

Delivering Policy

The Contested Politics of Assisted
Reproductive Technologies in Canada

FRANCESCA SCALA



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

Sample Material © UBC Press 2018

Contents

Abbreviations / vii

Acknowledgments / ix

- 1 Politics, Science, and ARTs Policy in Canada / 3
- 2 Normalizing and Resisting Assisted Reproductive Technologies: Canadian and Comparative Perspectives / 18
- 3 Claiming and Contesting Epistemic Authority: The Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies / 42
- 4 Science and the Public Weigh In: The Discursive Terrain of ARTs Policy Making / 78
- 5 “Proceed with Care”: (Re)negotiating the Science/Politics Divide / 103
- 6 Setting Boundaries and Crafting ARTs Legislation / 124

| | |
|----------|--|
| 7 | Science, Boundary Work, and Parliamentary Politics: The Passing of Bill C-6 / 155 |
| 8 | Understanding Boundary Work and ARTs Policy in Canada / 189 |
| | Notes / 202 |
| | References / 213 |
| | Index / 230 |

Politics, Science, and ARTs Policy in Canada

1

Because no technology stands outside of or occurs before its representations in discourse, there is no “real,” fixed, or essential technology. How a technology gets represented is always a result of historical negotiations that are subject to subsequent renegotiations.

– Dion Farquhar (1996, 5)

On July 25, 1978, the first “test tube baby” – Louise Brown – was born in Manchester, England. Conceived through in vitro fertilization (IVF), Brown represented the technological realization of an idea once confined to the imaginations of science fiction writers – conceiving human life within the sterile confines of medical laboratories. Assisted reproductive technologies (ARTs) – such as IVF, genetic engineering, and embryo research – exemplified the latest technological advances in reproductive medicine. But the rise of ARTs also raised a number of legal, ethical, and social issues, not least with regard to their impacts on prevailing institutions and practices, and posed a challenge to commonly held understandings of “reproduction,” “motherhood,” “parenthood,” and “family.”

In the 1980s, a number of events brought to the fore some ethical and legal dilemmas posed by reproductive technologies. In 1984, the

legal status of frozen embryos “orphaned” after the accidental deaths of their biological parents in a plane crash became a hotly contested issue (Gallagher 1987). Another well-publicized event in the late 1980s was the parental rights controversy in the surrogacy arrangement of an infant known to the public as “Baby M.” The surrogate mother’s attempt to gain guardianship of the child led to a long and bitter custody battle between the surrogate mother and the biological parents who had contracted her services (Raymond 1993). In both cases, the court became the primary venue for settling disputes involving parental and ownership rights in this burgeoning field. However, these well-publicized cases and others like them would also spark a public debate on the merits of ARTs, prompting social movement organizations and interest groups to lobby for government action.

In 1989, the Canadian government appointed the Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies (RCNRT) in response to growing pressure from feminist activists and women’s groups. After four years of research and nationwide public hearings, the commission released a final report in 1993. The broad recommendation was for Canada to proceed with great caution with ARTs research and practice. The commission laid out a blueprint for legislative action. However, it would take another eleven years for federal legislation on ARTs to pass. The path to the 2004 Assisted Human Reproduction Act (AHRA) was long and fraught, characterized as much by the sheer volume of public hearings, consultations, expert reports, and parliamentary debates as by the spectre of past failed legislative attempts. At the time of this writing, fourteen years on, with key parts of the AHRA struck down or never clarified, Canada’s ARTs policy continues to be besieged by challenges.

Delivering Policy: The Contested Politics of Assisted Reproductive Technologies in Canada explores ARTs policy making in Canada as a story of contested boundaries between science and politics. Focusing on the time period between the 1978 birth of the first IVF baby and the enactment of the 2004 Assisted Human Reproduction Act, in this book I examine the efforts of scientists, policy makers, and civil society to define the issue of ARTs from both within and outside the realms of science and politics. Through the lens of “boundary work” (Gieryn 1983), I examine how actors on both sides

of the ARTs debate sought to challenge, reinforce, or blur the boundary between science and politics in policy making. Boundary work is an important conceptual tool in science and technology studies and, I argue, policy studies; it helps to identify the strategies that policy actors use to shape the parameters of a debate and have their knowledge claims translated into legitimate and authoritative voices on a policy issue. It thus provides a useful lens through which to understand contests over the “insider” and “outsider” status of groups and individuals in policy deliberations.

