms. DeGette. And are you familiar with the view that because
2827	the timing of recognition of a spontaneous abortion or ectopic
2828	pregnancy is unpredictable and both conditions may result in a
2829	serious emergency for the woman, the fetal tissue collected under
2830	these circumstances is often not suitable for research purposes?
2831	Are you aware of that?
2832	Mr. Goldstein. I am aware of that.
2833	Ms. DeGette. And do you think that we can substitute the
2834	tissue from spontaneous abortions or from ectopic pregnancies?
2835	Mr. Goldstein. I don't.
2836	Ms. DeGette. Why not?
2837	Mr. Goldstein. And I would add that frequently spontaneous
2838	abortions have genetic abnormalities that render them unsuitable
2839	for further downstream work.
2840	Ms. DeGette. Thank you. I have no further questions.
2841	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.
2842	Dr. Bucshon, for 5 minutes.
2843	Mr. Bucshon. Thank you very much. Thank you to all the
2844	witnesses for being here. By the way, I did my residency at the
2845	Medical College of Wisconsin and I spent 7 years there. My wife
2846	went to medical school there. Welcome, all of our witnesses.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 129
2847	Dr. Goldstein, in your testimony you failed to mention that
2848	functional kidney organoids have already been grown using iPS
2849	cells and adults stem cells. Is that true?
2850	Mr. Goldstein. It is true that organoids have been made.
2851	And organoid is not the same as an organ. In fact, Dr. Little,
2852	in whose lab that work was done is a member of our team
2853	Mr. Bucshon. Okay. Now
2854	Mr. Goldstein trying to figure out how to harness
2855	organoid technology to the development of an intact functional
2856	kidney.
2857	Mr. Bucshon. That is fair enough. So, with fetal cells
2858	then, you are trying to grow organs?
2859	Mr. Goldstein. Ultimately, the goal would be to figure out
2860	whether using fetal cell lines, or embryonic cell lines, or
2861	induced reprogrammed cell lines, whether it is possible to build
2862	a functional kidney or not.
2863	Mr. Bucshon. Okay. And the same thing, if you have already
2864	made it to organoids from iPS cells and adult stem cells, it seems
2865	like you are actually further along in that area using those.
2866	Mr. Goldstein. I am not sure I agree with that. I think
2867	that is conjecture.
2868	Mr. Bucshon. Okay, well that is your area. So, I can't
2869	dispute that.
2870	You mentioned fetal cells related to spinal cord injuries.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
2871	Are there peer-reviewed journal studies about clinical cures of
2872	spinal cord injuries from adult stem cells?
2873	Mr. Goldstein. There are published papers from a number of
2874	labs around the world that claim to have seen dramatic results
2875	with cells from adult sources in spinal cord injury. In a number
2876	of cases, those studies have been discredited. In a number of
2877	cases, we are just not sure and we need to have further
2878	investigation to find out.
2879	Mr. Bucshon. Okay, thank you. And can I ask, where do you
2880	guys get your fetal tissue?
2881	Mr. Goldstein. So, the fetal neural stem cells that we
2882	obtain for our clinical trials come from our collaborating company
2883	called Neuralstem, which expands them to a large number, literally
2884	billions of cells.
2885	Mr. Bucshon. Okay, where do they get the tissue to start
2886	their cell growth?
2887	Mr. Goldstein. I honestly don't know where they obtain
2888	their tissue.
2889	Mr. Bucshon. Do they pay for it, do you know?
2890	Mr. Goldstein. I don't know but I presume that since it is
2891	against the law for them to pay for it, that they do not pay for
2892	it.
2893	Mr. Bucshon. Okay and so somebody made the point that since
2894	tissue would otherwise be discarded I am just asking, this is

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  131
2895	a philosophical question should anyone be paying for fetal
2896	tissue or making a profit from it, since it was just going to be
2897	quote, unquote, discarded anyway? The reason I ask that is
2898	because we know there are agencies that have been making a lot
2899	of money off of this tissue. So, just philosophically, would you
2900	think that that would be the right thing, that money should be
2901	exchanged? I mean I understand that the argument is that it takes
2902	money to process the tissue.
2903	Mr. Goldstein. Right, exactly. So, I am comfortable with
2904	the law of the land as it currently sits.
2905	Mr. Bucshon. Okay, Dr. Schmainda?
2906	Ms. Schmainda. Yes.
2907	Mr. Bucshon. That same question. If the tissue is just
2908	discarded, I mean does it make any ethical sense that people would
2909	be making a profit from it if it is just as has been quoted
2910	by many people, a couple people in this hearing, if it is going
2911	to be discarded anyway, what is the big deal? Then how come we
2912	are selling it and making a profit from it?
2913	Ms. Schmainda. Right, the ends never justify the means.
2914	Mr. Bucshon. How come we are buying it?
2915	Ms. Schmainda. Exactly. So while the ends never justify
2916	the means, supposedly, the guidelines are in place and so the
2917	researchers are not connected with abortion. They clearly are
2918	by creating the market that is driving the development of these

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  132
2919	cell lines or the use of fetal cell tissues. The
2920	biopharmaceutical company, there is a lot of areas where people
2921	could be making a lot of money. So, it is clear that is a
2922	money-making effort.
2923	And I also want to speak to the fact that if you don't mind,
2924	there has been a lot of discussion of the 1988 Advisory Panel,
2925	this Blue Ribbon Panel that people have been discussing. And I
2926	want to clarify because in my reading of this panel, there is
2927	actually 21 panel members and of the 21, there was two or three
2928	that dissented from the majority opinion. Now, the majority
2929	opinion itself basically was that we agreed that there is a moral
2930	question here.
2931	Mr. Bucshon. Okay. I am going to have to move on because
2932	I am running out of time.
2933	Ms. Schmainda. Okay.
2934	Mr. Bucshon. Dr. Lee, do you have any comments on that
2935	question about I mean it is just like it makes no sense to me
2936	that if there is no money in this, the tissue, and it is about
2937	research and I support research. Don't get me wrong and Dr.
2938	Harris addressed that in the last panel then why are there
2939	organizations out there wanting to do this? If there is just no
2940	money involved, it is going to be discarded anyway, what is the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

Well my comment is if the argument that the fact

big deal? We will just use it for research.

