

FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN
CHAIRMAN

FRANK PALLONE, JR., NEW JERSEY
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115
Majority (202) 225-2927
Minority (202) 225-3641

March 23, 2016

Dr. Patrick Lee
Professor of Philosophy
Director, Center for Bioethics
Franciscan University of Steubenville
1235 University Boulevard
Steubenville, OH 43952

Dear Dr. Lee:

Thank you for appearing before the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce on Wednesday, March 2, 2016, to testify at the hearing entitled "Bioethics and Fetal Tissue."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Wednesday, April 6, 2016. Your responses should be mailed to Rachel Collins, Investigative Counsel and Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to Rachel.Collins@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Marsha Blackburn
Chairman
Select Investigative Panel of
the Committee on Energy and Commerce

cc: The Honorable Janice D. Schakowsky, Ranking Member, Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce

Attachment

Attachment — Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Marsha Blackburn

At the hearing, you made an ethical argument that emphasized the continuity of life. This was rejected by some members of the panel as “ethically arrogant.” Since you did not get a chance to respond to that “point,” please elaborate for the record how an ad homonym attack fails to refute your fundamental argument.