

AASHO in making specific recommendations as to particular elements of the design. I think it would be kind of difficult for them through this committee, to produce something in the way of design standards, other than as their comments would indicate what is more desirable.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will the gentleman yield on the same question?

Mr. CLAUSEN. Yes. Just one second, Mr. Blatnik.

The point I am trying to make here is I am hopeful what we have started here as a committee would provide a permanent record, so that we can actually compare the problem areas with what we will have in the way of correcting recommendation.

It seems to me our hearings should at least have the comparison, examine the before and after approach. I would be pleased to yield to the chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Later on, Congressman, we have very fine witnesses, top officials of AASHO and certain Bureau of Public Roads people, who will try to answer the question: How come as many findings were presented, things we have been viewing, things we have been hearing, in these past several weeks of hearings?

It is a massive attack. AASHO is working full speed and earnestly, revising the whole safety criteria, as we call it, regulations, directives, etc.

Wherever it is possible, we can get recommendations and be helpful. I think the gentlemen will agree, as Mr. Constandy points out, the overall job which must be gotten underway, we hope the big end result of these hearings, will be specific action as to modifications. Whether we can do it in the hearing itself is highly doubtful.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Actually what I am after, I guess, is a way to prepare what I think could be a historical document. Because that which has been brought to the attention of we lay members of the committee here certainly could well be recorded and be properly utilized, for instance, among many of the engineering schools and students now coming on, to point out how, in effect, good engineering has brought about a certain amount of oversight. I think the principal intent of these hearings is to do just this; it is simply to get at the heart of the problem and, hopefully, record this as an historic document, so engineers in the future will not be making these inadvertent mistakes. I am sure they are inadvertent.

Mr. CONSTANDY. In addition, in the course of this work, as we will see in the next few slides, where possible we have shown a before and after, in a sense, by showing, as here, the design standard that was in effect just as recently as 1966, when this project was completed, and the evolution in the design standards showing the better design within the same State probably within a fraction of a mile of this particular installation.

We will, in that sense, get to see an example of something that is desirable and something that is less desirable, even though the improvement, we may find from the experts, is not perfect.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Yes. I gathered that very point during the discussion just prior to the opening of this hearing with Mr. Wilson, from my State of California, that this is underway. But I still hold the point of view we continually provide an extra service by supplying a document which prohibits this sort of thing as best we can in the future.

And I would like to ask the staff to give very careful consideration