

## **A Question for a PEER REVIEWED article in VIEWPOINT**

**Topic:** Stem Cells

**Length:** 3000-3500 (not including references)

### **Question**

In 2002, federal parliament passed the *Research Involving Human Embryos Act*, which allowed research on 'surplus' human embryos created as part of the IVF process but not selected for implantation. Parliament also unanimously passed the *Prohibition on Human Cloning Act*, which forbade the creation of cloned human embryos.

The *Lockhart Review* concerning *The Prohibition of Human Cloning Act 2002* and the *Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2002* was delivered to the government in December 2005.

A private members bill *Prohibition of Human Cloning for Reproduction and the Regulation of Human Embryo Research Amendment Bill 2006* was introduced by Senator Patterson that passed the Senate on 7th November 2006 and subsequently in the House of Representatives on 11 December 2006. The amendments removed the ban on cloning for research purposes and contained a requirement to review the legislation in 3 years.

What were your views about the Lockhart review recommendations?

What were your thoughts about the amendments in 2006?

With a review of the legislation due to happen this year should any aspects concerning cloning, stem cell research and the use of embryos be changed, removed, restricted or relaxed?

### **Considerations**

In your article could you please address the questions above in the context of the following:

- It is recommended that you reference key journals, academics or other notable figures that support your view.
- You should use relevant and contemporary examples to justify your position and critically respond to the main concerns and arguments against your position.
- Articles should contain clear recommendations or suggestions to policy makers with a particular eye towards swaying an equivocal politician towards your point of view.