These contests are highly politicized struggles, for the “winners” determine how the issues are framed and ultimately the policy outcomes. In this book, I explore the discursive and institutional strategies used by scientists and political actors to maintain or expand control of ARTs. In various policy venues, pro-ARTs forces frame the issue of ARTs – in particular stem cell research – as a scientific, economic, or moral imperative in order to mobilize public and government support in favour of human biotechnology research. They also build networks and forge alliances with patient advocacy groups to push back against restrictive policies. However, these strategies have not been solely responsible for shaping the evolution of ARTs policy in Canada. Rather, as I argue here, the boundary work of ARTs supporters and critics is shaped by the institutional context of Canadian politics. Ultimately, federalism and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms play central roles in how the boundaries between science and politics are eventually drawn.

Delivering Policy is a unique contribution to the scholarship on human biotechnology policy in Canada and elsewhere in a number of ways. First, it traces the different stages of ARTs policy making to uncover the ideas, interests, and institutions that have influenced the process and content of the 2004 ARTs legislation. As Isabelle Engeli and Frédéric Varone (2011, 255) explain, to understand how morality issues are framed and resolved, “we have to identify the main categories of policy actors, as well as the resources and institutional arenas or venues they mobilise to promote their frames, arguments and policy positions.” To this end, I examine four significant events in Canadian policy on reproductive technologies: the appointment of the Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies in 1989; the interim moratorium on several of these

practices announced in July 1995; the draft of and subsequent failure to pass Bill C-47, the Human Reproductive Technologies Act, in 1996; and the enactment of Canada's current legislation, Bill C-6. By examining these distinct events and time periods in ARTs policy making, we can attain a better understanding of the discursive and institutional strategies of both proponents and opponents of ARTs to exert influence on government policy. I pay particular attention to the boundary work of the medical-scientific community and its efforts to safeguard its professional autonomy and authority in the field of ARTs.

Second, *Delivering Policy* distinguishes itself from other ARTs scholarship in Canada by using the concept of boundary work to understand how actors on both sides of the debate have attempted to (re)negotiate the science-politics divide. Canadian policy and legal scholarship on ARTs has addressed a broad range of issues, including policy design and public deliberation for ARTs (Baylis and Herder 2009; Montpetit 2003); the role of federalism and the courts in ARTs policy making (Cameron and Gruben 2014; Snow 2015); as well as legal, ethical, and feminist concerns related to current ARTs regulations and specific practices, such as egg donation and egg freezing, embryo research, cryopreserved embryos, and so on (Baylis and Widdows 2015; Cattapan 2014; Cattapan and Snow 2017; Deckha 2012). Less attention has been paid, however, to ARTs as a public controversy involving groups striving to (re)negotiate the space between science and politics. Using the lens of boundary work as a broad heuristic, I conceptualize ARTs as a contested space in which scientists, policy makers, and civil society have competed for epistemic and institutional authority over the governance of science. Therefore, on one level, the study helps to shed light on the actors, processes, and institutions that have shaped and continue to shape the outcomes of ARTs policy making in Canada. On another level, it contributes to our understanding of the interaction between science and politics, the exercise of social control of science and technology, and the cultural authority of expertise in general (Cozzens and Woodhouse 1995).

Third, *Delivering Policy* makes a contribution to the field of Canadian public policy by highlighting the effects of political institutions on ARTs policy and discourse in Canada. Although I conceptualize ARTs policy making as a story about the contested boundary between science and

politics, the influence of institutions, in particular federalism and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, cannot be discounted. Indeed, these institutions have loomed large in shaping the boundary work of actors in the ARTs debate. Boundary work scholars, including Thomas Gieryn (1983), tend to depict scientists and other actors as consciously and deliberately pursuing strategies to protect, maintain, or expand their authority in specific domains. However, I adopt Abby Kinchy and Daniel Lee Kleinman's (2003, 871) view that most actors act "relatively unreflectively, adopt[ing] widely used models of behaviour and organization." As I reveal in this book, federalism and the Charter have provided institutional and discursive resources for boundary work in ARTs policy in Canada.

