

The recommendations of the Lockhart do not reflect reality in several aspects and appear to be developed to ensure a particular course of action independently of the valid evidence which negates such action.

The proposition is put forward that cloning does not produce a human embryo. The United Nations, last year, called on all member states to prohibit all forms of human cloning on the basis that it was a human embryo that was being developed. Even the reputable journal Nature had an editorial headed "Playing the Name Game: Stem-cell scientists should not try to change the definition of the word embryo".

The scientists use the fallacious argument that since the embryo is not formed from the union of an egg and sperm, it is not an embryo despite the fact that they admit that given the right environment it could develop and be born as a human person. It is still an embryo even if it is created by parthenogenesis and SCNT cloning.

Have some of the politicians supporting the recommendations failed to familiar themselves with the Prohibition of Human Cloning Act 2002. The explanatory notes to that Act specifically define embryo to include an embryo created by the fertilisation of an egg by sperm and also an embryo that has had its development initiated by any means other than by the fertilisation of an egg by sperm. The notes then specify that SCNT cloning is included here.

Creating embryos to deliberately destroy them by testing or harvesting parts sounds like the thinking of the Nazi scientists with no respect for our humanity.

Earlier experiments have already shown the risks associated with combining human and animal genetic material and is repugnant to most people.

It seems to me that the funding and support that embryonic stem cell research is receiving offers a benefit to the scientists subsidised by the drug companies who in turn look to any success as providing long term patients who will require anti-rejection drugs for life. Adult stem cells have no such problem and have already been proven to work in many varied instances. Why is this being ignored? Vested interests?

Michael Sobb