

*Highway Traffic Accidents*

automobile club executives took issue with him, saying there has been marked coolness in the past, and that the manufacturers generally saw the light only after prodding by motorist and safety organizations.

In requesting the industry to give high priority to developing better braking systems for heavy trucks, the AAA noted that under the uniform vehicle code—the standard adopted by most states—big trucks must be capable of stopping from a speed of 20 miles an hour within 50 feet with smaller trucks held to 30 or 40 feet. Private cars are required to have brakes that will stop a car within 25 feet.

The AAA also urged manufacturers to provide windshield wipers that would be effective while cars are accelerating rapidly or when they are climbing steep grades.

The gist of this statement, it appears to me, is that the head of one of these great car manufacturing companies was insisting that more and more safety was being built into cars, while these other people were telling him that the industry had to be prodded.

One of the little pamphlets I encountered shortly after reading this report was put out by the Chrysler corporation, and says: "The Forward Look in Safety—your guide to proven 1959 safety features." For what follows I do not necessarily put the blame on the Chrysler corporation itself; probably the same practice is followed throughout the automobile field, but a number of safety features are fitted as standard equipment on all Chrysler cars. Then there are further safety features which are optional at extra cost. It seems to me that safety is something which should not be optional at extra cost. If seat belts, instrument panel safety padding, power brakes, power steering, windshield defroster, rear window defroster, windshield washer, outside rearview mirror, automatic beam changer, parking brake warning light, back-up lights and captive-air tires are good for safety they should be built in to the standard product, and not be available merely as extras.

A royal commission, or a committee, might well inquire into such a field as this. Certainly, the Americans are moving in this field in a fairly effective though scattered way and it seems to me that we should try to do the same. For this reason, as I close, I should like to say that I think the hon. member concerned should be congratulated upon bringing in this motion, and I hope it is the subject of much further discussion.

**Mr. Murray Smith (Winnipeg North):** In the short time which is left, I should like, first of all, to congratulate the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Kucherepa) for having introduced this resolution this evening. The hon. member has evidently done a great deal of work in preparation and has had a good deal of experience in the study of these accidents in

[Mr. Fisher.]

the field of civic government. In addition, he has had experience as a medical man, and I feel he is extremely well qualified to speak on this matter in this house.

I should like to deal with the point raised by Your Honour when you mentioned that aspects covered by a royal commission would be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces, and I should like also to deal with the point raised by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) who considered that a committee of this house would be more effective in dealing with this problem of traffic accidents than would be a royal commission. I should like to offer the suggestion that possibly the resolution could be amended in such a way that a royal commission could be appointed with the consent of the provinces so that the commission could go into all three fields in whose jurisdiction traffic accidents occur; those which are covered by federal jurisdiction, such as offences enumerated in the Criminal Code, the field covered by provincial jurisdiction—provincial highways—and then those aspects under the control of municipal jurisdiction in built up areas.

May I call it ten o'clock?

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Chevrier:** May I ask what is the business to be for Wednesday and Friday? I understand the business for tomorrow was agreed upon some time last week. I wonder if we could obtain from the leader of the house information as to which items would be discussed on Wednesday and Friday.

**Mr. Churchill:** I just want to say a word with regard to this matter of the business of the house, because there have been some complaints uttered on the other side which seem to indicate that they are not being fairly treated. There was a complaint by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) the other day and on Friday, in my absence, by the hon. member for Laurier who stated there was a clear-cut agreement on Monday that we would have a supply motion. There was no such clear-cut agreement. These things have to be arranged by negotiation.

I am always one who believes that so far as possible the work of the House of Commons should be announced several days in advance in order to give members plenty of time in which to prepare. I have attempted to do that, and on three occasions—January 29, February 5 and again on February 11—I outlined the work for a week. Still there have to be changes and modifications for reasons over which we have no control. The practice which I have followed is, I suggest, not the practice which has been followed in the past and if