

P U B L I C     H E A R I N G

on

SENATE BILLS NOS. 174 and 175  
[Driver Education Bills]

before

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY

Held:  
December 14, 1966  
Assembly Chamber  
State House  
Trenton, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Senator Ned J. Parsekian [Chairman]

ALSO:

Paul G. Levy, Legislative Aide

\* \* \* \*



# I N D E X

<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
Dr. Herbert J. Stack Bergen County Safety Council	5
William J. Toth Center for Safety Education New York University	17 & 57
Miss June Strelecki Director, New Jersey Division of Motor Vehicles	29
Dr. Frederick L. Hipp New Jersey Education Association	35
Judge Edgar P. Silver Municipal Court Judge of Baltimore	46
C. Stewart Mead New Jersey Automobile Association	57
Paul W. Selby President New Jersey Driver and Safety Education Association	65
Mrs. Grace Lyon Head, Driver Education Department Ridgewood High School	72
C. Edwin Max Administrative Assistant New Jersey State Safety Council	78
John Callery Principal, Bordentown Regional High School	86
Ralph J. Jackson Director, Driver Education Division Allstate Insurance Companies	89 & 142
John J. Hassett National and New Jersey Professional Driver Education Association	97
Eugene J. Fanning Assistant Registrar of Motor Vehicles Commonwealth of Massachusetts	109





# INDEX (Continued)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
Dr. William Warner Director of Secondary Education New Jersey Department of Education	116
Donald D. Van Heemst New Jersey Association of Independent Insurance Agents	123
Gerald Donohue Bergen County Catholic Education Association	128
Dr. Oscar W. Knade Assistant Executive Director State Federation of District Boards of Education	131 & 151
John E. Kane Director of Safety Ternstedt Division General Motors Corporation	139
T. Donald Cairns Memorial High School Cedar Grove, New Jersey	144
Fred M. Rosenberg New Jersey Youth Commission and Motor Club of America	147 & 158

- - - -



SENATOR NED J. PARSEKIAN [Chairman]: Ladies and gentlemen, these are hearings before the Committee of Law and Public Safety of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, of which I am Chairman.

Present at the table with me is Mr. Paul Levy, my Legislative Aide.

The hearings concern Bills Numbers 174 and 175 which were introduced January 31, 1966, and were referred to the Committee on Law and Public Safety. These are the Driver Education Bills. The bills are fundamentally the same as bills introduced two or three years previously, which were the result of recommendations of a Commission on High School Driver Education. I was a member of that Commission at that time and was the Director of Motor Vehicles of the State of New Jersey and, therefore, am familiar with the subject matter. The bills were the result of discussions held by the Commission with interested parties, parties interested in traffic safety and in education, public as well as private agencies with those concerns.

In the course of studying this problem for many years, I had occasion to visit class rooms that were taking the class-room phase of training in driver education and behind-the-wheel sessions with students and their instructors, and had occasion to question the instructors and the pupils. Some of the more interesting comments and critiques came

from those teachers and those students.

I might say at the commencement of this day's hearings that I wouldn't consider the inquiry complete unless we had testimony from some of the students as well as instructors of those courses. There are others that have expressed an interest in testifying who are not here, so it is certain that we will need another day to complete the inquiry and I would expect that would be after the first of the year.

Another aspect of the problem has arisen since the Federal government passed the Highway Safety Bills this year, which bills include an interest in driver education. Recent statements appearing in the press which concern the preliminary regulations issued by the new Department of Transportation and the agency which deals with traffic safety indicate that the Federal programs will be designed to encourage high school driver education and certain steps will have to be taken by the states to be eligible for the funds for this program. I have been in touch with Dr. Haddon. I talked to him personally by telephone as recently as last week and I have been in correspondence with him. They are not entirely prepared to issue their specifics on what is expected of the states and how they can be eligible for funds or the extent to which the Federal government will encourage or require high school driver education in the state safety

programs.

We had scheduled before this same Committee hearings on December 19th of this year to inquire into the Federal aspects of traffic safety, including how they affect high school driver education. The Federal officials were unable for that date to send a representative and I feel that to be of great importance, and several other people interested in the problem are unable to attend the 19th because of the Holiday Season and other commitments. So I want to notify those present that those hearings will be adjourned to a date after the first of the year when all interested can come in and alert you that I feel that that is an integral part of this inquiry.

Now there is no pride of authorship in S 174 and S 175. The purpose of the hearings is to hear a critique and recommendations for improvement. I might say that I have faith in the educational process and the educability of the public. It would seem if they are properly educated, they will respond to a problem.

I don't know that high school driver education is the only education idea that concerns traffic safety and would suggest that it may be that the process should have more depth to extend below the high school level. And I have wondered whether the new generation, if they were exposed to the social import of traffic safety and its effect on their

lives and the lives of others as early as kindergarten - it wouldn't have a broadening effect. I recall experiments in several cities where very brief courses on a play level were attempted in kindergarten and the alleged success of that approach. I wonder if we shouldn't inquire as to whether the process of education in traffic safety could not afford even two hours, a minimal number of hours, in the very early grade school age and perhaps three or four hours of discussion in the late elementary school stage, as well as a short reference in Freshman high school, all before the broad type of program we are talking about here - whether that depth in time of years wouldn't bring an added appreciation extending back to the formative years in the students.