Mr. Lee.

2941

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
2943	that these would be discarded anyway had any merit, it would prove
2944	too much. It would prove that well, then, since it is going to
2945	be discarded anyway, we might as well allow people to make money
2946	off of this. In any situation where someone dies who did not
2947	consent to have his body used for research, the same argument could
2948	be made about that person's body and say well, look, yes, it is
2949	true that person did not give consent
2950	Mr. Bucshon. Understood. My time has expired. Thank you
2951	very much.
2952	Mrs. Blackburn. I thank the gentleman.
2953	Ms. Speier, you are recognized for 5 minutes.
2954	Ms. Speier. Thank you all.
2955	Dr. Lee, again, you are not a researcher. Correct?
2956	Mr. Lee. Not in physical science.
2957	Ms. Speier. Not in physical science and yet this hearing
2958	is about the use of fetal tissue in a scientific setting.
2959	Mr. Lee. Right, my area of study is bioethics.
2960	Ms. Speier. It is a little confusing to me as to why this
2961	panel, which should be comprised of scientists doesn't have a
2962	whole panel of scientists. But, you are an ethicist. So, let
2963	me ask you this.
2964	One of the questions one of my colleagues asked was is it
2965	unethical for a tissue procurement facility to contribute to an

abortion clinic and you gave an answer. Do you think it is ethical

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  134
2967	for members of Congress to receive campaign contributions and then
2968	vote for a specific bill from that institution or carry a bill
2969	for that institution?
2970	Mr. Lee. I would have to get more specifics by meaning a
2971	bill for that institution. I don't know. If it is a bill, yes,
2972	I guess. If you are saying if the bill is precisely not for the
2973	public good but for only this specific institution, yes, that
2974	would be unethical. But then of course, that just raises the
2975	question of whether we are talking about the public good or whether
2976	we are trying to promote a specific institution. And I think that
2977	
2978	Ms. Speier. Well, thank you. Thank you for your comments.
2979	This is kind of preposterous for us to sit up on this committee
2980	and suggest about ethical behavior when we are in the business
2981	of campaigning and raising money from individuals who are
2982	interested in getting us to vote one way or another.
2983	Let me ask you, Dr. Goldstein, 41 academic institutions have
2984	written a letter emphasizing the need for continued fetal tissue
2985	research. In your own words, can you explain what is at stake
2986	if this research is not permitted to continue?
2987	Mr. Goldstein. Predicting the future is a very dodgy
2988	business and any of us who claim to predict the future have got
2989	to do so cautiously but I think it is fair to say research into
2990	deadly disease will slow down. And that is not virtual. If I

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
2991	am 2 years later finding a therapy for a disorder, that is 2 years'
2992	worth of people who will have developed that disorder and passed
2993	away from it.
2994	I think back to Christopher Reeve, with whom I testified some
2995	years ago in an embryonic stem cell hearing and we talked at that
2996	time about what was at stake for people like Mr. Reeve. And the
2997	fact was, time was at stake. So, he, sadly, did not live long
2998	enough to see us putting an appropriate fetal neural stem cell
2999	type into clinical trial. I am sorry about that because I think
3000	he would have been really heartened to see that and he ran out
3001	of time.
3002	Ms. Speier. I was very impressed by your work with spinal
3003	cord injuries. There are many people who are paralyzed, whose
3004	life, quality of life has diminished greatly. The work you are
3005	doing right now where you are using fetal neural stem cells has
3006	the potential, does it not, to create a means by which individuals
3007	in the future who are living in a paralyzed state could in fact
3008	have fuller function?
3009	Mr. Goldstein. That is the potential, if everything goes
3010	according to plan.
3011	Ms. Speier. There was a reference made earlier about
3012	reconstruct of cosmetic purposes that fetal tissue could be
3013	used for. It was interesting that my colleague didn't reference
3014	the word reconstructive and cosmetic purposes. And I think we

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3015	fail to appreciate that skin grafts are used in very important
3016	reconstructive purposes. Persons who are burn victims benefit
3017	by the use of skin grafts. I, personally, have a body that is
3018	full of skin grafts due to an injury I received over 36 years ago.
3019	So, let's not diminish or somehow dilute the importance of the
3020	use of skin grafts in the effort to potentially improve people's
3021	lives.
3022	I am also concerned and I have only got 20 second left,
3023	so Dr. Goldstein, I am concerned about the chilling effect on
3024	researchers who are now being called, much like the McCarthy
3025	hearings of old to have their names associated with research they
3026	are doing. Could you speak to that?
3027	Mr. Goldstein. I think the chilling effect of naming names
3028	is always a danger of this sort of proceeding.
3029	Ms. Speier. Thank you. I yield back.
3030	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back. Dr. Harris is
3031	recognized for 5 minutes.
3032	Mr. Harris. Thank you very much.
3033	Dr. Schmainda, let me just clarify because I think a question
3034	was asked of you before, do you oppose tissue cell fetal tissue
3035	research. But your summary says that you believe that we should
3036	prohibit research using fetal tissue from induced abortion. Is
3037	that the correct summary?
3038	Ms. Schmainda. Correct.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 137
3039	Mr. Harris. Okay because we are frequently painting with
3040	a broad brush that somehow we all oppose this life-saving fetal
3041	tissue. We are talking specifically
3042	Ms. Schmainda. Yes.
3043	Mr. Harris about induced abortions.
3044	Ms. Schmainda. Absolutely.
3045	Mr. Harris. So now, you have done medical research for 25
3046	years and, although your qualifications have been questioned to
3047	sit on this panel, since this panel is bioethical issues, I take
3048	it you have filled out IRB consents before?
3049	Ms. Schmainda. Yes, all the time.
3050	Mr. Harris. Okay. And the purpose is to ethically protect
3051	patients, right?
3052	Ms. Schmainda. Correct.
3053	Mr. Harris. So, I am going to ask Exhibit A-3 to be put up
3054	again, which is the donation form that comes from a clinic where
3055	this fetal tissue is obtained. And I will tell you and I am
3056	sure when you have obtained consent for research you are careful
3057	not to over-promise because that, of course, would induce a
3058	patient to accept and consent to research.
3059	So, I am going to say read the first line. It says: "Research
3060	using the blood from pregnant women and tissue that has been
3061	aborted has been used to treat and find a cure for such diseases
3062	as diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, cancer,

3063 | and AIDS."

