

The Budget—Mr. Addison

I would think the motion before the house is incidental to a proceeding of the house, in the sense that it is the procedure by which the house proceeds to the work of the committee of ways and means. I think this motion is a procedural and not a substantive one, and therefore the Minister of Finance does not have the right of reply.

May I refer hon. members to a ruling made by Mr. Speaker Beaudoin on April 2, 1957, when the then Minister of Finance, Mr. Harris, rose to speak in almost exactly the same situation. Mr. Speaker Beaudoin then ruled that while there was an argument for both sides, he would take the view that it was not a substantive motion and therefore the minister did not have the right of reply. I would give this information to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Sharp: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would have welcomed the opportunity to make a few brief remarks in reply, but I shall certainly abide by your ruling.

Mr. John H. Addison (York North): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the members in the house would rather hear from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) than myself at this time. I have been watching the clock and it seemed to me I would not have this distinct privilege but that he would. However, fate is sometimes in the hands of other people, and in this particular case Your Honour was the judge.

I wanted to speak this afternoon, and am delighted I have the opportunity to do so, because of the exchange that took place in the house this morning between the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Graftey) and the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) with regard to the whole question of automobile safety. I listened very carefully this afternoon to the remarks of the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) who suggested that his was not a political argument and was not partisan in the sense that one political party was capturing the attention of the public in regard to the particular problem to which he was referring.

I for one certainly do not wish to see this question of automobile safety become a partisan, political instrument which can be used for a particular purpose or a particular party. I think everyone in this house is genuinely concerned about the safety of every Canadian citizen. I believe the problem facing us is a very substantial one. The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi suggested that the hon. member for Villeneuve should not be included

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

in dealing with this problem because he had a conflict of interest. It may be assumed that I have a conflict of interest in this respect, but I would suggest this is an absurd assumption because those of us who are in the automobile business and understand it—and I have been in the business for 15 years—have something to offer for the general good.

I think we must identify the problem. I am sure we have all had experience through close, personal friends and others, of automobile accidents and deaths. Last year in Canada 4,879 people met their death in automobile accidents. A total of 395,310 people were injured in Canada last year. One traffic death occurs every 100 minutes in Canada, and one injury occurs every 3½ minutes. In 1966, there will be 385,000 young Canadians who will reach driving age and only 6 per cent of them will have received any standard driving course. It is also interesting to note that 27 per cent of all traffic victims in 1965 were pedestrians.

Let us consider the statistics in the United States. Every 13 minutes a man, woman or child is killed in a traffic accident in that country. Every 18 seconds somebody is injured seriously enough to be disabled beyond the day of the accident. Financial losses in the United States pile up at the rate of \$15,000 per second around the clock.

We have heard and read a great deal about the discussion that has been taking place in the United States with regard to automobile safety. Most of the publicity, serving the sensational side of this problem, is concerned with events after the accident has actually taken place, what happens inside the car, truck or other vehicle or what happens to the object it hits. It seems to me that the old adage "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" could well be applied here.

A program called "Elmer the safety elephant that never forgets" was instituted about 19 years ago in our public schools. This program is for children between the ages of approximately five to nine years and is sponsored in Canada by the Canadian Highway Council. A city that is very close to us, Hull, instituted this program a short while ago in 22 schools in the area. I am sorry the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron), who sits in front of me, is not here today. Comparing a five-month period when the Elmer safety program was not in effect with the same five months when the program was in effect, it was found that the accident rate in regard to children in Hull was cut by 50 per cent. This