Negotiating the Boundary between Science and Politics

Conventional accounts of policy making have focused on the lobbying efforts of interest groups that strive to influence government action on behalf of their members. Financial and organizational resources – such as size, leadership, and access to decision makers – are said to be important determinants of whether a group fails or succeeds in influencing government policy. Within this framework, science policy is best understood as a result of interest group competition, with the scientific community being regarded as one among several lobby groups vying to exert influence on policy makers. Although the scientific community might engage in lobbying, it is far from a typical lobby group. In our present-day society, science is accorded more power and authority compared with other forms of knowledge. There are several reasons for the privileged status of scientific knowledge in a policy debate. First, experts are expected to have special skills and policy-relevant knowledge derived from their training and professional membership. Second, as Stephen Brooks (1996) argues, experts have symbolic and cultural roles in our society, which characterizes them as the purveyors of moral truths. Third, expert knowledge enters the policy process through certain channels. Frequently, expert or scientific knowledge enters policy processes through formal institutional arrangements, such as policy research institutes or advisory commissions. This system allows for greater inter- and intra-agency communication among experts and policy makers. In contrast, other forms of knowledge are usually marginalized from these formal channels.

The relationship between science and politics is therefore unique. Increasingly, science is inculcated into the day-to-day activities of policy making. As Clark Miller (2001, 482) explains, “informed by science, concepts of objectivity, practices of knowledge making, objects of discourse and embodied expertise pervade the hallways, offices, and courtrooms [...] [of] executive agencies, and the legal system, helping to make up the constitutional foundations of contemporary democracy.” However, science and politics constitute different social worlds, with unique sets of institutions, social organizations, practices, and discourses. For example, though notions of objectivity and neutrality are said to inform the production of scientific knowledge, politics is primarily concerned with values and power. Models of interest group politics and lobbying strategies cannot fully explain how science and politics are bridged in policy making.

A more fruitful conceptual lens for understanding science and technology policy is what scholars of science and technology refer to as the boundary work between science and politics. Boundary work theories are used to explain how different disciplines, professions, and social organizations negotiate and maintain the boundaries that delineate their activities and spheres of influence and authority. These boundaries are not fixed; rather, they are “ambiguous, flexible, historically changing, contextually variable, internally inconsistent, and sometimes disputed” (Gieryn 1983, 782). Boundary work contests the notion that scientific knowledge and experts enjoy a privileged status in society because of some inherent or essential quality of science. Instead, the epistemic authority of the scientific community is said to be a product of its boundary work. In other words, scientific knowledge is also inherently political, for it involves conflicts over values and power.

Gieryn (1996) describes four types of boundary work: monopolization, expansion, expulsion, and protection. Monopolization refers to the acceptance of certain knowledge claims as authoritative and true. When activities are labelled as “science,” individuals who are not scientists are automatically precluded from participating in this area of inquiry (Jasanoff 1990). Consequently, a distinction between science and nonscience ensues.

The second type of boundary work, expansion, occurs when insiders broaden their spheres of influence and authority into areas already

claimed by others. This type of boundary work is exemplified by the medicalization of childbirth in the early 1900s during which midwifery was displaced by the newly emerging specialty of obstetrics and gynecology.

The third type of boundary work, expulsion, occurs when members are rejected because they do not conform to the accepted principles and practices of the group. Here “real” science is distinguished from fraudulent or “junk science,” the latter being deemed illegitimate by insiders. This activity not only serves as a form of social control but also is an “opportunity for corrective public relations campaigns, restoring among powerful constituencies elsewhere in society the belief that science on its own is capable of weeding out imposters” (Gieryn 1994, 422).