And I am going to ask Dr. Goldstein in a second, we really have found a cure using fetal tissue for diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, cancer, and AIDS? Because that is exactly what this form says. And if I had made this promise to a patient I was obtaining consent for, my IRB would never allow me to say that what we are doing has found a cure. Is that what your IRBs would do?

Ms. Schmainda. Absolutely. Yes, we can --

Mr. Harris. That is what I thought. Let me just keep going because I have limited time and I do want to ask Dr. Goldstein a few questions because I personally am not -- Dr. Goldstein, look, thank you for your willingness over 40 years to look into these diseases that affect human beings. No question about it. I was medical research. You are medical research. Again, I am not going to re-litigate use of fetal tissue because I think we have a broad agreement that fetal tissue ethically obtained is absolutely appropriate.

First of all, you have suggested that anything that slows this process down is a bad thing. You kind of suggested that. You have an IRB. How long does it take your IRB to approve, normally? Mine took months. I know exactly why you are laughing. It can take months or even year, can't it?

Mr. Goldstein. That is right.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 139
3087	Mr. Harris. Okay, so
3088	Mr. Goldstein. And if I might chip in here
3089	Mr. Harris. No, you can't. I have got to keep going because
3090	I have a bunch of questions. And I appreciate that you are totally
3091	honest about that.
3092	So, we have already made the decision that it is all right
3093	to slow down life-saving research when it involves humans for
3094	ethical reasons because we have a national policy that you have
3095	to have an IRB, which we know slows down life-saving research.
3096	So, the question is not whether it is all right to slow it
3097	down. It is whether it is ethical to assure ethics.
3098	In an article in Nature magazine in December, I am sure you
3099	know, you have said this, regarding aborted fetuses, you said:
3100	"We are not happy about how the material became available but we
3101	would not be willing to see it wasted and just thrown away." And
3102	I am just going to concentrate on the quote: "We are not happy
3103	about how the material became available." Why? Why are you not
3104	happy about how that material became available? Is that an
3105	accurate quote? I know sometimes the press misquotes us.
3106	Mr. Goldstein. It is an absolutely accurate quote and I
3107	think probably the best way to think about it is I don't seek out
3108	controversy. I am happier if my research just happened in a quiet
3109	back room and I could get on with the business of looking for
3110	therapies.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 140
3111	Mr. Harris. And that is every researcher I have known in
3112	medicine has felt the same way. So, I absolutely understand that
3113	opinion.
3114	I have got to tell you and, again, you have been brutally
3115	honest with us, and I thank you for your honesty.
3116	It has been suggested that it is immoral for these tissues
3117	to be discarded. Literally, I mean we can replay the transcript,
3118	that it is immoral. Do you agree that if one of these patients
3119	doesn't sign this form and that the tissue is discarded, that woman
3120	is making an immoral decision?
3121	Mr. Goldstein. May I answer?
3122	Mr. Harris. Absolutely.
3123	Mr. Goldstein. It is up to the patient to make that
3124	decision.
3125	Mr. Harris. But is it immoral if the woman chooses not to
3126	make the donation?
3127	Mr. Goldstein. No, it is not immoral.
3128	Mr. Harris. Thank you. Thank you very, very much for that
3129	honesty.
3130	And I am just going to ask Dr. Lee, because you are a
3131	bioethicist, is that form ethical where you tell a patient that
3132	diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, cancer, and
3133	AIDS, that this tissue has been used to find a cure? Past tense.
3134	It is not we are going to use it to attempt to find a cure, it

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 141 3135 has been used to find a cure. English has a very specific meaning. 3136 Is that unethical to ask this woman at a time when she is making 3137 a difficult decision to say that this tissue has been used to cure 3138 diseases when it hasn't? 3139 Mr. Lee. No, in order to make a fully informed consent, you 3140 have to be given accurate information. 3141 Mr. Harris. Thank you very much. I yield back. 3142 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back. 3143 Ms. DelBene, you are recognized. 3144 Ms. DelBene. Thank you, Madam Chair. 3145 I think everyone agrees that medical research using human 3146 tissue should adhere to ethical standards. There is no 3147 But as Dr. Goldstein and every researcher in 3148 America knows, that is true for all human tissue. If I wanted 3149 to donate tissue as part of a research study, the use of my tissue would be overseen by an Institutional Review Board and subject 3150 3151 to strict ethical and legal rules. I am an organ donor. I assume 3152 many people in this room are organ donors. And if an accident 3153 took place and any of us were in a position where our organs would 3154 be donated, the use of our organs to save someone else's right 3155 would rightfully be subject to similar ethical guidelines. 3156 quiding scientific research should be crafted in a reasonable and 3157 deliberate manner and they should be crafted by science, not by

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

ideology.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 142
3159	As Professor Charo pointed out, diseases also do not
3160	discriminate. The majority's attacks on research are an attack
3161	on all Americans because nearly everyone in this country has
3162	benefitted from research involving fetal tissue.
3163	Dr. Goldstein, as you know, medical breakthroughs come after
3164	years of incremental progress, often starting with very basic
3165	research that was conducted sometimes for an entirely different
3166	purpose and we learned something that was very relevant to move
3167	forward in a different area. Our greatest discoveries might have
3168	gone undiscovered if we cut off avenues of basic research that
3169	didn't seem promising at the time. So, how would you respond to
3170	claims that this research isn't useful or necessary anymore?
3171	Mr. Goldstein. Well, I don't disagree that it is not useful
3172	or not necessary any longer. And the fact is, as you correctly
3173	recognize, of 100 times that we start testing the therapy, 90 or
3174	95 percent of the time it is a dry well. We fail more often than
3175	we succeed but we persist. What we learn from the failures is
3176	important to help us figure out how to be successful in the future.
3177	Ms. DelBene. So, to clarify, you do think that it is useful
3178	and necessary to continue this type of research.
3179	Mr. Goldstein. Oh, absolutely, yes.
3180	Ms. DelBene. If republicans were successful in cutting off
3181	this research, would potential for medical breakthroughs be
3182	slowed or stopped altogether?

