

Human Tissue Transplants

hope the House might see its way clear to allow me a very brief extension of time. I would conclude rapidly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Does the House agree?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We agree, provided there is no arrangement whereby the few minutes the hon. member talks and the few minutes somebody else will talk will result in the motion being talked out.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker, I would not wish us to enter into an agreement under which the rights of some members to speak would be based on what we do at the end of the private members' hour. I think every member has the right to decide for himself what he wants to do with respect to a bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman). I do not think we ought to look ahead to what may happen.

Mr. McBride: Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation of the interest of others. I was saying just before my time had expired that there was no unanimity, and apparently no great anxiety was expressed by officials at the meeting in November, for the provinces to move ahead in this field. I think that was unfortunate. So for reasons given previously, although it might be said that there was no active support for this kind of motion, we should support it because it has apparently become obvious that the provinces need to be goaded or encouraged into action.

The international situation needs to be made uniform, because tourism is expanding all the time. Many, many people through accident, disease or bad luck are bound to die while they are in transit in countries other than their own and therefore the matters touched on in this motion become more and more important for those reasons as well. The motion has become especially important in view of the rapid developments which have led to the creation of life in test-tubes and to the sustaining of life in incubators. Those factors make the subject matter of this motion all the more urgent.

Another matter which might be discussed at a national conference is the suggestion that uniform legislation might recognize an individual's wishes in the disposal of his own body. I am criticizing the archaic concept which says that if one dies in a hospital one's wishes will be recognized, but if one dies outside a hospital one's wishes may not be recognized. The legal right relating to the disposition of one's body after death passes to the next of kin, and that must be recognized. There ought to be some method whereby a person's wishes, made known before death, are recognized. In my professional capacity I have run into this situation many times. Sometimes an individual requests that his body be disposed of in a certain manner, yet after death the next of kin say, "No, we do not want to follow that procedure". The corpse is in their hands and they say, "We will do it another way."

[Mr. McBride.]

The motion being considered this afternoon is important and requires the attention of members on all sides of the House. It has been a pleasure to participate in this debate, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. I think it would be appropriate to suggest to hon. members that private members' hours are only one-hour "shots" and that hon. members might prepare their speeches, in accordance with the rules, to last 20 minutes. I would say that 15 minutes would be desirable rather than 20 for speeches during this hour.

Mr. Dinsdale: Agreed.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to amend your motion and reduce the time to ten minutes. I hope that all the talk of death of the last few minutes does not foretell the death of this motion, especially at the hands of its friends. It seems to me that this is a good motion. I cannot see anything in it that would embarrass the House or the government if it were to pass. I hope that it will not be subjected to death by talking out.

If I may speak for the entire opposition—if those on my right will give me *carte blanche* to do so, and I am sure I can do it for all the others—we welcome the opportunity this afternoon to go a second mile and to return good for evil, or whatever you want to call it. The mover of the motion, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), is frequently the last speaker in private members' hour. He is almost an official "talker-outer". Let me tell him that we on the opposition side will not do that to his motion. We think it is a good one. I think that the appeal he made, that the law should at least catch up with medical science, is a good one. Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will have the opportunity of putting the question on this motion to the House and that it will be carried before five o'clock.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[Translation]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I should like to congratulate the former speakers for their contribution to the debate on so important a motion.

I should also like to congratulate my colleague, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), for introducing a motion intended to arouse the awareness of all Canadians to the importance of having reserves of organs for future transplants in order to help those who might eventually need them to continue leading a more pleasant life.

Allow me also to thank my colleague from Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride) who, with his usual logic, gave us an extremely important lecture, from the legal point of view, and especially with regard to the difficulties that might stem from the suggestion of my friend from Algoma.

I would also like to congratulate my friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who would not like to