And the fourth type of boundary work, protection, occurs when scientists strive to safeguard their autonomy in a particular sphere of activity against external controls. This struggle for control is most evident in the boundary negotiations between science and politics (Jasanoff 1990). For example, the scientific community generally resists any effort by legislators to determine its standard practices of care or its research agendas.

The concept of boundary work is useful for studying public policy for a number of reasons. First, it recognizes that the authority and legitimacy of groups, such as experts, are not embedded in objective conditions; rather, they are socially constructed. The question of social standing, therefore, becomes highly contested in policy making. Second, experts (e.g., scientists) and their organizations engage in different strategies to distinguish themselves from others in an effort to protect their particular spheres of activity. This can have important consequences for whose “voices” are included during policy deliberations and whose are not. Third, boundary work draws our attention to the political nature of the scientific enterprise and the use of scientific research in policy making. It reminds us that the divide between science and policy, and between facts and values, remains a highly contested terrain in policy making and in society more broadly.

Government, Science, and Policy Deliberation

Delivering Policy also situates human biotechnology within the broader context of the challenges that policy deliberations pose in the area of science and technology. The issue of autonomy is especially important

in the boundary negotiations between scientists and policy makers. Governments increasingly rely on the scientific community to advise them on technology and science policy. In this case, the challenge for the scientific community is to remain influential in the political sphere while maintaining its autonomy vis-à-vis its own professional activities, such as setting its research agendas. Too close a relationship between scientists and policy makers can undermine the legitimacy and semblance of impartiality that scientists enjoy in society. Conversely, too distant a relationship between the two can undermine scientists' capacity to influence government decisions and access government funding for research projects (Gieryn 1996). From a political or democratic standpoint, a heavy reliance on experts in the formulation of science policy can effectively exclude other societal groups who have vested interests in a policy issue.

The central issue that defines boundary negotiations between science and policy is control. What control does the public have over scientific endeavours? What is the appropriate role of the government in defining the boundaries of scientific activities? How are disputes resolved among scientists, political officials, and the public about highly contested issues such as ARTs? Deliberations on science and technology policy have generally occurred in isolation from public scrutiny and have been dominated by scientific knowledge and professional discourse (J. Abraham and Sheppard 1997; Fischer 1990). Through technology and science advisory boards and research councils, researchers and experts have been disproportionately represented in discussions of "scientific" issues that have broader social and ethical implications, such as stem cell research. The epistemic authority of scientific experts in society has helped to maintain their privileged status in the policy process and, in turn, served to frame socially relevant issues in narrow, technical terms. As Anne Larason Schneider and Helen Ingram (1997, 167) argue, science and professionalism can "commandeer an issue with important social value implications and transform it into a matter of elite scientific and professional concern. In such cases they define the issue, specify the goals, supply the assumptions, and rationalize the policy element choices."

However, the knowledge claims of the scientific community do not go unchallenged. Interest groups, social movements, and other political

actors often challenge the expertise of scientists, especially during scientific disputes and controversies. They too engage in boundary work. This is especially the case with what Giandomenico Majone (1989) terms “trans-scientific” problems – that is, issues that arise from technological or scientific developments but cannot be resolved through the methods of scientific inquiry. For example, scientific evidence showing minimal risks associated with the building of a hazardous waste site is often contested by neighbourhood groups and community leaders concerned about the quality of the surrounding environment. Although scientists might frame these problems in technical terms, critics of science and technology see themselves engaged primarily in moral or ethical disputes (Nelkin 1987). It is during these disputes that “ambiguous knowledge claims, the authority of science and social movements, political power, and vested interests have met in yet unresolved conflict” (Jasanoff et al. 1995, 393). The politics of knowledge and expertise is therefore an important feature of science policy in general and ARTs policy in particular. Increased reliance on experts and expertise in policy making has been countered by calls to engage citizens and democratize expertise in science and technology policy. Expert-driven deliberations are contested and eschewed in favour of more democratic forums (e.g., consensus conferences and citizen juries) that encourage citizen-expert dialogue. In these forums, scientific knowledge is not viewed as objective, infallible, and authoritative; rather, it is understood as “interpretative, mediated and contestable” (Blok 2007, 165).