Certainly if the program is to be accepted, it will cost money and that brings with it a responsibility that the money is well spent, that the programs are the best available, the teachers well trained and the courses adequate to the problem. I would expect that we ought to consider as part of a Driver Education Bill, therefore, that there be mandated a continuing research project along with the expense of the course to insure that the courses are continually checked against new thoughts, better methods, more economy, so that they don't degenerate into just another course or degenerate into what we thought was best in 1966 or 1967, but may not be the best in 1968 or 1970.

It would be important, I would think, that that be part of any program.

I have made these introductory remarks because so many present are interested in this field and have been for many years and I would hope to spark an interest in you in this type of thinking.

Now we will try to get through as expeditiously as possible. We have a list of witnesses, 20 in number, almost all of whom are already present. We will try, of course, to make sure that all of the out-of-town witnesses are heard without any question. Some people have come from far away.

Our first witness was scheduled to be the Director of Motor Vehicles, Miss June Strelecki. Is there a representative from that office here? (No response.)

The second witness scheduled is Dr. Herbert J. Stack of the Bergen County Safety Council. Dr. Stack.

D R.     H E R B E R T     J.     S T A C K:     Mr. Chairman and, we hope, friends of driver education, I am Dr. Herbert J. Stack of Teaneck, New Jersey. While my work is primarily with the State Traffic Safety Council of New York, I am here representing the Bergen County Safety Council at this hearing.

I am the former Director of the New York University Center for Safety Education and the author or editor of eight books in the traffic safety field, and have been the

sponsor or a member of the committees for 45 men and women who have won their Doctor's Degree in Safety at New York University.

I have gone over the two bills which we are considering here today and am familiar with the legislation in other states, working now as I am with three other states regarding this legislation.

I am going to take the liberty of reading my statement for only one reason. As a college professor we are paid on the amount we talk and I happen to have just written a book which is just being distributed called "The History of Driver Education in the United States" which I am going to refer to and what I am afraid is that unless I read my paper, the sergeant-at-arms will have to stop me because I am just full of Driver Education.

Thirty-two years ago, the driver education movement was born in Bergen County, which, as you know, is a small county in the northern part of our State with quite a bad accident record this year. The same Safety Council that I represent today was the sponsor and developed the course of study which guided the movement. In other words, driver education was born right here in New Jersey. It was used to develop the New Jersey State course of study and later on courses in Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Hampshire and other states.

For several years New Jersey led the country in the



percentage of schools adopting driver education. It was chiefly due to its head start and to the aid given by the Motor Vehicle Department. Those were the days in which Harold Hoffman was Commissioner of Motor Vehicles many years ago.

Later on, the State Safety Council and the automobile clubs became very helpful and assigned members of their staff to aid the schools. While the State Department of Education was interested, it had the supervision of dozens of other subjects in the schools, of which driver education was only one. But the Motor Vehicle Department quickly recognized the value of driver education and assigned members of their staff to help.

Now soon after World War II driver education began to bog down in New Jersey while other states went far ahead of us. It was reported that this was due to budget problems, although I understand that New Jersey ranked as the ninth amongst the states in income. But in the period of the last five years, driver education has reached in New Jersey a kind of an impasse. In five years the percentage of eligible students trained has grown about one per cent a year. That's bad. Actually we are standing still the last five or six years. I quote this from the authoritative source, the National High School Achievement Program, which shows that we are practically in the doldrums here in New Jersey.

While we were once the leaders, today New Jersey is 19th in national standing on the basis of the number of eligible students trained. For those of you who are not familiar with the term "eligible students," we mean that group that has reached the legal driving age in the state or is about to reach that age.

Now why have these other states moved ahead while New Jersey is standing still? Other speakers are going to discuss these causes. But the chief reason is that 25 of these states have passed legislation for some form of state financial support of driver education and New Jersey has not. The reason given by many of the towns and cities is that it has been a kind of a budget problem. But, of course, New Jersey is no poorer than many of our other states. States that have passed legislation similar to that in the bill which we have before us have shown a marked increase in their registration of eligible drivers. As a matter of fact, as I say, the ten leading states - and we are not amongst that ten by any means - their percentage of eligibles trained is between 70 and 100, several of them in the 100 bracket.

As I have said, I have just completed this book which is being distributed all over the country which shows the results of the programs in the various states and quotes from 152 research studies and reports.

I am very glad that the Chairman mentioned the fact that in connection with this bill we should see to it that funds are available for research. Sometimes I feel that we are kind of standing still in New Jersey and in some of the other states.

The study that I have made points out that the states that have passed legislation of this kind now lead the country. Incidentally, New Jersey has the dubious distinction of being one of three states that do not have standard courses in driver education in either its principal city, Newark, or its state capital. I won't mention the two other states. In addition, little or nothing is being done in Jersey City and Elizabeth. This is extremely unfortunate. I do not know the reasons why these cities are standing still in an important thing of this kind. I do know that several cities and towns in this state discontinued driver education for one year and then it came back. It happened in Teaneck. And, by the way, it came back in a hurry and it is now, I would say, one of the better programs in the state.

