

REGULATING ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Reproductive science continues to revolutionise reproduction and propel us further into uncharted territories. The revolution signalled by the birth of Louise Brown after IVF in 1978 prompted governments across Europe and beyond into regulatory action. Forty years on, there are now dramatic and controversial developments in new reproductive technologies. Technologies such as uterus transplantation, that may enable unisex gestation and babies gestated by dad, or artificial wombs that will completely divorce reproduction from the human body and allow babies to be gestated by machines, usher in a different set of legal, ethical and social questions to those that arose from IVF. This book revisits the regulation of assisted reproduction and advances the debate on from the now much-discussed issues that arose from IVF, offering a critical analysis of the regulatory challenges raised by new reproductive technologies on the horizon.

AMEL ALGHRANI is a senior lecturer in law and Associate Dean (Education) in the School of Law & Social Justice at the University of Liverpool.

CAMBRIDGE BIOETHICS AND LAW

This series of books was founded by Cambridge University Press with Alexander McCall Smith as its first editor in 2003. It focuses on the law's complex and troubled relationship with medicine across both the developed and the developing world. Since the early 1990s, we have seen, in many countries, increasing resort to the courts by dissatisfied patients and a growing use of the courts to attempt to resolve intractable ethical dilemmas. At the same time, legislatures across the world have struggled to address the questions posed by both the successes and the failures of modern medicine, while international organisations such as the WHO and UNESCO now regularly address issues of medical law.

It follows that we would expect ethical and policy questions to be integral to the analysis of the legal issues discussed in this series. The series responds to the high profile of medical law in universities and in legal and medical practice, as well as in public and political affairs. We seek to reflect the evidence that many major health-related policy debates in the UK, Europe and the international community involve a strong medical law dimension. With that in mind, we seek to address how legal analysis might have a trans-jurisdictional and international relevance. Organ retention, embryonic stem cell research, physician assisted suicide and the allocation of resources to fund health care are but a few examples among many. The emphasis of this series is thus on matters of public concern and/or practical significance. We look for books that could make a difference to the development of medical law and enhance the role of medico-legal debate in policy circles. That is not to say that we lack interest in the important theoretical dimensions of the subject, but we aim to ensure that theoretical debate is grounded in the realities of how the law does and should interact with medicine and healthcare.

Series Editors

Professor Graeme Laurie, *University of Edinburgh*
Professor Richard Ashcroft, *Queen Mary University of London*

REGULATING ASSISTED
REPRODUCTIVE
TECHNOLOGIES

New Horizons

AMEL ALGHRANI

University of Liverpool



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-16056-9 — Regulating Assisted Reproductive Technologies
Amel Alghrani
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India
79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.
It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of
education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107160569
DOI: 10.1017/9781316675823

© Amel Alghrani 2018

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2018

Printed and bound in Great Britain by Clays Ltd, Elcograf S.p.A.

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Alghrani, Amel, author.

Title: Regulating assisted reproductive technologies : new horizons / Amel Alghrani.

Other titles: Cambridge bioethics and law.

Description: Cambridge, United Kingdom ; New York, NY : Cambridge University Press,
2018. | Series: Cambridge bioethics and law | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018022365 | ISBN 9781107160569 (hardback)

Subjects: | MESH: Reproductive Techniques, Assisted – legislation & jurisprudence |
Ectogenesis – ethics | Uterus – transplantation | United Kingdom

Classification: LCC RG133.5 | NLM WQ 33 FA1 | DDC 176/.2–dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2018022365>

ISBN 978-1-107-16056-9 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of
URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication
and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain,
accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-16056-9 — Regulating Assisted Reproductive Technologies
Amel Alghrani
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

For Habeeb

CONTENTS

Foreword by Professor Margaret Brazier page ix
Acknowledgements xiii
Table of Cases xiv
Table of Statutes and Statutory Instruments xvii
List of Abbreviations xviii