As this book reveals, the interplay between science and politics and disputes arising from conflicting knowledge claims is clear in the area of ARTs. Although scientists engage in boundary work to safeguard their power and autonomy in this area, societal actors, such as religious and feminist groups, seek to reframe the debate in an effort to advance their agendas. Policy makers, for their part, are often ill equipped to make timely decisions on highly technical matters because of their lack of expertise in the area. Moreover, they must reconcile the public’s demand for accountability and open deliberations with calls to safeguard the autonomy and research interests of the scientific community. As this book reveals, these struggles would play out in the development of ARTs policy in Canada.

Methodology and Organization of the Book

I relied on semi-structured interviews, secondary sources, media stories, official government documents and reports, and official transcripts of public hearings held by the Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies and Parliament and Senate committees. For my analysis of the RCNRT, I consulted the staff member list printed in the back of the commission's final report. I then targeted individuals who had occupied key positions within the commission's organization, such as commissioners, researchers, and directors. I also contacted advocacy group representatives and individuals who had worked for the commission as external researchers. This resulted in twenty-two interviews overall.¹ For my analysis of key players' boundary work strategies in the ARTs debate, I primarily conducted a textual analysis of public hearing transcripts and House and Senate proceedings on ARTs, as well as media releases, submissions, and government reports. Through analyses of these texts, I was able to identify and categorize key actors' discursive strategies and uncover the boundary work dynamics that underpinned the politics of ARTs in Canada.

The book is organized around key political events and processes between 1989 and 2004 in ARTs policy making in Canada. In [Chapter 2](#), I examine the normalization of, and resistance to, ARTs from Canadian and comparative perspectives. I illustrate the earlier perception of ARTs as the exclusive domain of medical-scientific experts, with governments and the public largely excluded from decisions in this area. I examine how assisted reproductive technologies, in particular in vitro fertilization and fertility drugs, were quickly transformed from experimental treatments to routine practices in reproductive health care. The normalization of ARTs, however, would be contested in the 1980s and early 1990s by both governments and civil society groups. During this period, a number of international and national public inquiries were appointed to look into some of the legal and ethical ramifications of reproductive technologies.

Although these inquiries reconciled some of the legal issues, they did not challenge the self-regulatory authority of scientists and medical practitioners in the governance of ARTs. Concerns raised by critics of reproductive technologies, such as religious and feminist groups, remained

at the periphery of the ARTs debate. For example, the implications of ARTs practices for women's health and social status were largely ignored during inquiry deliberations. This would change when civil society groups, in particular feminist organizations, forged an international movement against reproductive technologies and mobilized lobbying efforts aimed at restricting or banning a number of ARTs practices (e.g., commercial surrogacy, IVF) in many industrialized countries. I analyze alternative epistemic communities' competing perspectives on reproductive technologies and examine their attempts to challenge the medical-scientific discourse in this area. I end the chapter with an examination of the Canadian Coalition for a Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies, which lobbied the Canadian government for an inquiry into the social and ethical implications of these technologies for Canadian society.

In [Chapter 3](#), I explore the RCNRT, in particular its research agenda and internal governance structure. Appointed in 1989, the commission represented the first time that regular citizens and social science experts were brought into official discussions on ARTs in Canada. The commission was given the mandate to examine and develop recommendations for issues related to reproductive technologies and genetic engineering (including fertility treatments, surrogacy, donor offspring, and embryo research) and the consequences of these practices for women and Canadian society in general. As is common in policy-formulating royal commissions, the government appointed commissioners who represented key stakeholders and/or areas of expertise. The chairperson of the commission, Patricia Baird, was a physician and a specialist in genetics. Two of the original commissioners – Maureen McTeer and Louise Vandelay – were well-known critics of ARTs and had been active in the coalition of feminist and women's groups that had lobbied the federal government to appoint a commission. Another commissioner, Suzanne Rozell Scorsone, was recruited from the Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto. The commission's broad mandate and the "nonscientific" backgrounds of the majority of commissioners signalled the possibility of reformulating the parameters of the ARTs debate. However, the commission would be plagued by internal disputes over epistemic authority and legitimacy in its research and public consultation work.