There may be some of you who doubt the value of driver education. Others at this hearing will discuss this subject. It is utter nonsense to doubt the value of driver education. The Board of Education this year began to doubt the value of athletics and discontinued coaches and directors

of school bands and other subjects.irate parents stormed the board and the activities were restored. Why, of course, driver education is valuable or there wouldn't be 1300 high schools teaching it this year.

You will find in this book here quotations from 30 research studies that have been conducted in various parts of the country, some of them pretty poor research, but in general showing the value of driver education. Trained players make better teams. Trained orchestras make better orchestras. Trained drivers make better drivers.

Now, of course, some of our youngsters have accidents. It is to be expected. But would you doubt the value of health instruction because there is an epidemic of adolescent diseases in our community? Would you doubt the value of Civics instruction because we have a little trouble with juvenile delinquency?

There is still another development that the Chairman has mentioned. You all know that Congress has passed the Federal Highway Safety Act. It will provide funds to the states on a matching basis to be used in the development of a highway safety program. And I have been working to a little extent with the Committee in Washington on this. Now you know, of course, that this is for the complete highway safety program, of which driver education is only a part. But driver education is specifically highlighted

in the law and here is the important statement, quoting from the regulations - and I don't have a copy of the law here - I should have a copy of the new law - quoting the regulations: "The driver education program should be comprehensive." That word "comprehensive" means both classroom instruction and practice driving. "Moreover when the state program exists, there must be a significant expansion and improvement of such a program." There must be a significant expansion and improvement of such a program. Thus the state must show a standard or comprehensive 30 and 6 program and must show a growth in both quantity and quality. Now would you say that our one per cent average in the last four years is a significant expansion? I am afraid Dr. Haddon and his associates in the highway safety education agency would say, no.

Why, of course, we are not expanding. We are standing still.

Now, fortunately, there are other phases of the state safety program in which New Jersey has been a leader over the last two decades. You know what these are. We have had a strong Motor Vehicle and State Police Department for many years. The same is true of our Highway Department, traffic engineering, vehicle inspection, driver's license and driver's clinics. But it is not so with driver education. Apparently we have a 50 per cent program here and some way

or other, we must be low man on the totem pole. Other speakers will stress the losses experienced in insurance in the last five years because 50 per cent of our drivers do not get this training.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Dr. Stack, 50 per cent, public school only?

DR. STACK: Public school only.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: How about parochial schools?

DR. STACK: I don't have the figures for parochial schools. In fact, I don't know if there are any figures for parochial schools.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: It is something like 9 or 10 per cent, as I understand it, but maybe someone else can enlighten us. But when you say 50 per cent, I want to make sure the record indicates what I am sure it is your knowledge, that it is far less in the private and parochial schools.

DR. STACK: That's right.

This driver education achievement program gives these figures and it keeps the parochial school and private school in a separate column.

I am glad to say, particularly in my own county, Bergen County, parochial schools are doing very fine work. I am not sure of the exact number we have there, but many of them are doing very fine programs.

Now there are several parts of the existing bill

which I would suggest be changed. On the first page, instead of the word "standard," I like better the word "comprehensive." While you or I may know that standard means 30 and 6, the 30 and 6 program of the National High School Driver Education Program, comprehensive is the word used in the new Federal law. That means, in effect, the complete program of classroom instruction and practice driving.

Second, the \$28 per pupil allotment is too low. In the ten leading states - now I am talking about the ten leading states and that is where we want to be - the range is from \$30 to \$50 - one of the states has just jumped up to \$55 - with an average of about \$40 to \$45. I like the use of the term 50 per cent, the amount to be 50 per cent of the actual cost to the school district.

No state, and this is important, unless it is Florida or Delaware, reimburses the school district the full amount of the per pupil cost and Florida does it because Florida has 72 ranges and its range program costs 40 per cent less. Delaware does it with an appropriation.

There was one minor change that I would like to see made, and perhaps it cannot be made at this time. The phrase is used "public and private schools." I like better "public and private secondary schools." I like that phrase better.

I strongly urge the passing of this bill. At one

time we had a list of 70 national and state organizations that endorsed the action program of the President's Committee, which includes driver education. In other words, there were probably around about 70 organizations in New Jersey that were behind the action program which includes driver education. I feel sure that most of these organizations would be ready to endorse legislation that would extend driver education in the public and private secondary schools of the state. We would like to see driver education for all children in the state.

One final statement - I may be stepping on somebody's toes, but fortunately now I have no Superintendent to report back to - I have no boss to report back to - I sincerely hope that when this bill is passed, and it will be passed sooner or later, and Federal funds are available to pay for supervision, and as you understand, Federal funds pay for supervision on a matching basis, that New Jersey will select a top-flight driver education supervisor as the State Supervisor, and pay a salary that will attract the best supervision in the State to get the best people down here. We have got to do something of this kind to get this program going.