Introduction 1

**PART I Regulating Reproductive Technologies:
 Challenges Old and New** 17

1 Regulation of Assisted Reproduction: Past, Present and
Future 19

2 Regulation of Gametes: Resolving Embryo Disputes
between Gamete Progenitors 64

**PART II Regulating New Reproductive
 Technologies** 107

3 In Vitro Gestation I: The Road to Artificial Wombs
(Ectogenesis) and Mechanical Reproduction 109

4 In Vitro Gestation II: Ectogenesis: A Regulatory
Minefield? 144

5 Regulation of Uterus Transplantation: When Assisted
Reproduction and Transplant Medicine
Collide 179

6 Uterus Transplantation beyond Cisgender Women: ‘O Brave
New World, That Hath Such People In It’ 220

Conclusion 266

Index 275

FOREWORD

On 25 July 1978, a much-wanted little girl was born in the small Lancashire town of Oldham. As she lay in her cradle, Louise Brown would have been blissfully unaware that her birth signalled a revolution not just in reproductive medicine but in society as a whole. Louise was of course the first baby to be born as a result of *In Vitro Fertilisation* (IVF); or, as the media preferred to say, she was the first test-tube baby. Since that day a whole generation (including the author of this book, Amel Alghrani) has grown up taking IVF for granted. Infertility is no longer something that must simply be accepted as a vicissitude of life. An embryo could now be created outside the body of a woman and then implanted in the mother to be gestated as normal. Louise's mother, who could not conceive naturally because of an obstruction in her Fallopian tubes, was able to give birth to Louise, and later to a second daughter.

Looking back forty years and knowing what we know now about the subsequent developments in the reproductive technologies, Louise's birth after IVF using her married parents' gametes does not seem so earth shattering. Other more dramatic and controversial developments were to follow. To give but a few examples: Dolly, the most famous sheep in the world, offered the prospect of cloning human beings; Pre-Implantation Genetic Diagnosis (PGD) enabled doctors to screen embryos for serious genetic disease and paved the way for 'saviour siblings'. In 1978, the news of the birth was amazing, prompting great celebration and heart-warming media coverage rejoicing for the Browns and other couples unable to have a child. But at the same time the birth gave rise to prophecies of doom and condemnation of unnatural practices. In particular, the ability to create a child outside the womb and the potential for research on in-vitro embryos led to attempts to ban embryo research and effectively stop IVF in its tracks. Enoch Powell's Unborn Child Protection Bill came very close to becoming law.

Governments across Europe and beyond were slow to respond, fearful of the moral debates that raged around IVF and the opposition of the Catholic Church and other religions. In the United Kingdom, a Committee of Inquiry chaired by Dame Mary Warnock reported in 1984 and the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act was enacted in 1990, by which time Louise Brown was 12 years old. Nonetheless, the United Kingdom legislated much more swiftly than many other states and, as Dr Alghrani explains, the Human Fertilisation Act 1990 came to be seen as a model for regulation abroad, albeit often denigrated in the United Kingdom itself. The central problem with the 1990 Act was that no sooner than Royal Assent had been granted, the Act became outdated. Research and developments in the reproductive technologies gave rise to ethical dilemmas and legal questions that the lawmakers had never envisaged. The law could only play ‘catch up’, aided by judges ready to give imaginative interpretations of the Act, leaning towards the spirit of the Act rather than the letter of the law.

At the heart of this book is a plea that the law relating to the reproductive technologies should, as far as possible, be proactive rather than constantly reactive. Amel Alghrani seeks to look to the new horizons in relation to how we should regulate assisted reproductive technologies on and beyond the horizon today. Thus, in Chapters 3 and 4 of Part II, she explores the questions that will be posed by ectogenesis (artificial wombs), venturing into a field that until very recently was much more the concern of literary scholars and science fiction. Few of us will not have read Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World*. In the final two chapters of the present book, the focus is on uterus transplantation and the prospect that a uterus could be transplanted into a man. Uterus transplantation illustrates vividly just how formidable a task Dr Alghrani faced in writing this book. When she began her work, the possibility of a successful uterus transplant seemed some years away. Then, in September 2014, a Swedish team announced the first live birth to a woman who had received a donated womb from a living donor. In a sense, the Swedish success demonstrates the importance of the message at the heart of this book – legislators and regulators cannot afford to sit on their hands and say to themselves, ‘don’t bother about ectogenesis or male pregnancy yet: it won’t happen till tomorrow’. Unlike the promise of jam in *Alice through the Looking Glass*, in the field of the reproductive technologies ‘tomorrow’ becomes today at a frightening speed.

The reader fascinated by how the frontiers of research to develop the reproductive technologies are changing society may be tempted to rush

