

Point-by-Point CRITIQUE
Senate Bill 306 (Hines & LaFleur)
May 12, 2005

p. 1. lines 4 ff.

"... to prohibit the expenditure of state funds for the purpose of cloning human beings ..."

A human being is cloned at the moment of stimulation of the re-constituted *ovum* to begin development as a zygote or one-celled (clone) embryo. Were this not so, Dolly the sheep would not have been a sheep, and similarly with the other species cloned thus far, including horses and household pets — a very “going” industry in California.

p. 2. lines 15 ff.

"It is the intent of the legislation to ... insure the sanctity of life ..."

How does this proposed law ensure the sanctity of life? It has already destroyed that sanctity by proposing to permit the manufacture of human clone embryos!

line 18.

"... research that shows the tremendous promise to cure disease and end human suffering."

What "tremendous promise?" There have been zero (0) successes with natural embryonic stem cells— which are obtained from an entirely equivalent embryonic stage as those proposed here — whereas adult and other mature stem cell research has yielded numerous clinically effective materials and techniques. I believe the last count is 58 to zero.

lines 22-26.

"Clone" means the practice of *creating or attempting to create a human being* by transferring the nucleus from a human cell from whatever source into a human egg cell from which the nucleus has been removed ..."

The definition of "clone" introduced by this bill is biologically/scientifically inaccurate. The clone begins at the moment of stimulation of the re-constituted, recipient *ovum* to begin development. If his or her life were to be allowed to continue, an easily recognizable human form would be attained.

p. 3 line 6

“which is then stimulated to form a blastocyst ...”

A human blastocyst is nothing more (nor less) than a 4 (or so)-day old embryo that, by his or her own internal, living processes, has developed a central (fluid-filled) cavity. He or she remains as such while continuing cell division – for an additional 10 (or-so) days. This bill's own use of the term, blastocyst, acknowledges – even if inadvertently – the undeniable humanity of the clone embryo, even at this early stage.

As was the case with Dolly the sheep, and other cloned animals, final confirmation of such an admission is undeniable long before the adult stage is reached.

lines 9-11.

“Unfertilized blastocyst ...”

This second sentence makes no sense, as it is biologically self-evident (blastocysts cannot be fertilized until they have grown to reproductive age!)

p. 5 lines 21-22.

“(1) With full consideration for the ethical and medical implications of the research.”

How can one require – or assure – that research be conducted with “full consideration for its ethical and medical implications,” when the basic step – that of creating a human being for research – is already unethical (given, particularly that the clone embryo is to be put to death and used for research), with totally improper medical implications?

p. 6 lines 24-28 (Sections A. and B.)

“... state funds are not to be used to clone or attempt to clone.”

If state funds are not to be used to clone [a human being], why should you do this in the first place?

p. 7 lines 4-8 (Sections A. and B.)

What this says is that no cloning is to take place in a health facility or agency. However, everything leading to, and including the actual cloning is promoted by this bill.

Laws must be based on truth and reality – not the other way around. We cannot suspend the law of gravity by passing a law; similarly, you cannot deny the truth of what this bill is promoting, i.e. the manufacture of what is, biologically and rationally, early human life. Were it not human life, the researchers would not be interested in going to all the trouble involved. For what they *think* their research will do, they need human life. The trouble is that in order to do what they *think* they need, they must destroy it, once formed, in order to get what they want.