Now I happen to be working with another state that I can mention in connection with this. They have had three State Supervisors in four years. Why? - because salaries were so poor and they were number three assistants in some



department or other. This is important business. I urge that the State Department of Education when this bill is passed see to it that the best people in the State are available as candidates for the position so that you will have a man that won't come in here and then go away because of an inadequate salary - you will have a person here, a man or a woman, who will do a top-notch job and get these towns and cities that are doing very little now in operation. Thanks very much.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Dr. Stack, one question, if you will: How would you insure, if there is a State program, that each school district that is getting this subsidy per pupil has an adequate program?

DR. STACK: State regulations put out by the State Board of Education would provide for a description of an adequate program. Unfortunately, I say this with regret, the State course in New Jersey is ten years old. But State regulations would insist upon that. Reports would come from that and there would be visitation. I would hope to see in this State a Supervisor and one or two assistants. I would likewise hope to see the control of the commercial driving schools under the Motor Vehicle Department as they are now and as they also are in New York State.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I didn't quite catch what you said. You said New Jersey courses are ten years old, meaning

that they need revision?

DR. STACK: Yes, I should say so.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: And your recommendation would be that if the program is adopted at a State level, there be a requirement for reports and a visitation power to insure proper courses?

DR. STACK: Right.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: All right, sir.

DR. STACK: In other word, I would expect that the State Department would get to work on the revision of this - we will call it course of study or curriculum guides or what not - just as soon as possible because otherwise the country is going right by us. I mention just one thing, we only have in this State, I think it is four simulators, and we don't even have one range. Well, that is not a good record. We should have more of them. We should be doing more experimenting. We should be doing more research.

I think sometimes, Mr. Chairman, that too often in this State there are schools that have three or four people teaching driver education and then teaching some other subject when it should be carried on by one person. That is simply my own feeling. We should have full-time people. I regret to say that at this State Conference held here a week or two ago, only 35 people were in attendance from the driver education crop. I don't like that at all. Thank you.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you, Dr. Stack.

William J. Toth, N.Y.U. Center of Safety Education.

W I L L I A M J. T O T H: Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen: My name is William J. Toth. I am a resident of Somerset, New Jersey, a homeowner and a taxpayer. I am an Assistant Professor at the Center for Safety Education at New York University. I have worked in the field of safety education for over twenty years, as a driver education teacher, as a college teacher of driver education teachers, as a traffic consultant to the insurance business and to two major automobile manufacturers. I was a writer and editor and staff member of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety when the most recent action program was written. I have also been an author and writer and a lecturer to groups throughout the United States and Canada. My students have not only included educators, but hundreds of enforcement and motor vehicle officials.

I welcome the opportunity to speak to you while you are considering public education legislation.

Our department or center, as it is called at the University, was the first one that was ever established in the United States at any college or university. At present we graduate more high school driver education teachers than any other college in the United States. Over these 27 years

of our existence, we have learned much about safety and accident prevention through education.

At present, we are engaged in a national program of education for state officials in traffic safety management. This program is without parallel. It is the first of its kind in the country. New Jersey has and is participating in the program. Our students in this program come from every official family of state government. We have had governors, legislators, judges, attorney generals, police commissioners, motor vehicle commissioners, highway officials, traffic engineers, and, yes, educators. We know that education is an important must. We know that none of these agencies that I mentioned can solve the traffic problem alone. We also know that all of the agencies together without education cannot succeed.

Horace Mann put it best when he said, "No cause will ever succeed without making education its ally." And this goes doubly true for our traffic safety problem.

Presently at the University we are turning out driver education teachers at a record rate. More and more educators are realizing the importance of educating our citizens behind the wheel as well as on the sidewalks, in the home and in the community.

Here are some important things that I would like to call to your attention for serious consideration:

Driver education is not a course to learn to drive, but it is one to learn to live. It is not a course to pass the driver's test, but rather a course to enable an individual to live to a ripe old age, during which time he can enjoy life, raise a family, contribute to his community, society, and to civilization.

Driver education belongs in our schools, not only as a separate course, but also as part of an over-all safety education program which begins in the kindergarten and continues through all grades. We know that youngsters pick up attitudes and knowledges of driving while they are riding as passengers with their parents and other people. Safety happens to be a very important part of education. You take chemistry, physics, physical education and health. These people have long known that safety is important. Driver education thrives in the atmosphere of a school setting. The complete package includes the library facilities where a student can go and look up materials and do research papers. They can converse with fellow teachers in related subjects. They can bring up points in the physics class, in the chemistry class, that are related to automobile driving. The classrooms are available. The visual aids are available. All of the equipment - everything that is conducive to learning is in our schools. Classroom instruction conducted concurrently with practice driving is one of the

most effective learning experiences in our schools.

During the recent difficulties that we had in our educational programs when Russia had shot off its first Sputnik, we had many people from other fields come in and tell us what a bad job the American education system was doing. The National Education Association then took time out and conducted a nationwide study, trying to find out what techniques that we were using were effective and which ones were not in our educational field. Interestingly enough, one of the techniques that they found to be most effective in teaching was the one where classroom phases were conducted concurrently with ~~laboratory~~ or actual experiences in the area that they were talking about. And as it turned out, even the driver education people were amazed to find that driver education met this standard far beyond most of the other courses given in our curriculum.