straight to Part II and the exciting, brave new world of babies gestated by ‘dad’, or by machines. They should avoid that temptation. Understanding the context within which radical developments in science, law and ethics may come about is crucial to an informed assessment of regulating new reproductive technologies. Part I sets the scene, giving a critique of the principles of regulation and addressing the fundamental problems arising when gamete donors disagree. The clash of claims by A to a right to reproduce and B to a right not to reproduce is poignantly demonstrated in the sad case of Natalie Evans. On her recovery from cancer, Ms Evans sought to have embryos implanted: embryos that had been created with her eggs and fertilised with sperm from her then partner before Ms Evans underwent chemotherapy. The couple’s relationship had broken down and her ex-partner successfully blocked her access to what she saw as ‘her’ embryos.¹ Ectogenesis will exacerbate the questions around who is entitled to decide about the fate of embryos and fetuses. Imagine that an embryo is created with gametes from A and B, and the couple celebrate the placement of their ‘child to be’ in the ectogenic chamber. Some weeks later A and B fall out, and B asks for the chamber to be switched off. A objects and wants the fetus to be allowed to develop and be ‘born’ at the due time. Does it matter if A is the ‘mother’ or ‘father’? Do words such as mother and father continue to have any meaning? Is it relevant how many weeks the fetus has been gestated? If a uterus is successfully transplanted into a man, and he changes his mind against the wishes of his partner, do laws designed to address termination of pregnancy in a woman apply?

By beginning the book with a strong account of the framework of regulation of the more established reproductive technologies, Amel Alghrani ensures that, in moving on to the more dramatic possibilities on the horizon, her argument is well grounded. She considers ethical and social perspectives, as any work on this subject must. The principal focus of this book, however, is the law. All too often in debates about the regulation of healthcare and biomedical science, law is depicted as rather boring and simplistic. Other ‘experts’ are prominent in the arguments about what society should do; the lawyers are just there to work out how to enforce the outcome. Dr Alghrani demolishes such an attitude. She shows that law is far from dull or simple. And necessarily she contends with the reality that the ‘experts’ vary rarely, if ever, agree. Lawmakers, legislators and judges confront the dilemma of how to develop laws

¹ *Evans v. United Kingdom* (Application no 6339/05); [2007] 22 BHRC 190 [54] (ECtHR).

within a society that includes divergent views on, for example, matters of the status of the fetus, payments for gametes or surrogacy and gendered roles in parenting.

Exploring new horizons in the reproductive technologies is exciting. The future of human reproduction is of interest to most if not all humans. This is a book that will make the reader think; it challenges prejudices and at some points prompts concern about where the journey to the future is taking us. Readers will disagree about the solutions to the dilemmas that Dr Alghrani presents. Some readers will challenge her conclusions. No one will be bored by this book, and very many of us will be much better informed.

Professor Margaret Brazier

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my son and family for their patience and support while I wrote this manuscript. I love you, and perhaps now this is complete we can enjoy spending more time together!

I wish to record my thanks to my two former PhD supervisors, who later became my mentors and friends, who have shaped my ideas and have been a constant example to me of how academia should be done: with humour, humility and hard work. I remain inspired by their sheer intellectual brilliance; they are Professors Margaret Brazier and John Harris.

Thank you to my colleagues at the University of Liverpool for generously covering my period of research leave to write this book and for the continued intellectual and emotional support. I would like to thank those colleagues and friends who read parts of the manuscript and made many invaluable suggestions: a big thank you to Professor Marie Fox, Hannah Quirk, Craig Purshouse, Johanna Byrant and Pdraig McAuliffe.

To my friends, Danielle, Deena, Dana, Taibah and Eva, who over the years have provided me with much encouragement and welcome distractions during the writing of this book.

Lastly, thanks are owed to the two anonymous reviewers of the proposal for this manuscript, who provided very useful feedback that I have endeavoured to incorporate.