In [Chapter 4](#), I analyze the discursive strategies that key stakeholders used in the ARTs debate during the commission's public hearings. The nationwide public hearings provided a forum for both critics and supporters of these technologies to articulate and advance their positions in order to shape public opinion. At this point in the policy debate, most of the public consultation discussions focused on fertility treatments and related practices, such as IVF, surrogacy, prenatal genetic testing, and human gamete donations. Unsurprisingly, abortion politics would shape the constellation of actors and the discursive strategies used by both critics and supporters of ARTs. Religious groups were the most visible and active anti-ARTs contributors during these public consultations. With local chapters already in place, representatives of the anti-abortion movement participated in all of the public hearings held across Canada in an effort to centre the ARTs debate on the status of the human embryo. Feminist groups and activists also appeared before the commissioners, framing their opposition to ARTs in terms of their political and social consequences for women. These feminist voices, however, represented only a small percentage of the women's groups that participated in the public hearings. Historically engaged in abortion rights activism, the vast majority of women's groups could not avoid getting involved in the embryo-centred framing of the ARTs debate advanced by anti-abortion adversaries. Although favouring some government oversight on ARTs, they rejected any restriction on ARTs practices, such as prenatal genetic counselling and IVF, on the basis that they would undermine women's reproductive rights and autonomy. This position would buttress the scientific-medical community's resistance to the government's encroachment on the field of ARTs. In general, most scientists and medical practitioners would continue to depict professional self-regulation as the panacea for any potential misuse of reproductive technologies.

In [Chapter 5](#), I examine the commission's final report, *Proceed with Care*. Released in 1993, the 1,275-page, two-volume report would become a reference point for government and societal actors during future deliberations on ARTs. The report outlined over 290 recommendations addressing a variety of topics, including fertility treatments, infertility prevention, gamete donations, surrogacy, prenatal diagnosis techniques, and embryo research. With respect to infertility treatments, the report

argued against banning treatments such as IVF altogether; however, it did recommend that IVF be considered an experimental practice rather than a mainstream medical procedure because of its low rates of success. Informed by the precepts of evidence-based medicine, the report also recommended that access to IVF be limited to women who met a specific medical criterion: namely, fallopian tube blockage, a condition that has been proven to be amenable to the procedure. With regard to embryo research, the report recommended that research be allowed on human embryos less than fourteen days old, subject to a licence granted by a newly established regulatory agency. It did recommend, however, that more controversial research practices be prohibited, such as animal-human hybrids and reproductive and therapeutic cloning. A central recommendation was that the role of the federal government be enhanced in the governance of ARTs, particularly through its criminal law power and its constitutional power “to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada.” The report recommended that the system of professional self-regulation be replaced by greater government oversight and control of reproductive technologies and genetic research. Faced with this possibility, the medical-scientific community would engage in boundary work strategies, both discursive and institutional, to protect its epistemic and professional authority in the field of ARTs.

After the release of the commission’s final report, the ARTs debate would unfold further in Parliament. In [Chapter 6](#), I explore the discursive and institutional strategies that ARTs critics and supporters used both inside and outside Parliament. The federal government introduced an interim moratorium as well as Bill C-47 in 1996, which ultimately died on the order paper because of the call for a federal election. The bill also lacked support from the medical-scientific community because of what it perceived as a generally hostile tone toward reproductive and genetic engineering. During this time, the scientific and medical communities engaged in boundary work strategies to protect their professional autonomy and interests in the area of human biotechnology research. They constructed reproductive and genetic technologies, in particular stem cell research, as the world’s leading industry and a national symbol of progress. The discursive strategies used by the scientific and medical communities focused on blurring the boundary between science and