Driver education in our schools is under the immediate supervision of the local officials as is any other course. Standards of learning, discipline and supervision are maintained. This is an educational function. This was challenged in the State of California a number of years ago, as to whether driver education belonged in the high school curriculum. The School Board in L.A. was about to toss it out, but instead they held a meeting and they decided to turn this over to their research bureau in the school system, out

of the hands of everyone who might be influenced to change the final result. And in a survey where they went around through the community and questioned taxpayers, voters, parents, students and so on, that were immediately concerned with this problem, they found out that there was an overwhelming majority said, "Yes, driver education belongs in our school system," and then the critical question came up: You agree that it belongs in our school system, are you willing to pay an extra tax for this? Amazingly enough, a greater number of people said, yes, they were willing to pay a tax. This is available from California.

Driver education taught by a college-educated individual means that our future citizens and leaders will be exposed to the very best opportunity to learn. No driver education teacher can wholly rely upon a driver education course alone to guide, to teach, to help, and to convince the students under him. With a rich background of psychology, history, science, english and so on, a high school teacher is soon able to gain the respect and confidence of his students, a must for teaching, and he can share so much more with these students.

What have I been stressing? I have been stressing a quality program, a program meeting educational standards, supervisory standards, time standards, and being taught by a fully-qualified teacher who has been educated to teach

others. I have been talking about the importance of having a very good program.

We are more interested in getting a quality course and program start than getting a large number of students to be involved in a half-baked course; we want a quality course for all eligible students.

Where high school education has been criticized, where the record doesn't really look good, we usually find that the driver education program has been of poor quality and has never really been given a chance, meaning that probably less than half of the students available or eligible are given a course. When driver education meets the recommendations of the National Commission on Safety Education and more - incidentally the 30 and 6 that we hear so much about is a minimum standard rather than a maximum. At the last Conference, it came quite near to being that this would be raised to 60 or 90 hours in the classroom. In fact, the State of West Virginia now has a standard of 90 hours in the classroom, meaning the course would meet at least five times a week. Teachers who are really dedicated to this course find that 30 hours is not really enough to do the job as they would like to do it.

In answer to the age-old question that has haunted us in driver education, the question being, "What is the scientific proof of the value of driver education," let me



quote briefly from a letter that Dr. Walter A. Cutter, the Director of the Center for Safety Education, wrote to a Congressman in this regard and as was recorded in the Congressional Record recently. I quote:

"The statement is made in many forms that there is no scientific proof of the value of driver education. This is a most remarkable statement and should be answered with another question: What scientific proof exists for the value of anything that purports to deal with human behavior? In the realm of the professions, the crafts, and even the trades, what is done? The content of knowledge is taught, essential skills are taught and at given periods in educational process we test to see whether knowledge and skills have been sufficiently mastered to pass a student. But who demands proof that this knowledge and skill will maintain themselves for ever after? Who asks for proof that all doctors will practice medicine effectively or pharmacists or lawyers? Patients die. Do we automatically strike the doctor off the register or the pharmacist? The lawyers lose cases. When they do, do we immediately ask for disbarment and soon? What objectively-obtained scientific evidence can be secured to prove the value of any kind of education? By value do we mean the professors of medicine, law and so on will always teach their best, that their students will steadfastly learn their best and the majority of learners will ever after

do their best? And when we had the modifier scientific, which means that following the same research procedures, the same proof could be obtained by any competent student at any time at any place, the whole concept collapses. As Burlson and Steiner state in 'Human Behavior, an Inventory of Scientific Findings,' for nothing is true in the behavioural sciences or in life under certain circumstances."

If we were to ask for the proof of any other course in our high school curriculum, scientific proof that has been asked of us, I am afraid we would find many of our courses could not be justified in our curriculum and we are not asking for this because we do believe that these courses belong there because they are doing good.

If education as a whole is not effective in meeting the needs of our citizens, then we are wasting billions of dollars and hours and hours of time and careers of men. No, I happen to believe in the effectiveness of education and so do you or your children wouldn't be going to school. We wouldn't have legislation making them go to school. We wouldn't have all the fine facilities we do in this country. We believe in education.

I happen to especially believe in driver education. The benefits are numerous. We have better citizens, informed citizens. We have safe drivers and safe pedestrians. We have educated and informed voters and most importantly of all, we

have citizens who are alive.

In closing, let me stress the importance of what you are considering here with this true story. A mother who was very much concerned about her son going into the Army wrote to the Commanding General asking him what she might do as a parent to better insure his returning to her after his service with the Army. The General took time out from his busy routine to write her a letter in which he said, "We'll do all we can to train him to live and to survive what he has to do in the Army. The best thing you can do as a parent is to see that your son gets a good quality course in high school driver education."

Thank you.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Mr. Toth, how would you insure that the moneys invested in the course or the requirement for the courses would result in a high quality course that you demand?