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
Mr. Goldstein. It would be slowed.
Ms. DelBene. And could you speak about some of the work that
is going on right now, the ongoing research in this area?
Mr. Goldstein. Well, I mean if our clinical trials with
fetal neural stem cells in spinal cord injury were halted, I think
that would be a terrible shame because I think it is one of our
most promising avenues. It is not just us that have seen these
properties with these cells. It has been repeated in other labs.
It looks like a very good, fertile ground and I would hate to see
it stalled. The same for our work on Alzheimer's.
Ms. DelBene. Do you think there would be ethical
implications to not continuing that type of research?
Mr. Goldstein. You know, we owe it to our descendants what
kind of world we give them. And I know that can be taken in a
variety of different ways but we are following the law. We are
doing work that has been deemed ethical by the mainstream
scientific community and it is work that looks as though it is
going to be very promising.
I wonder if I might give you one comment. In Parkinson's

I wonder if I might give you one comment. In Parkinson's disease, fetal tissue research is sometimes pointed to as having not been successful because it didn't yield, in and of itself, a cure. The fact is, that fetal tissue research has taught us what now to do with embryonic stem cells and perhaps with reprogrammed stem cells. So, even in that case, we learned a lot

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  144
3207	about how not to do things, how to avoid overdosing tissue, what
3208	types of cells to make in the future.
3209	Ms. DelBene. I agree. I did medical research when I
3210	started my career and sometimes the things that didn't go as you
3211	anticipated actually yield the greatest learning.
3212	Mr. Goldstein. Yes.
3213	Ms. DelBene. Folks brought up earlier that there has been
3214	a series of subpoenas and sweeping overbroad document requests
3215	to many names of patients, doctors, medical students, all who are
3216	involved in women's healthcare and vital medical research without
3217	really any legitimate reason for doing so. I wondered if you
3218	believe that that kind of environment is conductive to academic
3219	freedom and scientific advancement.
3220	Mr. Goldstein. No, I think it is terrible when researchers
3221	have to worry about their personal safety.
3222	Ms. DelBene. And do you think the political climate can have
3223	a chilling effect on scientific research going forward if that
3224	continues?
3225	Mr. Goldstein. It is already having it.
3226	Ms. DelBene. It is already having it. In what way are you
3227	seeing that today?
3228	Mr. Goldstein. So, there is another project that I am
3229	involved with that is basically seeing a supply of fetal material
3230	dry up completely and it was a very promising therapy for MS.
	NEAL R. GROSS

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3231	Ms. DelBene. Thank you. My time has expired. I yield
3232	back, Madam Chair.
3233	Mrs. Blackburn. I thank the gentlelady.
3234	Mrs. Hartzler for 5 minutes.
3235	Mrs. Hartzler. Thank you Madam Chairman.
3236	I just wanted to clarify that we don't have issues with
3237	studying the babies who are stillborn or miscarried due to the
3238	microcephaly and Zika and that is happening. But it is another
3239	thing entirely to have parents abort and use the aborted babies
3240	for research.
3241	So, Ms. Schmainda, can information about microcephaly
3242	associated with Zika be obtained using fetal tissue from affected
3243	babies that are miscarried or stillborn?
3244	Ms. Schmainda. Yes, absolutely. And I think when we speak
3245	of abortions, induced abortions and the tissue we get from them
3246	as a reference or as a gold standard, that is completely incorrect
3247	because the identity, the genetic identity of these children are
3248	not known.
3249	Mrs. Hartzler. Very good. I would like to carry on some
3250	more questions with you.
3251	Could you describe in detail how the tissues procurement
3252	process takes place, what personnel and equipment are involved?
3253	Ms. Schmainda. Absolutely. So, as I had mentioned briefly
3254	before, we actually have a full-time person that oversees a tissue

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3255	bank. And they are on-call with a pager so they know when the
3256	tissue is going to be removed at the time of surgery. So, they
3257	have to be there within 30 minutes, carrying with them a liquid
3258	nitrogen Dewar because the tissue has be flash frozen in order
3259	to maintain the quality of the research tissue. Otherwise, a lot
3260	of the analysis, the advanced analysis like genetic and proteomic
3261	analysis could not be performed with any reliability.
3262	Mrs. Hartzler. Are you familiar with how fetal tissue is
3263	procured, though, and the process involved with that?
3264	Ms. Schmainda. I am not but I can't imagine it is any
3265	different.
3266	Mrs. Hartzler. If we could put up Exhibit A-2, this is the
3267	exact compensation chart for a procurement technician. And I
3268	think America needs to be aware of this process. They are paid
3269	\$10 per hour plus a per tissue or blood bonus as outlined in the
3270	table below. The tissue is divided up into categories A, B, and
3271	C. One to ten specimens, for instance, of category A is \$35 a
3272	tissue and it goes up from there, \$45 to \$55, \$65, \$75 a tissue.
3273	So, there is a financial incentive for them to take this money
3274	to take this tissue and they are getting paid for that.

And yet, if you could put up Exhibit A-3, we have, once again, the consent form that is given to the woman who comes in to have an abortion under a very, very stressful time in their life. We have already discussed how this form is clearly unethical because

3275

3276

3277

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 147 3279 it makes promises to the woman saying that this going to result 3280 in cures and has resulted in cures for AIDS, cancer, Alzheimer's, 3281 et cetera, which is totally false. So, women are already being 3282 told inaccurate information in order to induce them. And then 3283 it also says I understand I will not be paid. So my question is, 3284 how come the woman isn't paid for this? 3285 That is a good question because in all other Ms. Schmainda. 3286 -- we look at coercion of the patient is a very, very severe, very 3287 strict guideline when you are putting the IRB together. 3288 can never promise that there is any benefit to the patient when 3289 they undergo an IRB-approved study. And so having this 3290 information about diseases that is untrue and not talking about 3291 what could happen as the possible risks is also completely 3292 irregular, compared to --Mrs. Hartzler. Didn't you, in your testimony, give an 3293 3294 example of some money that was spent by a procurement company for 3295 a sample? I am trying to find it. Do you remember it? 3296 Ms. Schmainda. Yes, \$830 per fetal liver tissue sample. 3297 Mrs. Hartzler. So, a woman is not giving any money for this. 3298 She is being coerced to sign this under duress with inaccurate information and yet the procurement company is getting up to 830 3299 3300 some dollars per liver, in addition to whatever else is in the 3301 It could be people are getting rich of off this and yet 3302 the woman is getting nothing from it, other than having an