TABLE OF CASES

- ARB v. Hammsersmith Ltd [2017] EWCH 2438 (HC) 7n33, 10, 30n61, 65, 66, 82–87
 Attorney-General's Reference (No 3 of 1994) [1997] 3 WLR 421 12n52
 A v. another v and others [2011] EWHC 1738 (Fam) 199n117
 Bellinger v. Bellinger [2003] All ER (D) 178 AC, Para 28 220, 225, 226
 Briody v. St Helen's and Knowsley Area Health Authority (2001) EWCA Civ 1010,
 [2001] 2 FLR 1094 21n14
 Corbett v. Corbett [1970] 2 All E.R. 33 220n5, 225
 C v. S [1987] 1 ALL ER 1230 144n3
 CP (A Child) v. Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority [2014] EWCA Civ 1554;
 [2015] 459 (QB) 165n100
 Davis v. Davis 842 S.W.2d 588 (Tenn.1992) 96, 102, 173–174
 Dickson and Another v. United Kingdom 920080 (2007) 46 EHRR 41 21
 D (A Minor) (Wardship: Sterilisation) [1976] Fam 185 232n72
 D v. Berkshire County Council [1987] 1 All ER 20 12n52
 Evans v. Amicus Healthcare Ltd [2003] EWHC 2161 (Fam); [2004] EWCA Civ 727;
 [2005] EWHC 1092 (QB) 3n12, 10, 21n14, 27n43, 65, 66, 67–82, 86, 87, 89–95, 97,
 100, 171, 174, 241n112
 Evans v. United Kingdom (Application No: 6339/05) [2006] 1 FCR 585; [2008] 46
 EHRR 342.11 xi, 3n12, 68n17, 160n74
 Fitzpatrick v. Sterling Housing Association Ltd [2001] 1 AC 27 27n46
 Frette v. France (2004) 38 EHRR 438 252n146
 Jefferies v. BMI Healthcare & HFEA [2016] EWHC 2493 65n8
 J v. G [2013] EWHC 1432 (Fam) 199n117
 Kass v. Kass 673 N.Y.S 2d 350 (N.Y. 1988) 96, 174
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act (Cases AD, AE, AF, AG and AH – No 2)
 [2017] EWHC 1782 (Fam) 41
 L v. Human Fertilisation & Embryology Authority & Secretary of State for Health
 [2008] EWCH 2149 (Fam) 200n123
 McFarlane v. Tayside Health Board [2000] 2 AC 59 84, 85, 86
 Montgomery v. Lanarkshire Health Board [2015] UKSC 11 204n148, 205n150
 M.R. & Anor v. An tArd Chlaraitheoir & Ors [2013] IEHC 91 203n145, 258n173
 Mrs U v. Centre for Reproductive Medicine [2002] EWCA Civ 565 67n10
 Mount Isa Mines v. Pusey (1970) 125 CLR 383 4n24
 M v. F & SM (Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008) [2017] EWHC 2176 6n33

TABLE OF CASES

XV

- Nachmani v. Nachmani 50(4) P.D. 661 (Isr.) 102n146
 Paton v. British Pregnancy Advisory Service [1979] QB 276 10n43, 12n50, 79n58, 126n96, 144n3, 150n23, 159n67, 170, 214, 241n110
 Paton v. UK (1981) 3 E.H.R.R. 408 10n43, 75
 Planned Parenthood v. Danforth 428 U.S. 52, 69 (1976) 79n58
 Quintavalle (Comment of Reproductive Ethics) v. Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority [2005] UKHL 28 52
 Rance v. Mid-Downs Health Authority [1991] 1 QB 587 155n47
 Rees v. Darlington Memorial Hospital NHS Trust [2004] 1 AC 309 84n80
 Roe v. Wade 410 U.S. 113 (1973) 114n34
 Re A (Medical Treatment: Male Sterilisation) [2000] 1 FCR 193 196n96
 Re an adoption application (surrogacy) [1987] 2 All ER 826 198n115
 Re B (A Child) (Immunisation) [2003] EWHC 1376, [2003] EWCA Civ 1148 134n138
 Re C (A Minor) [1985] FLR 846 199n119
 Re C [1998] 1 FCR 1 136n143
 Re E & F (Children) (assisted reproduction: parent) [2013] EWHC 1418 (Fam) [2013] All ER (D) 279 (Jun) 40
 Re F (In Utero) [1988] 2 All ER 193 12n52, 171
 Re Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (Cases A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H) [2015] EWHC 2602 (Fam) [2015] All ER (D) 57 (Sep) 6n33, 40n118, 41n122
 Re Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (Cases AD, AE, AF, AG and AH) [2017] EWHC 1026 (Fam) 6n33
 Re JJ (Foreign Surrogacy Agreement Parental Order) [2011] EWHC 921 (Fam) 199n117
 Re J (Child's Religious Upbringing and Circumcision) [2000] 1 FCR 307 134n138
 Re L (Commercial Surrogacy) [2010] EWHC 3146 (Fam) 199n117
 Re L (Medical Treatment: Benefit) [2004] EWHC 2713 (Fam) 136n143
 Re MB (An Adult: Medical Treatment) [1997] 2 FCR 541 12n51, 159n68, 163n84, 214n197
 Re MW (Adoption: Surrogacy) [1995] 2 FLR 789 198n114
 Re R (Children) (Residence: Same-Sex Partner) [2006] UKHL 43 259n175
 Re S (Parental Order) [2009] EWHC 2977 (Fam) 199n117
 Re T (Adult: Refusal of Medical Treatment) [1992] 4 All ER 649, CA 12n51, 159n69, 214n197
 Re TT (Surrogacy) [2011] EWHC 33 (Fam) 113n25
 Re W and B [2001] 2 FLR 582 76
 Re X and Y (Foreign Surrogacy) [2008] EWHC 3030 (Fam) 199n117
 Re Z (A Child) [2016] EWFC 34 Re Z (A Child) (No.2) [2016] EWHC 1191 (Fam) Royal College of Nursing of the United Kingdom v. Department of Health and Social Security [1981] AC 800 6n33
 R v. Adams [1957] Crim. L R 365. 177n140
 R v. Bourne [1939] 1 KB 687 (CA) 151n26
 R v. HFEA ex p Blood [1999] Fam 151 27n43, 201n128
 R (Quintavalle) v. Secretary of State for Health [2003] UKHL 13, [2003] 2 AC 687 27n44