MR. TOTH: I would like to see this come through the State Department of Education as any other course, to make sure that the administrators of the course on the local level are very much aware of what the requirements are and how they must adhere to these requirements. In other words, they do have requirements in other courses. They must meet so many hours a week. They must meet certain State requirements. These requirements must be made very clear and very exacting

to the local administrator and they should fit under the aegis of this man so that he will supervise them as such. Now we know that in some states - take the State of Utah where at the end of every year for moneys received by the state the local superintendent or the local officials must certify that they have met all state requirements in hours and the quality of instructors and so on. Then they insure this even further by having it taken to a notary public to certify this. The main point is to have it come under your State Department of Education.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Well, suppose the State Department of Education says you have 20 hours of classroom and 6 behind the wheel. Now that is setting out a time factor.

MR. TOTH: Well, they would have to have some justification for this and what research we do have --

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I mean by that, you can have 20 hours of instruction and it can be good or it can be bad. How do you insure that it is good?

MR. TOTH: Well, one thing is you may insure that you have certain certification standards for your teacher. In other words, your teacher should not be - with all due respects to retired people - somebody who is retired from another discipline and suddenly says, "Well, I'm going to start teaching someone to drive. After all, I have driven 20 years without an accident." Insuring a quality teacher

is the first step.

Now, of course, we have no assurance ever that any teacher is going to do a tremendous job in the classroom. But we will expose him on the college level to the various techniques, the methods, the materials and courses.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: How about course content?

MR. TOTH: This has been pretty well set up at present. But in relation to the remark that you made previously about research, I don't think we can sit on our hands alone. I think the continuous research that has been going on on the national level and even on our State level and research that can be conducted by the individual teacher, himself, should be continuously inserted into our classes so we don't have the 1960 course or even in 1967, we do not teach the '66 course. Any teacher that teaches the same course over year in and year out has been left by the wayside because this thing is a changing experience.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Would you leave the course content, text and structure of the course to the local boards of education or would you have them handled by the State Department of Education?

MR. TOTH: I believe that you must have, let's say, a structure that may be set or recommended by the State Education Department, but with enough freedom that the local board can move in and out of this without being restricted to exactly

fourteen minutes on stopping distances.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I see what you mean. Well, you have both sides going there, Mr. Toth. The question is: What do you do to insure that the moneys you invest in this course don't as you, I believe, said earlier wind up in half-baked courses?

MR. TOTH: Well, this again gets back to the individual teacher and your superintendent, your principal and these people on your local level who take these moneys and spend them.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Well, would you be satisfied if the State of New Jersey spent two, three, four or five million dollars to foster driver education in hope that the school superintendents and the local boards would have a good course or would you have some mechanism to insure it?

MR. TOTH: Quite definitely the State Education Department would have control of this as they do with other courses and other moneys that are spent down there.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: They don't have great control in other courses. They prescribe hours and they consult.

MR. TOTH: What has been the experience in those, sir?

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: The experience has been good, generally good.

MR. TOTH: Then I would have no great fear that it would not be good in driver education. But the point is, you

need somebody from the State Education Department that is going to get into a car and go down to these schools, go down and check their schedules and work with the local superintendents and local teachers, and make periodic visits to these schools and give them the assistance and the supervision and anything else that they need to make a good course and I am not talking about a "dirty shirt" supervision where you are on the guy's back all the time. But I am talking about diplomatic supervision, diplomatic rapport with the local people. But if you don't have a good man at the state level and a decent staff, then this one man is run ragged all over the state trying to help and to push the course forward in the state. I believe in a strong man from the State Department to go out and to be able to go on the road and do this, and I concur with Dr. Stack when I say to get this type of person you are going to have to make the job attractive enough for him to go out and do the job.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you.

MR. TOTH: Thank you, sir.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: The Director of Motor Vehicles, Miss June Strelecki.

J U N E     S T R E L E C K I:     Thank you, Senator. I appreciate your taking me now and I apologize for being late.





would be even younger. Section 5, lines 3 and 4, also refers to "tests of physical ability required for the issuance of a special learner's permit." There is no such requirement in R.S. 39:3-13.1. Now we would, of course, have no objection to 16 year olds participating in the classroom portion of the driver education program, but we do object to their participating in the "behind the wheel" portion before they have attained the age of 16 years and 6 months.

Now we have rewritten that section as we feel it should be amended, and, if I may, without reading it, I will submit a copy of it to you.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: That would be helpful. Thank you.

(Following is Section 5 of S175 as Miss Strelecki would like to see it amended)

5. The course maintained in each school shall be open to every pupil who is [between the ages of 16 and 19] not less than 16 nor more than 19 years of age or who is regularly enrolled in the eleventh grade therein, provided however that the portion of the driver education course involving training in the actual driving of a motor vehicle be available only to persons who are over 16 years and 6 months of age and who qualify [is able to pass the tests of physical ability required] for the issuance of a special learner's permit provided for by Chapter 7 of the laws of 1951, without the payment of any fee and in addition thereto the board of education of a district or the governing body of any school shall be entitled to admit to such course any person of such suitable age [and

physical ability], who would be eligible for attendance at such school at the secondary level or who resides within a reasonable distance of the place at which such course is to be given and any such public or private school shall be entitled to charge a fee for the giving of such course, to any person not otherwise a pupil in such school, calculated upon the basis of the difference of the cost to the school of the giving of the course per person less such amount as shall be paid by the state to the school for the giving of the same.