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 148
3303	abortion.
3304	I think it is just unconscionable that we would accept, as
3305	America, that this would continue on, when women are being taken
3306	advantage of and money is being made off of them at the expense
3307	of not only that woman but her aborted baby.
3308	I yield back.
3309	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.
3310	Mrs. Watson Coleman, you are recognized for 5 minutes.
3311	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I wanted
3312	to ask Mr. Goldstein a couple of questions.
3313	Mr. Goldstein, you mentioned that some promising research
3314	with regard to MS was stopped or has been negatively impacted.
3315	Could you please elaborate a little bit on what you mean, and what
3316	direction was it going into, and why it has not yielded that?
3317	Mr. Goldstein. It was getting close to the clinical trial
3318	stage and then as a result of the political discussion and the
3319	threats to abortion providers, it is believed that they stopped
3320	being willing to provide tissue any longer.
3321	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Dr. Goldstein, have there been cures
3322	to any diseases resulting from the research emanating from fetal
3323	tissue? Have any cures been found of anything?
3324	Mr. Goldstein. I think we have gone back and forth on the
3325	vaccine issue a number of times. So, I think we will leave that
3326	one alone for the time-being.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 149
3327	I think I am in the business of moving forward. I look for
3328	therapies for diseases where we don't yet have any. I am not aware
3329	of any that have been definitely been solved using fetal tissue,
3330	although, arguably, the development of treatments for HIV
3331	depended a great deal on being able to develop humanized mice that
3332	had a human immune system in animals and I think that was initiated
3333	using fetal blood-forming stem cells.
3334	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Do you believe that anything on that
3335	form is creating an undue hardship or an intimidation or a
3336	misrepresentation to women who are being asked to consider whether
3337	or not they will donate this tissue?
3338	Mr. Goldstein. I am sorry, which form?
3339	Mrs. Watson Coleman. The form that my colleagues keep
3340	referring to that says that women who are under duress need to
3341	sign in order to give their consent.
3342	Mr. Goldstein. So, if it is the form that says therapies
3343	for diseases such as Alzheimer's disease and all the rest have
3344	already been found, I agree, that is an inappropriate statement
3345	and it should not have been made on that form. I don't know who
3346	wrote it. That would not have made it past my IRB either.
3347	Mrs. Watson Coleman. It seems to me that this has been an
3348	interesting day where we have had empirical evidence as to the
3349	worthwhile use of fetal tissue research, that it has produced and
3350	is producing results moving us in the right direction to be cures

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3351	and appropriate therapies and treatments for diseases and for
3352	injuries that otherwise negatively impact the life and the quality
3353	of life for individuals. It is also clear to me today that the
3354	question before us is just really nothing more than a proxy for
3355	getting at an attack on women's rights to what have already been
3356	established as a safe abortion in this country. And it just
3357	concerns me that we would have a panel of legislators sharing
3358	misinformation and sharing information that isn't documented in
3359	any way, shape, or form, indicating that people are making money
3360	off of women's bodies and that there is something about people
3361	becoming rich by engaging in fetal tissue research and leaving
3362	it out there as if it is the truth when, in fact, we know it is
3363	not.
3364	Mr. Goldstein, Dr. Goldstein, I know that you don't generally
3365	handle that end of it but to your knowledge, is there an industry
3366	that is getting rich and that is taking advantage of women's body
3367	parts as a result of fetal tissue research?
3368	Mr. Goldstein. Not to my knowledge.
3369	Mrs. Watson Coleman. Thank you. I yield back.
3370	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.
3371	Mrs. Love, you are recognized for 5 minutes.
3372	Mrs. Love. Thank you.
3373	Dr. Lee, can you explain to me how organ donations are done
3374	at Georgetown Medical? What kind of codes of conduct must be

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 151
3375	followed in order to get consent for organ donation?
3376	Mr. Lee. Well, I am not at Georgetown but at Mercy Hospital
3377	in Pittsburgh, there is a consent form that is very detailed and
3378	the donation team is separate from any of the doctors who treat
3379	the patient and there has to be a fully-informed consent there.
3380	And that complete separation, the doctors say well, the team will
3381	come in and they want to talk to you but they won't. The doctors
3382	who are treating the patient will not bring it up with the
3383	families.
3384	Mrs. Love. Okay. So, is there any contact between the
3385	person giving consent, the recipient of the organ, the technician
3386	that is transferring the organ, or the physician that is procuring
3387	the organ during or before the forms are signed or consent is
3388	given?
3389	Mr. Lee. There is not direct there might be there is
3390	contact between the team that mediates between the procurement.
3391	Mrs. Love. So, there is a mediator.
3392	Mr. Lee. Yes and that team is the one that speaks to the
3393	family members and patients. But there is always that
3394	go-between, that mediation.
3395	Mrs. Love. Great. I want to focus, again, on trying to
3396	protect the minor.
3397	Is it possible, Dr. Schmainda did I get that
3398	Ms. Schmainda. Schmainda.

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 152
3399	Mrs. Love. Thank you. Is it possible for a minor
3400	undergoing an abortion procedure to be faced with the decision
3401	to donate tissue on the same day that she is receiving that
3402	procedure?
3403	Ms. Schmainda. That is unconscionable, no. At that age,
3404	no, that should never happen.
3405	Mrs. Love. Does that happen?
3406	Ms. Schmainda. I am not aware. I mean I am not in that
3407	industry so, I am not aware of exactly the procedures followed.
3408	Mrs. Love. Does anyone know, on this panel, if that actually
3409	happens the day that the minor is receiving or the day that anybody
3410	is receiving the procedure that they are faced with donating the
3411	tissue on that very day?
3412	Mr. Lee. I don't think so. I don't think so, except for
3413	abortion, I think it is.
3414	Mrs. Love. Okay. So, from what I understand there are
3415	strict codes of conduct and guidelines for adult organ donations
3416	but there are little to no laws or guidelines protecting minors
3417	when giving consent to perform an abortion or giving consent to
3418	have a child's tissue donated. Again, I am coming at this looking
3419	at my 14-year-old and seeing what it was like for her to have an
3420	ACL surgery and how frightened she was. I couldn't imagine a
3421	14-year-old going into a clinic without someone there that she
3422	trusts, that is an advocate for her when she is faced with donating

