insurance company will offer the Guaranteed Benefits. This is to avoid the necessity of having two different insurance companies involved in negotiating with the injured person.

We are glad to make available details of the Guaranteed Benefits program to all interested persons, and we plan to release to the public all data flowing from the experiments. We hope this information will be of assistance in the conduct of the study authorized by House Joint Resolution 958.

Let me say again that we fully support a comprehensive, objective, and nonpartisan study. We are ready to assist and cooperate in any possible manner.

Mr. Smith. Let me say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that we offer our unqualified support for the study authorized by House Joint Resolution 958.

We agree with you and the other sponsors of this resolution and with the President that there is a need for comprehensive, objective, and nonpartisan study of the entire system used for compensating automobile accident victims.

We welcome the study, sir. We are confident that an objective study will clear the air of misunderstandings which are doing harm to the good name and reputation of our industry. We feel that some criticisms of the present system are misdirected or based on unrealistic expectations.

An unbiased study can perform a useful public service by providing a factual basis for sorting out the issues, and for placing responsibility where it rightfully belongs.

I think one of the major points we want to bring out, Mr. Chairman, is that the usefulness of such a study will reveal many conflicting demands which the insurance industry finds itself subject to today.

We in the industry are constantly dealing with contradictory demands. Such demands come from claimants, from purchasers of insurance, legislators, regulatory officials, from the press, and the academic community.

The responses we make to these conflicting demands may not always please everyone but the responses are not arbitrary. These represent honest efforts to provide practical and equitable solutions to the dilemmas we have to face.

I would like to skip over now, if you please, Mr. Chairman, to page 4 down at the last paragraph. I would like to bring to the committee's attention one of the dilemmas that the industry faces today is the conflict with society's demand that drivers with high loss exposure be provided with insurance and at a price they can afford to pay.

If we charge these drivers a price commensurate with their actual loss potential we are accused of pricing them out of the market.

If we cancel their policies in order to avoid saddling our other policyholders with the losses they cause, there is a public clamor for protection to be provided regardless of their driving performance.

If we accept these drivers at a subsidized rate, we run into strong protests from the average or better drivers who have to pick up part of the price.

We might ask ourselves, What is then the solution to such a problem in attempting to provide coverages or the desire of the public generally, the Congress, the legislators, the academicians, everybody generally who desires the insurance industry to provide coverages without any restrictions whatsoever to the public generally?