Another area, to which we would ask you give some consideration is the area of financing. We would recommend that the Division of Budget and Accounting undertake a cost study of existing driver education programs so that actual costs can be clearly established. Thus, figures would be available to determine whether in fact it is necessary at this time to provide for an increase in the driver license fee. In making this re-determination, we feel one thing that should be considered is the fact that New Jersey now has a broad base tax and the other thing to be considered is the possibility that federal funds may be available for such a program.

We would therefore recommend that the sections of the bill which refer to an increase in the driver license fees be reconsidered.

We would close by saying that we strongly support legislation which would provide for compulsory driver education with the thought that it would most certainly

provide a large portion of our newly-licensed drivers with an excellent training program prior to the obtaining of their initial driver licenses, and enable us to comply fully with anticipated future federal standards.

(Miss Strelecki submitted a recommendation that Section 7 of S175 be amended to read as follows)

7. There is hereby established the State Motor Vehicle Driver Education fund into which shall shall be paid annually, the sum of [\$1.00 for each yearly license and \$3.00 for each 3 year license issued by the state to operate a motor vehicle upon the highways of the state] \$28.00 for each pupil certified by the Department of Education to the Division of Budget and Accounting in the Department of the Treasury to be enrolled in an approved driver education course or so much thereof as shall be appropriated by the Legislature for such purpose together with such other sums, if any, as may be so appropriated by the Legislature.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Miss Strelecki, how would you insure that the funds that the State gives to the local school districts would be well spent? Now let me review the fact that the bills themselves give the Director some important power as the payments are made to the school districts only under authorization.

MISS STRELECKI: Right.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: How would you insure that the courses are the best available and well taught and so on?

MISS STRELECKI: Well, I would think that it would be the responsibility of the Division to make periodic checks of the programs as they are being given. We, of course, have

training programs for our own officers who administer the tests and we are going into more extensive training programs for them. So I would think that if we went into a program of compulsory driver education under the terms as outlined in the present bill, within the department there would have to be set up a special program for continually examining the programs which are being given in order to determine that they are, not only adequate, but superior.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: To come to issue with this problem, would you leave the selection of course materials and study to the local school district or would you have a standardization or supervision process?

MISS STRELECKI: When you say "to the local school district," in other words, just permit every school district to give the course as they see fit --

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Yes.

MISS STRELECKI: -- without any standardization at all?

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Yes.

MISS STRELECKI: Well, I would think that some standardization would be required. I don't think that everything within the course would have to be standardized. But I think that certain minimum standards would be required.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I don't know, Miss Strelecki, if you were here a little earlier when we were discussing research

and development and the question of whether there should be within the compass of the bills a required process of continual research and development of the courses to make sure that we stay up to date. It was implied in what you had to say formally. But would you recommend or would you consider that there should be an allocation of funds or a system for insuring that the courses are reevaluated as time runs?

MISS STRELECKI: I don't know whether it would be required in the bill, but I would think that anybody who was responsible for supervising such a program would see to it that there was a continuing program of research and development. You know that within the Division you are constantly working with research and development and I think as part of the over-all process within the Division you would get such a program. You know we have been authorized now to hire a psychologist, for example, who will be working with all of the Division programs and this, of course, would be one of the areas with which the staff psychologist would be working.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much, Miss Strelecki.

Dr. Hipp.

D R. F R E D E R I C K L. H I P P: Senator Parsekian, you have my statement there. I have been encouraged

by a number of things that have been said here that cover some of the points in our statement.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Yes, I specifically had read the statement so I asked some questions to go to an issue you raised because the people who testified didn't have the opportunity to read it, of course.

DR. HIPPE: Would you like to have me read it?

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Yes, I would appreciate it.

DR. HIPPE: The New Jersey Education Association is vitally interested in seeing the expansion and improvement of driver education opportunities in the schools of New Jersey. However, we regret that the pending legislation attempts to do so in a manner that makes it necessary for us today to appear without enthusiasm.

There seems to be little question that the driving habits of today's teenage generation still leave much to be desired. Insurance rates, based on age group experience, are all the testimony we need that young people below the age of 25 are responsible for an extremely disproportionate share of the automobile accidents and fatalities which occur each year. We believe that adults, too, will benefit if they have the opportunity to take advantage of a good driver education course when young.

In an age where the automobile has become the principal means of transportation for our population, it is essential

that young people have provided as part of their education - preferably as part of their formal public schooling - training in driving skill and attitude development for safe and courteous behavior on the road. It may even be said that such driver education has become as essential as instruction in reading, writing, mathematics, the sciences, history, geography, the arts, and vocational preparation.