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3423	tissue of an organ when she is going to be receiving these
3424	procedures herself. I couldn't imagine doing that myself, let
3425	alone a minor.
3426	I am trying to ask who is there to actually protect that minor
3427	when they are going in to have those procedures. Who is there
3428	on her side?
3429	The last thing I want to say is that there are times in our
3430	history in this country that we thought the behavior and the
3431	terrible treatment of some human beings were okay. Throughout
3432	our history, we had the opportunity to look back and say we were
3433	wrong. I am here because we have looked back at behavior that
3434	we thought was unethical and we changed it. Boy, I hope that we
3435	live in a country where we can look at the history and say the
3436	treatment of an unborn child is unethical, the treatment of a minor
3437	that is going in to receive some of these procedures should have
3438	someone on their side, and I hope that we live in a country where
3439	we can look back and we can change some of those things.
3440	I would not be here if we didn't have people making that
3441	courageous decision. I hope that we, in this country, are able
3442	to stand up and say the treatment is unethical; we are going to
3443	change it.
3444	I yield back.
3445	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back.
3446	Mr. Nadler for 5 minutes.
	NEAL D. CDOSS

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

Mr. Nadler. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Let me first make an observation. Dr. Lee, in his written testimony, says there is a serious problem concerning the woman's consent regarding the use of tissues and organs from the abortion procedure. How can her consent have ethical or legal significance, given her previous choice to abort? We went through this in the first panel, too.

He also said a little later, "Anyone with a just moral outlook would not consent to an abortion." Anyone with a just a moral outlook would not consent to an abortion; that is his opinion. That is the opinion of a lot people in this room but it is not the opinion of a lot of other people. How can her consent have ethical or legal significance, given her previous choice to abort? Maybe the choice to abort had more significant questions. Maybe the fetus had Down Syndrome, for instance, and it is a less easy question.

There are plenty of religious leaders in this country who disagree with your moral conclusion. This is a moral question. It is a moral choice that is quite clearly debatable. It is not self-evident. It is clearly debatable since we have been debating it for the last 50 or 60 years without a conclusion. Even if individuals, such as two of our panelists and some others on this panel, may have moral opinions of which they are certain, other people have contrary opinions of which they are certain.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

155

So, to say that because the woman, the mother disagrees with your personal conclusion or the personal moral view of some church, therefore, you will take away -- we should take away her moral right to make the choice on donation of fetal tissue, is an assertion of absolute moral arrogance which you have no right to make and we have no right to make. It is her decision, not ours, and not yours. And it is her moral decision, not ours, and not yours.

Second, I would like to ask Dr. Schmainda, I hope is correct.

Ms. Schmainda. Schmainda.

Mr. Nadler. Dr. Schmainda, you said that the use of -- we have all agreed that the use of fetal tissue derived not from an abortion is ethical. The question is is the use of fetal tissue derived from an abortion. And you said that the use of such tissue to cure, if it were possible, or perhaps when it is possible, to cure Parkinson's or Alzheimer's, would create a market for lots of fetal tissue, since a lot of fetal tissue would be necessary to cure the Alzheimer's and the Parkinson's and, therefore, this should be avoided. But it is true that abortions, in order to generate fetal tissue, are absolutely illegal and no one has suggested otherwise.

So, I gather -- tell me if I am wrong -- that you would rather have people suffer from curable diseases, you would rather have people -- you think it is more moral to have people suffer from

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3495	Alzheimer's who could be cured, suffer from Parkinson's who could
3496	be cured, rather than use fetal tissue from abortions that would
3497	occur anyway, tissue that would otherwise be discarded. You
3498	would make the moral choice and you would impose it on society
3499	that those people should suffer from the diseases, if they were
3500	curable. Am I correct?
3501	Ms. Schmainda. The ends never justifies the means. You
3502	can't extinguish one life to save another.
3503	Mr. Nadler. So, the answer is yes, you would because the
3504	ends don't justify the means. And the ends here, which is to cure
3505	people diseases don't justify the moral wrong of using tissue from
3506	an abortion that was not performed for this purpose but tissue
3507	that would otherwise be thrown out and you would rather have people
3508	suffering the disease. Okay, we have a disagreement and it is
3509	a very clear moral disagreement. And I hope you will not try to
3510	impose your moral view on the rest of us.
3511	Third, everyone I shouldn't say everyone. A number of
3512	questions asked about the consent form to donate tissues. Are
3513	any of you in clinic settings where such consents might be sought,
3514	Dr. Lee, Dr. Schmainda, Dr. Goldstein?
3515	Ms. Schmainda. Yes.
3516	Mr. Nadler. You are?
3517	Mr. Lee. Which kind of consents are you talking about? You
3518	mean for fetal tissue?
	NEAL D. ODOGG

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3519	Mr. Nadler. Yes.
3520	Mr. Lee. Fetal tissue from abortions?
3521	Mr. Nadler. Yes, fetal tissue from a specific abortion to
3522	be used for research or whatever.
3523	Ms. Schmainda. No, consents for research, for human
3524	research.
3525	Mr. Lee. No.
3526	Mr. Nadler. You are not. Okay. So, you are not there.
3527	You don't really see what is going on. Sort of a red herring
3528	because what I think some of the members of this panel are really
3529	concerned about is that the underlying abortion decision, not the
3530	separate donation decision, I think you are concerned about that
3531	because you said abortion is always morally wrong and the mother
3532	should be any mother who is so morally depraved as to consent
3533	to an abortion should be deprived of the right to consent to
3534	donating fetal tissue.
3535	Mr. Lee. The basis for that my argument was not that she
3536	was deprive because she was making a depraved decision
3537	Mr. Nadler. Sure it was.
3538	Mr. Lee but because she was no, that was not my
3539	argument. My argument was that she lacks the authority to make
3540	the decision because the authority to make a decision for your
3541	child is based on the best your having the interest of that child
3542	at heart. Mr. Nadler. Therefore, because of your