industry policy in an effort to enhance their research agenda's legitimacy vis-à-vis the government and the public. This discourse would resonate with the Liberal government's Canadian Biotechnology Strategy, which touted the industry's economic and social benefits (Industry Canada, 1998). However, the boundary work efforts of pro-ARTs forces would be derailed when scientists in Scotland announced the birth of Dolly the sheep, the first mammal to be successfully cloned from an adult cell. This announcement would help to galvanize anti-ARTs forces and shift the focus of the debate away from infertility treatments and toward genetic research and human cloning. Using the case of Dolly to underscore the dangers of a world where science is unregulated, ARTs critics both within and outside Parliament would call for a ban on genetic engineering and human cloning. Although these legislative attempts would ultimately fail to pass, the research community would remain defensive as it worked to draw the boundaries between scientific fact and science fiction during the debate on ARTs.

In [Chapter 7](#), I explore the events leading up to the passing of Canada's current policy on human biotechnology. During this time, pro-ARTs forces would be joined by patient advocacy groups and together challenge claims about the moral rights of embryos by appealing to society's moral obligation to alleviate the pain and suffering of ill patients. As the federal government contemplated legislative restrictions on reproductive technologies and genetic research, the ARTs research community would continue to engage in boundary work strategies to safeguard its epistemic and institutional authority. Meanwhile, anti-ARTs forces would find allies among socially conservative members of Parliament who, through the introduction of amendments, aimed to delay legislative action that would allow any form of embryo research in Canada. In May 2004, fifteen years after the appointment of the RCNRT, the federal government finally passed Bill C-6, the Assisted Human Reproduction Act. The current bill prohibits and imposes criminal sanctions on a number of activities, including animal-human hybrids, gene manipulation, reproductive cloning, and the creation of human embryos for research purposes. The government also established a regulatory agency, the Assisted Human Reproduction Agency, which would be responsible for issuing licences under the AHRA and carrying out inspection and enforcement related

to controlled and prohibited activities. The legislation and the agency represented a significant curtailment of the self-regulatory authority of researchers and practitioners working in the field of ARTs. However, the federal government's authority to act in the field would be challenged by the Quebec government on the ground that the AHRA infringed on the provinces' jurisdictional authority in health-care provision. In 2010, the Supreme Court of Canada sided with Quebec and struck down many parts of Bill C-6, including the agency's licensing authority. In 2012, following years of inactivity, the agency was abolished in federal budget cuts.

In [Chapter 8](#), the concluding chapter, I summarize my arguments and findings. First, I discuss how ARTs policy in Canada offers an excellent example of the nature of boundary work, in which scientists mobilize to protect their professional autonomy as other societal actors attempt to limit it in a particular field of inquiry. Second, I explain why boundary work cannot be understood without being situated within the broader political and economic context. For example, the growing connection between industry and basic research and the emergence of entrepreneurial science (Etzkowitz and Webster, 1995) buttressed the scientific community's demands for a permissive policy on human biotechnology, including stem cell research and human cloning. Finally, I argue that the dynamics of boundary work and their effects cannot be fully explored without being situated in the broader institutional context of Canadian politics. In the case of ARTs, inter- and intraparty politics, along with federal-provincial relations, have been key factors in shaping the boundary between politics and science.

© UBC Press 2019

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Scala, Francesca, author

Delivering policy : the contested politics of assisted reproductive technologies in Canada / Francesca Scala.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Issued in print and electronic formats.

ISBN 978-0-7748-6009-3 (hardcover). – ISBN 978-0-7748-6011-6 (PDF). –

ISBN 978-0-7748-6012-3 (EPUB). – ISBN 978-0-7748-6013-0 (Kindle)

1. Human reproductive technology – Law and legislation – Canada. 2. Human reproductive technology – Government policy – Canada. 3. Science and state – Canada. 4. Technology and state – Canada. I. Title.

KE3660.5.S33 2019

344.7104'196

C2018-905668-1

KF3830.S33 2019

C2018-905669-X

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Awards to Scholarly Publications Program, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Set in Myriad and Sabon by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Copy editor: Dallas Harrison

Proofreader: Alison Strobel

Indexer: Stephen Ullstrom

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

www.ubcpress.ca