Motor vehicle occupant protection for children

EDTOR.—Thanks for the several articles in the June issue that discuss motor vehicle occupant protection for children. I have a few comments to add to the discussion.

In response to your comment about possible industry foot dragging in 'Random thoughts', the debate going on throughout the NHTSA and car seat industries and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) right now is not whether to install universal anchorages for child restraints, but which design will be the best in the future. Since a design standard is to be adopted, it must allow for the greatest flexibility of future improvements. Many advocates as well as industry experts in the occupant protection field do not think that the uniform child restraint system (UCR) proposed by General Motors and the NHTSA (UCRA, the 'American ISOFIX') is the best design. The Europeans have moved ahead to begin the refinement of the ISO committee's 'rigid anchor' system, with two manufacturers offering installed anchors in their 1998 models along with compatible child restraints.

The General Motors 'UCRA' design uses existing seat belt anchor holes (with buckles and webbing). It ignores the extensive research and consensus building that has gone into the ISO committee's design. I, and many others, feel strongly that adoption of the General Motors design will stifle innovation and do little to simplify installation. Rather than one belt to tighten, parents would have two lower anchorages that the user must tighten. The UCRA is 'uniform' but will never be 'universal' for the Europeans, Canadians, and Australians are planning on using the rigid anchors.

As Dr Flaura Winston says in her comment on Clifton's 'Food': we all hope that the final NHTSA rule will further universal harmonization as well as promote long range adaptability. So the opposition to the General Motors proposal as put forward by Ms Clifton and myself (as with airbags) but a desire by the international community to achieve what we have long envisioned, a truly foolproof snap-in installation for child restraints.

PS. Safe Ride News is a quarterly report on developments in child occupant protection and bicycle/pedestrian issues. It features updates and 'how-to' information related to child restraints, summaries of recent research, innovative programs, and new resources. The newsletter is broadening its coverage of Canadian activities and hopes to include Canada as a subscriber. To submit news or ideas, or for subscription information, contact Safe Ride News Publications (address above).

Should injury prevention programmes be targeted?

EDTOR.—I read with interest the September issue of Injury Prevention regarding the debate concerning targeted programmes versus population approaches in injury prevention. I do not agree with Ward's assessment that 'most parents are able to determine for themselves the risk of their child falling'. I disagree with Ward not because I think most parents might be incapable of such determinations, but because of other variables that come into these determinations—such as values and socioeconomic conditions. I do think, however, that in an effort to target programmes, we must consider the extent to which people 'need' to use restraints, and to 'disadvantaged' people.' I think this assumption that all the public needs is 'sufficient information' that I take to task. It is not due to the sufficiency of information per se that people change behaviours or that programs succeed or fail. Behaviours change and programmes succeed because of the interplay of a number of other variables. I mentioned two only because they are so easy to identify and tend to be interrelated. The one 'simple' mother with a few kids may be sufficiently informed that lighters can be easily used by children; she may even be sufficiently informed that she should take care to make sure that her child does not have access to mix. But after seeing dozens of young children a year who play with their single mother's lighter, I observe that people in this situation have made decisions based on different values—namely values based around the care of arguably the most hazardous device next to the automobile—the lighter; values that betray being disadvantaged.

As Jerry Moller writes in his Dissent, the economically disadvantaged are becoming increasingly so.2 Meanwhile the advantaged hardly realize the extent to which they are advantaged. The advantaged not only face life's risks with some information, but also a lot more choice—from being able to afford the interconnected smoke alarms on each floor of their homes, to the hot water regulator on their bath tub, and a host of other design advantages the advantaged take for granted.

The problem with only doing population based programs is that the advantaged are already far safer, while the disadvantaged are so far behind. For this and other reasons, I believe that programs need to be targeted and need to be population wide—I believe in 'both-and'. In other words, there is room for a fire safety curriculum like LEARN NOT TO BURN to be used school wide, while targeting the most at risk (high risk) communities with more services.

Thus I echo Moller's final statement while universal interventions have their place, we have not yet reached a stage where we can abandon our commitment to interventions targeted to high risk groups'.
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Death on the road

EDTOR.—Every year more than 40 000 people are killed on US roads. Each of these people was someone's child, mother, father, or other loved one. The death of Princess Diana, however, has focused public attention on the need for improvements that have previously unparalleled. The public is reminded yet again that speed kills, drinking and driving can be fatal, and not wearing seat belts contributes to the seriousness of any injury. We know these things and even have strict laws addressing them, yet such tragedies happen every day in every part of the world. Clearly knowledge and laws cannot always protect us. If anything good is to come out of the Paris crash tragedy, we must do more than redouble our efforts to promote and enforce safe driving behaviors. We also must educate ourselves and our decision makers about what other prevention options are available and effective, so that when the ubiquitous lack of perfection in human nature surfaces, it need not kill.

While we don't yet know enough details about Princess Diana and her companions, we do know that cars can be built to provide occupant protection and so cannot exceed reasonable speeds. The sides of roads can be designed to cushion and safely absorb the impact. Vehicles can prevent intoxicated drivers from driving. Better transport systems can attract the public to safer means of travel.

These are not radical suggestions, but feasible and potentially effective. A fundamental mental of the science of injury control is that prevention should be focused on the 'weakest link' in the chain of causal events leading to a crash. However, it is not clear that the programs that there are multifaceted opportunities to prevent injuries. Typically the media focus is on who is at fault and what the victim should do to protect himself. Let us seize this opportunity to educate the public about additional options that include car design, road design, and alternative forms of transport, because it is through support and advocacy that change can occur.
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