

Human Tissue Transplants

we would be very foolish if we were to say that we are going to provide the wherewithal to meet standards that are not ours, standards that we have not formulated. I am sure that many municipalities believe their primary treatment plants have gone as far as they can to protect the environment, and I am equally sure that those municipal standards are quite inadequate from a federal or even a provincial point of view. So in refusing to establish a national standard government is admitting that the converse must be true, namely, that it wants somebody else to set those standards.

I think few people would agree that industry should set its own standards. Certainly the minister who will have to administer this part of the legislation does not say that. He has said that the federal government will have to set the standards. We will have to put up the money to assist in setting standards and we will demand that certain standards be met before new industries are established in certain fields. This is what the minister has said of the pulp and paper industry, and the government is going to spend money in this regard. I suggest that the standards the minister has in mind are not provincial, municipal or industrial standards, but national standards.

The Chairman: Order. It being four o'clock, I do now leave the chair.

Progress reported.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill S-10, an act respecting La Société des Artisans, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

● (4:00 p.m.)

It being four o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely notices of motions. I understand there is agreement to allow to stand and retain their positions motions Nos. 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 and to proceed with motion No. 24.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS**HEALTH****SUGGESTED CONFERENCE TO CONSIDER UNIFORM ANATOMICAL GIFT LEGISLATION**

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of convening a national ad hoc conference of appropriate people to encourage the enactment in all jurisdictions in Canada of uniform anatomical gift legislation and to

[Mr. Peters.]

consider the need for international agreements to facilitate the transfer of human tissue between Canada and other countries.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the motion I have placed before the House today calls on the government to convene a national conference to promote the adoption in Canada of uniform anatomical gift legislation. The term "anatomical gift" refers to donations by people of tissues from their bodies for transplant therapy, medical research or medical teaching purposes. It is several years since the celebrated heart transplants dramatically focused world attention to the possibility of extending man's life by replacing worn-out body parts with those from another human being.

Some hon. Members: We have a few around here.

Mr. Foster: Although the practicality of doing large numbers of heart transplants is still being assessed and the techniques refined, there can be no doubt that many other organs and tissues can be routinely transplanted in a practical way. There are 35 different body tissues and organs which can be successfully transplanted. There can be no doubt that thousands of lives could be either saved or made more healthy by the modern techniques of transplant therapy. However, the scientific knowhow for transplant therapy in Canada is years ahead of the legal framework to allow would-be donors to easily make gifts of their body tissues. It is a sad state of affairs when the legislators of a country cannot pass relatively simple, non-controversial laws to facilitate medical progress as fast as the medical research people can develop these new techniques.

We in Canada will be in a few months at least three years behind the United States in this area of medical legislation. A uniform act was proposed there in 1968 and has been accepted by every state of the union since that time. I think it is in the interest of Canada and the United States that both countries start to provide a working, uniform act. One was started in 1965 and by 1968 a uniform act had been adopted in the United States. All jurisdictions in that country passed this legislation. In Canada we had not agreed on a uniform action until last summer's conference and no jurisdiction in this country has passed the legislation. Let me read part of a short article which appeared in *Time* magazine of July 13, 1970. It states under the heading "Anatomical Gifts":

At Salt Lake City's University of Utah Hospital recently, a 57-year-old man lay dying after heart surgery. In his wallet was a card that read: "Desiring that humanity may benefit I hereby give for any lawful medical purpose any specific organs or parts of my body determined to be medically usable . . . upon my death".

In the past, hospital authorities would have had to negotiate with the patient's next of kin to obtain organs for transplant, and the organs might have deteriorated and become unusable before permission was obtained. There was no such delay at the Utah hospital. Informed by the patient's wife about the donor card, surgeons were able to operate on him as soon as he was pronounced legally dead. They removed both kidneys for transplant and both eyes for cornea grafts. Within a few hours, one of each was used for transplants in other patients.