

which hangs over any society which maintains capital punishment.

One might point to laws we have in respect of which elements of injustice exist and may be exposed from time to time. The difference is that most of those injustices can be corrected. There is now way to correct the injustice of a life which has been taken by an act which should not have been carried out. We have examples in our society—and one might wonder how a society makes judgments about things—of intelligent men or women who become drunk, get into a car and kill an entire family. They are remorseful, but nevertheless they kill an entire family. In no way does our law say that these are persons who should hang. It was not premeditated or planned; it was an accident. At the worst, it will involve a charge of manslaughter. Yet we have the example of someone who is stupid, who has been torn apart by some internal demon over which he has no control, who in a moment's passion or in a moment of stupidity kills. He hangs. We make this kind of distinction.

Perhaps we forgive drunkenness but not a man's stupidity. In some way, the person who has intelligence and drinks is more guilty than the stupid, foolish man who has so little control over his emotions. These are the types of things one faces when one decides what is justice. We talked about bank robbers. I heard one member say that a bank robber who kills during a premeditated bank robbery should pay the penalty. Let us take the case of two men who go into a bank armed. One man worked up the scheme and is really responsible. He persuades someone of lesser intelligence than himself to accompany him. So often the criminals in this country are not the brightest people in the world, at least those who land in jail. In the course of the robbery both guns are fired, but the shots from only one gun kill someone. Both persons should hang. One man hangs; the other does not. How does one talk about justice in this kind of a situation?

Mr. Speaker, I have other things I wish to say. May I call it five o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Carter)—Harbours—Atlantic area—Request for improved facilities for fishermen; the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggan (Mr. Gleave)—Agriculture—Small farm development program—inquiry as to agreement with Saskatchewan; the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick)—Administration of justice—persons indicted for capital murder other than murder of police officers or prison guards—completion of legal process.

Urban Transportation

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills, notices of motions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

NATIONAL URBAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH AUTHORITY

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe) moved that Bill C-26, to establish the national urban transportation authority be read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support adoption of the bill which I have the privilege to introduce today, I would point out first that the terms of the bill are set out quite fully in the draft which is available to all members of this House. The purpose of the bill is to promote and improve rail, air and water passenger traffic in urban centres in Canada. To that end, we are proposing that a national urban transportation authority be established for the entire nation which in turn would have the power to establish local urban or regional transportation authorities in our urban centres.

● (1700)

I would draw the attention of the House to a motion, tied in with this bill, which I proposed on January 12 and which is on the order paper as No. 67. That motion reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give immediate consideration to the establishment of a National Urban Transportation Authority empowered with authority over all rail, air and water passenger traffic within designated urban centres including the authority to set rates, negotiate agreements with provincial and municipal authorities and to expropriate land for the purposes of carrying its duties and objects into effect.

In rising to deal with this subject, I believe it is important to first look at who administers our transportation needs in the domain of air, rail or water in our urban centres at present. As hon. members know, this matter is generally handled by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand). I have had the privilege of attending certain of the Transport Committee meetings—the chairman tables his first report today—and I must admit that in dealing with, say, the matter of a second airport in Toronto I was very startled to hear the Minister of Transport state:

I really do not mind that the government of Canada lose \$100 million—I do not mind—but what I would mind would be, if it were needed in 1980 and were not there, because we relied on something that did not happen. This is quite a responsible thing but I think it preferable to take the risk of losing the \$100 million than not to have it if needed.

Here is a Minister of Transport seriously suggesting to that committee that he is willing to shoot crap with \$100 million of public funds rather than seriously delay the opening of the Toronto international airport No. 2. At an earlier stage at that same hearing, the minister was asked to comment on the revolving fund that the department has