

Actually the various cost elements—wages, medical expenses, and so on—have been rising in recent years so that a one percent decrease in 1968 or 1969 would be a somewhat larger saving. An actual decrease in total accidents would not be necessary to effect this saving. Because the trend in total accidents has been rising rapidly during the past six years, even reducing the rate of increase would result in a bona fide saving.

How reasonable is it to expect a reduction of one percent in accidents?

If allowances are made for the differences between rural and urban accident experience, then an "expected" fatality rate can be computed for each state on the basis of the 1967 mileage death rates. If those states whose actual rates were worse than their "expected" values were improved just to the "expected" level, there would have been a five percent reduction in motor vehicle deaths, injuries and property damage accidents, and a corresponding five percent decrease in overall accident costs in 1967. This would have amounted to \$500,000,000.

If the 35 states with poorer accident experience were improved to the level of the 15th highest ranking state, there would have been an 11 percent reduction in accidental deaths, injuries and property damage accidents and a 12 percent reduction in overall accident costs in 1967. This would have amounted to nearly \$1,300,000,000.

Thus if it is acknowledged that some of the states with poor accident experience can be improved to a level already achieved by half of the states, a potential saving of 5 to 10 percent is possible and a reduction of one percent in a single year is a reasonable, practicable and valuable objective.

It seems likely that a \$140 million Federal-aid program (\$280 million with State matching funds) would at least attain the break-even point of a 2.6% reduction in waste. The payoff may well be much larger—if the reduction is 5%, there would be a quarter-billion dollar profit to the society.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I might add at this point that Mr. Kluczynski, the chairman, was called out and he asked me if I would preside momentarily.

Now, there may be some questions by other members of the committee, including the chairman, and we would like to beg your indulgence, and we may submit some questions to you in writing and ask that you respond to them, in order to accommodate the members that were not able to be here.

We are sitting under special permission today.

I believe that the question of how the Highway Safety Act is being implemented and some of the expressed concern that you have, as I understand it, has prompted the chairman, Mr. Kluczynski, to suggest that maybe next year they would be holding hearings on the overall implementation and the progress and that sort of thing.

Mr. PYLE. Thank you, that will be very helpful.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, any questions anybody on the committee might have, we will be delighted to answer them.

We plan to appear before the Senate committee next week, and so we will be coming in and out of the city, and if, for any reason, you want us to drop by and visit with either staff members or members of the committee, we will be delighted to do so.

We are grateful for the opportunity to present our statement, because we have a feeling that maybe this traffic safety thing needs a little more emphasis than it appears to get in the total concept of the bill.

It is just a piece of it, but it is a part of the system, and if it does not work safely, it is our view there is something wrong with the system.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Well, certainly, organizations like the National Safety Council are very much interested in helping all of our people, and you have made a great contribution here this morning.