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3543	Mr. Lee. Someone who chooses to have her aborted no longer
3544	has
3545	Mr. Nadler. Reclaiming my time which is going to run out.
3546	Because of your moral decision, you would take that right away
3547	from her for the reasons you or I stated in different form.
3548	And yet at Planned Parenthood, going back to my question,
3549	I know that at Planned Parenthood, only after providing consent
3550	for abortion is the patient given the option for tissue donation.
3551	Tissue procurement personnel are trained to obtain informed
3552	consent for tissue donation only after the patient has consented
3553	to the abortion procedure. There is no evidence whatsoever
3554	is anybody aware of any evidence that any donors of fetal tissue
3555	have ever felt coerced? That is my last question. Is anyone
3556	aware of any such
3557	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired.
3558	Mr. Lee. I would say that the general knowledge that these
3559	things are used for these could tilt the scale in favor of that
3560	decision.
3561	Mr. Nadler. But you are aware of no coercion or
3562	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired.
3563	Mr. Nadler. Thank you.
3564	Mrs. Blackburn. Mr. Duffy for 5 minutes.
3565	Mr. Duffy. Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to ask to put
3566	Exhibit A-1, -2, and -3 put up. And I want to go to Exhibit A-2

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 159
3567	for the panel.
3568	And maybe before I get there, Dr. Goldstein, you have to
3569	imagine what an aborted baby looks like when it comes out. Do you
3570	know how long it takes to carve out a little baby heart, or a little
3571	baby lung, or a little baby lung, or to take a little baby head?
3572	Do you know how long it takes?
3573	Mr. Goldstein. I have no knowledge of that.
3574	Mr. Duffy. You are a doctor, though, correct?
3575	Mr. Goldstein. I am a Ph.D.
3576	Mr. Duffy. Ph.D., okay. Any
3577	Mr. Goldstein. I am a scientist, not a physician.
3578	Mr. Duffy. Any idea? Well, to the panel, anyone know how
3579	long that would take? No.
3580	From those I have asked, it doesn't take very long. It
3581	happens pretty quickly.
3582	And so on the moral ethical conversation, usually as we look
3583	at economies, the more you produce, the cheaper something becomes.
3584	You become more proficient at it. But if you look at the pay scale
3585	and by the way, let's be clear what this is. We have the
3586	procurement business that sends in a technician, one of their
3587	employees into the abortion facility, implanted, embedded in the
3588	facility that is looking at women who are coming through the
3589	facility and going out and getting consent to harvest these little
3590	baby lungs, little baby hearts, little baby heads. Does it seem
	NEAL B. OBOOG

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3591	odd to you that the cost of procurement when you go from 10 to
3592	11, the cost doesn't get cheaper, the cost or the payment gets
3593	more for the technician. The technician gets more money the more
3594	that they produce. Does that seem odd to you if profit motive
3595	is not an element of this business?
3596	Dr. Goldstein, does that seem strange?
3597	Mr. Goldstein. I have no basis on which to judge that. I
3598	can barely see the exhibit.
3599	Mr. Duffy. Well, I think it is in front of you. Open up
3600	your little packet. I think it is right there.
3601	Mr. Goldstein. Nope.
3602	Mr. Duffy. I am asking you to use your common sense. You
3603	don't have to be a Ph.D.
3604	Mr. Goldstein. I am honestly I am not going to speculate
3605	about something that I don't have firsthand knowledge.
3606	Mr. Duffy. Let's talk about firsthand knowledge because you
3607	are obviously in the business and promoting the use of fetal
3608	tissue. And I think you earlier indicated that you would agree
3609	with the law that we shouldn't make a profitprofit shouldn't
3610	be made off the sale of little baby body parts, right? Is that
3611	your testimony?
3612	Mr. Goldstein. So, that has its roots, as I understand it,
3613	in the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act.
3614	Mr. Duffy. Do you agree with it? Do you agree with the fact

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  161
3615	that we shouldn't profit off of the sale of baby body parts?
3616	Mr. Goldstein. Yes.
3617	Mr. Duffy. Okay. And so what work have you done to make
3618	sure, I think it was Neuralstem, doesn't make a profit off of the
3619	baby body parts that they receive from clinics or they don't pay
3620	clinics for the body parts that they receive? Do you do any
3621	research into that?
3622	Mr. Goldstein. I have asked them if they complied with the
3623	law. They have told me they complied with the law.
3624	Mr. Duffy. So, that is it?
3625	Mr. Goldstein. Just as you trust the man sitting next to
3626	you to comply with the law
3627	Mr. Duffy. I don't trust Mr. Harris.
3628	But that is all you have done. You haven't taken any further
3629	steps?
3630	Mr. Goldstein. I am in no position to actually launch an
3631	inquiry like that. I don't have investigative powers the way the
3632	Congress does.
3633	Mr. Duffy. So, you would agree that Congress should use its
3634	investigative powers to look into this issue.
3635	Mr. Goldstein. No, I don't. I honestly think that Congress
3636	has better things to do with its time.
3637	Mr. Duffy. And we should just take on blind faith. You get
3638	a specimen. How much do you pay for a specimen? A little line
	NEAL R. GROSS

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.  162
3639	what do you pay for it?
3640	Mr. Goldstein. The material we get from Neuralstem is
3641	provided under a collaboration.
3642	Mr. Duffy. How much do you pay?
3643	Mr. Goldstein. We don't pay them anything for it.
3644	Mr. Duffy. They give it to you for free?
3645	Mr. Goldstein. It is part of the whole cost of doing the
3646	clinical trial. So, we pick up part of the cost of the clinical
3647	trial in doing the surgery; they pick up part of the cost; they
3648	provide the cells.
3649	Mr. Duffy. So, there is no financial incentive. They are
3650	just a pure middle man. They don't make any money on this. Is
3651	that your position, Dr. Goldstein?
3652	Mr. Goldstein. I would be surprised if they didn't have a
3653	financial incentive. They are a publicly held company. They are
3654	required by law to have a profit motive. I don't know the details
3655	of how they carve out, where they generate profit, where they
3656	don't.
3657	Mr. Duffy. You just told me that you agree with the law that
3658	they shouldn't make a profit but then you assume that they are
3659	making a profit.
3660	Mr. Goldstein. They are growing cell lines, which are
3661	derived from fetal origin. It is not the fetal tissue itself.
3662	The NIH recognizes a distinction between established cell lines

