

Mr. GARLAND: It has nothing to do with the date the application was made?

Mr. SHEPARD: No sir; the date of our order. I do know there were a number of applications where they have asked us not to issue our order because they were hoping that legislation of this kind would come forward.

Mr. DRYSDALE: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering as a matter of interest, what the statistics are as to the number of collisions between engines and cars which resulted through the cars running into the side of the train. I am thinking of this provision for reflective markings, and I am wondering what the situation was which led to this provision.

Mr. SHEPARD: Why people ran into the sides of trains?

Mr. DRYSDALE: Are there people running into the sides of trains?

Mr. SHEPARD: Yes, there are. I might make a general comment. The figure intrigues me, that only one per cent of the highway accidents take place at railway crossings. I have the figure here for the year 1957 of the number of motor vehicles which were struck by a train.

Mr. DRYSDALE: I am interested in those which run into the sides of trains.

Mr. SHEPARD: There were 51 which ran into the side of trains in 1957 in daylight hours and in night hours 109; struck by trains in daylight hours 225 and at night 152. There are relatively far more accidents at night in the case of an automobile running into the side of a train than there are in the daytime.

Mr. DRYSDALE: Why does this legislation not cover the engines?

Mr. HEES: They have lights.

Mr. DRYSDALE: The Scotchlite illustration showed a diesel locomotive with the Scotchlite on the side and yet the wording in the bill is "reflective markings on railway cars".

The CHAIRMAN: While they are looking it up, I might say this goes back to the war years because I remember bringing this up in the war years regarding painting the sides of freight cars. I think it has been brought up every session since then on account of the accidents at night, especially with freight cars.

Mr. SHEPARD: I think perhaps the only answer I can give to the last question about why is it not to be included on locomotives is that locomotives have their own lights and they have their own noise makers, both bells and whistles, and they are also usually fairly clean, much cleaner than the boxcars, and relatively easily visible.

Mr. DRYSDALE: My own personal confession is that I almost ran into the side of a locomotive myself in the middle of the city of Vancouver and it was only avoided through the engineer shining a flashlight on me. If the Scotchlite is considered to be a safety factor, I am wondering why it would not be advisable to include locomotives.

Mr. SHEPARD: I am advised that many engines have lights on the sides as well as on the front.

Mr. DRYSDALE: I thought it strange that this advertisement should merely indicate a diesel engine with the Scotchlite on the side and not boxcars.

Mr. HEES: This is something of which we can take note.

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

On clause 3—Failure to erect signboards at crossings.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe*): I have a question on clause 3 and it is probably because I do not have the complete section 270 in front of me. It refers to the repeal of section 411 which includes the words "where words are printed in the