- R v. Secretary of State for the Home Department ex parte Mellor (2001) EWCA Civ 472 [2001] 2 FLR 1158 21n14
- R v. Secretary of State for Health, Ex P Quintavalle [2003] 2 W.L.R 692 3n14
- R (on the application of Quintavalle) v. HFEA [2003] 3 ALL E.R 257 [2005] 2 ALL ER 555 3n13
- R (On the Application of Smeaton) v. Secretary of State for Health [2002] EWHC 610 (Admin) [2002] 2 FLR 146, [2002] 2 FCR 193, 66 BMLR 59 168n103
- R (on the application of C) (Appellant) v. Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Respondent) [2017] UKSC 72 224n16
- R (on application of Mr and Mrs M) v. HFEA [2016] EWCA Civ 611 7, 201n128
- R (on the application of M) v. Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority [2016] EWCA Civ 611 6n33
- R (Quintavalle) v. Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority [2002] EWCH 2785 (Admin), [2003] 2 All ER 105 47n155
- R (Quintavalle) v. Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority (Secretary of State for Health Intervening) [2003] EWCA Civ 667, [2003] 2 FLR 335 48n155
- R (Quintavalle) v. Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority [2008] EWHC 3395 48n155
- R (Quintavalle) v. Secretary of State for Health [2001] EWHC 918 (Admin), [2001] 4 All ER 1013 47n155
- R v. Secretary of State for Health, ex parte Bruno Quintavalle (on behalf of Pro-Life Alliance) [2003] 2 WLR 692 62n218
- St George's Healthcare NHS Trust v. S [1999] Fam 26, CA 12n51, 161n69, 162, 170, 214n197
- S v. McC; W v. W [1972] AC 24 12n51, 159n69, 214n196
- Re Y (Mental Incapacity: Bone Marrow Transplant) [1989] 2 All E.R. 545 196n97
- Re Y (mental incapacity: bone marrow transplant) [1996] 2 FLR 787 196n99
- Vo v. France (Application no. 53924/00) [2004] FCR 577 (ECtHR) 75n49, 145n4, 164n91, 170n117
- Wyatt v. Portsmouth NHS Trust and another [2004] EWHC 2247; [2005] EWHC 117; [2005] EWHC 693 (Fam) 136n143
- Yearworth v. North Bristol NHS Trust [2010] QB 1 6n33, 96n132
- Yuen Kun Yeu v. Attorney General of Hong Kong [1988] AC 175 163n89

TABLE OF STATUTES AND STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

Abortion Act 1967
 Congenital Disabilities (Civil Liability) Act 1976
 Equality Act 2010
 Family Law Act 1986
 Gender Recognition Act 2004
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology (Consequential, Transitional and Savings Provisions) Order 2010, SI 2010/196.
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology (Deceased Fathers) Act 2003
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology (Parental Order) Regulations 2010
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology (Quality and Safety for Human Application) Regulations 2007
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology (Research Purposes) Regulations 2001
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 1990
 Human Reproductive Cloning Act 2001
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority (Disclosure of Donor Information) Regulations 2004
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology Bill (2008)
 Human Tissue and Embryos (Draft) Bill (May 2007)
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology Regulations 2010
 Human Fertilisation and Embryology (Mitochondrial Donation) Regulations 2015 No. 572
 Matrimonial Causes Act 1973
 Offences against the Person Act 1861
 Surrogacy Arrangements Act 1985

ABBREVIATIONS

ARTs	Assisted Reproductive Technologies
CCG	Clinical Commissioning Groups
CoP	Code of Practice (HFEA)
CQC	Care Quality Commission
DoH	Department of Health
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
HCSTC	House of Commons Science and Technology Committee
HFE Act 1990	Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 1990
HFE Act 2008	Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008
HFE Act	Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 1990 (as amended)
HFEA	Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority
HTA	Human Tissue Authority
IVF	In Vitro Fertilisation
MRC	Medical Research Council
NICE	National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
PGD	Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis
PND	Prenatal Diagnosis
RCOG	Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists
VLA	Voluntary Licensing Authority