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3663	and fetal tissue itself.
3664	Mr. Duffy. So, here we have an incentive to procure more
3665	specimens and get more money for those specimens. I think that
3666	calls into question a need to look a little deeper.
3667	Quickly, do you think, Dr. Goldstein, that we should be using
3668	this research as Ms. Charo would say, for taste testing and
3669	cosmetics?
3670	Mr. Goldstein. I think the issue of cosmetics was
3671	adequately addressed by Representative Speier, I believe it was,
3672	a few moments ago, where treatment for burns is an adequate and
3673	appropriate cosmetic reason.
3674	Mr. Duffy. Don't you then think that in the sheet where we
3675	are going to get consent that we should this is not life-saving,
3676	this is for taste tests or this is for cosmetics?
3677	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired.
3678	Mr. Duffy. I yield back.
3679	Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back.
3680	I will reclaim my 5 minutes and wrap this up. You all have
3681	been patient with us.
3682	As we look at the bioethics of this situation, Dr. Schmainda,
3683	what I have seen is a difference of opinion between some of those
3684	on whether fetal tissue is necessary, it is a convenience, or it
3685	is a cost-saving. So, can you kind of help us understand how that
3686	difference of opinion exists?

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

Ms. Schmainda. Absolutely. I think the issue of researchers using fetal tissue is largely over exaggerated. There is \$76 million from the NIH given to those that use fetal body parts for their research. That is out of an annual budget of \$30 billion that amounts to 2.5 percent. Also, there is maybe 160 investigators funded by the NIH. There is 300,000 investigators, overall funded by the NIH. So, this is not going to change the direction of science.

Just 2 days ago, I looked at PubMed, which is the area you look for the most recent scientific, or all the scientific publications. There is over 32,000 articles on adult stem cell therapy and rarely ever do you get to publish anything with a negative result. I think that science will probably be better without it because whenever we do have limitations on both sides of the panel, we say when you have a problem you typically -- I completely agree in the creativity of the scientific mind to overcome these challenges. And I think we will -- I know we will come up with alternatives.

Mrs. Blackburn. Let me ask you one more thing. There has been a question about the immunized mice. Can't that come from adult stem cells?

Ms. Schmainda. You know I can't speak to specific things but what I know from colleagues of mine doing immunology research, as they say, it is not essential. It has given them nothing more

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 165
3711	than what they already get from adult stem cell models.
3712	Mrs. Blackburn. All right, I want to go back to and I
3713	am going to come to you, Dr. Lee. Go back to Exhibit -3 but let's
3714	go a little bit further down this permission form. Do you have
3715	the permission form in front of you?
3716	Mr. Lee. I don't.
3717	Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. If someone will be sure that these
3718	are at the desk or, Ms. Schmainda, if you have one, if you will
3719	share.
3720	Mr. Lee. Okay.
3721	Mrs. Blackburn. As you look at Exhibit -3, and we have
3722	talked about the statement at the top of that permission form that
3723	is misleading. Go a little further down. It says: "I
3724	understand I have no control over who will get the donated blood
3725	and/or the tissue or what it can be used for." And then a little
3726	further down, "I understand there will be no changes to how or
3727	when my abortion is done in order to get my blood or the tissue."
3728	And the next one: "I understand I will not be paid."
3729	Now, as we look at this, I would like to hear from you, Dr.
3730	Lee, because we have heard about how quickly the tissue has to
3731	be pulled. Dr. Schmainda talked about this of how they have
3732	someone so close at hand within those first few minutes and then
3733	the tissue is properly treated and moved on for the research that
3734	they are going to go. Do you think this is a proper representation
	NEAL R. GROSS

	A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3735	to women who are going in for an abortion who don't understand
3736	that there is a profit motive or a financial motive behind this
3737	when you look at Form A-2 that shows what they are being paid and
3738	then they are asked to say and agree that they have no control
3739	over their donated blood or tissue and that there will be no
3740	changes or manipulations on that abortion or how it is done and
3741	the time that it is done. And that there is no financial
3742	compensation to them.
3743	I would like to hear your take on the ethics of the situation
3744	with these items on that form.
3745	Mr. Lee. Well, it seems to me that there is an effort to
3746	present this in, I would say, a sanitized manner. It sounds like
3747	everything is being done altruistically and that no one here is
3748	making any money off of this. And I think when you talk about
3749	someone who is there, working on-site who gets compensated more
3750	the more parts are received, it makes it incredible to think that
3751	no one is really profiting from these things or is getting paid.
3752	So, I think that raises questions about the accuracy of the
3753	representation about this all being that there is no profit
3754	motive involved, that there is no that it is always just
3755	completely altruistic.
3756	Also, I think it is good to note that all of this is at a
3757	time when presented to them when I think knowing that this is

something that might come up or that is done, that fetal tissue

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3759	is so-called donated, that can tilt the scale, I think in her
3760	decision.
3761	So, I don't think it is credible to say that
3762	Mrs. Blackburn. My time has expired and I would ask you to
3763	wrap up. I thank you for the answer to the question.
3764	I would like to remind all members that they have 10 business
3765	days to submit questions for the record and I ask the witnesses
3766	to respond to the questions very promptly. I know we are all going
3767	to have questions for writing. Members should submit those
3768	questions by the close of business on March 16th.
3769	Mr. Harris. Madam Chair, I move to enter into the record
3770	ten articles regarding non-fetal sources to treat some of the
3771	neural and renal diseases we have discussed here today. The
3772	minority has been provided with copies.
3773	[The information follows:]
3774	
3775	********COMMITTEE INSERT 11******

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3776	Mrs. Blackburn. Without objection, so moved.
3777	Ms. Schakowsky. Madam Chair, I would like to have submitted
3778	to the record the documents that have already been approved by
3779	the majority.
3780	[The information follows:]
3781	
3782	**************************************

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.  A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3783	Mrs. Blackburn. Absolutely. So ordered.
3784	We thank our witnesses. And yes, we are going to submit for
3785	the record the exhibits that we have used today. [The
3786	information follows:]
3787	
3788	   *******TNSERT 13******

	may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 170
3789	Mrs. Blackburn. Without objection, so ordered.
3790	And without objection, the subcommittee is adjourned.
3791	[Whereupon, at 1:43 p.m., the panel was adjourned.]