However, the first defect we find in the approach suggested in these bills is the provision for the State to establish a "standardized program" in driver education, and incidentally I was encouraged by what you said at the outset, Senator, because I think that takes care of this objection if the bill is amended accordingly. It is not our tradition, nor our present practice in any other field, to have the State Department of Education prescribe courses of study for local schools. They are free, as they should be, to evaluate their own needs, outline their own curriculums, and develop lessons in the manner thought most effective by the educational staff of the system. What few minimum requirements we do prescribe, such as requirements for physical education and the teaching of American History, determine the time that shall be expended. They do not rule on program content and methods. It has been the practice of our Department of Education to provide consultants who advise and counsel on local program development. But the decisions are left to the local school faculties and

boards of education. The encouragement that State Department of Education consultants have given to the expansion and improvement of driver education courses is to be applauded, but imposition by them of a "standardized program" in driver education would set a precedent that could spell the end for experimentation, innovation, and local variation in other school subjects.

The bills themselves already set limitations that would be overly restrictive. Any "standardization" of courses by State officials would only compound these. For example, the bill specified "classroom and behind-the-wheel" driver training. Since the requirement of purchasing and servicing complete automobiles becomes a major item of expense, some school systems have used mechanical trainers that have proven effective and far less expensive for mass teaching of behind-the-wheel techniques. The bill also prescribes that the instruction be given to children between the ages of 16 and 19 or in the eleventh grade. Some school experiments have indicated that the important attitude considerations can be developed more effectively at an earlier age. Instruction in junior high school might, in some school systems, prove to be more desirable. But it is not for us to declare that one method is necessarily deficient or preferred over another. What we say is that the decision can best be determined locally rather than through a State



mandate.

This bill would grant \$28 per pupil in State aid. School administrators tell us that this will not cover even half the expense for such a program.

Our School Finance Committee recommends that these proposals before us today be revised to provide 100 per cent state financing of any mandatory driver education program. We would support an increase in the driver license fee to support such a program. We would also respectfully call to your attention the possibility of securing federal funds under the Highway Safety Act of 1966, and you, of course, mentioned that.

The NJEA School Finance Committee made a study of actual costs of driver education programs in 1964. At that time the average cost was estimated at \$70 per pupil. Salary increases since 1964 would raise the average cost to almost \$80 per pupil in 1967. We object to having local property owners pay the bulk of this cost, which is the difference between \$80 and \$28. At the same time the legislation creates the impression that the \$1.00 fee increase will pay for the entire program. Actually it would finance only about one-third of the cost. The 1964 study revealed that the \$1.00 would provide more State revenue than would be required to pay for a \$28 program during the first few years.

Another defect in the bill is the unreasonable system

of coercion used to force local school districts to participate in this program - to pay from their own funds at least half the cost of eleventh grade behind-the-wheel driver education courses even though they might have devised quite different methods to produce responsible future drivers. We refer to the establishment of an age 19 limit on those without a driver course who will be admitted to licensing examinations after July 1, 1969. We can hear the pleas from parents of 17 and 18 year olds at board of education meetings. We would prefer to have them request driver education because of its inherent benefits, not because it is the only way their youngsters can obtain a license.

We are particularly distressed when we hear it argued that this will help reduce the number of school dropouts. Forcing a dropout back into a school when there is no improvement in programs tailored to his needs will probably do more harm than good. A student who is in school only to "pass" the driver education course is one that most teachers would prefer to do without. Give us the means to offer him a comprehensive program of realistic vocational preparation, a complete sequence of guidance and social readjustment, and we will produce a worthy member of society. But please do not make driver education the main focus of his attention and reason for being in school.

We look forward to the day when it will be possible for all New Jersey school districts to offer effective driver

education programs. Improving general aid to these districts as has been done in the past year, incidentally, will greatly increase the willingness of voters to approve school budgets which include funds for driver education programs.

But again let us avoid the dangerous precedent of "State standardization," and of unreasonable coercion for local compliance. We ask that you amend S 174 and S 175 in accordance with our suggestions because we would very much like to support this legislation.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Dr. Hipp, if the entire cost is to be borne by the State and the local school district doesn't put up a dollar of it, how do you insure, human nature being what it is, that the courses will be the best available and that they will be somewhat zealous in insuring that the courses are the best available?

DR. HIPPI: Oh, I don't know. I don't know what you mean by "human nature being what it is." You have had Federal programs given to local communities where they didn't match anything. They were very good programs. Because of the value of the programs, people were interested in them. I think what we would like to see - if you have 100 per cent state financing, it would really move fast and we believe it would move well and they couldn't have these programs unless they meet the minimum standards.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: What minimum standards?

DR. HIPPI: Minimum standards that would be established by the State for any curriculum.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Oh, then I must have misunderstood your testimony. Are you saying that the State should provide minimum standards?

DR. HIPPI: They should provide minimum standards, but they wouldn't provide a standardized course.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I see. Then we are not too far apart.

DR. HIPPI: No. The usual procedure is that the local school district develops a curriculum in any field. It submits it to the State Department and then the Department either approves or disapproves it.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Let's explore that a little further because it is so important. Are minimum standards this, that you shall give instruction for x hours in a classroom and y hours behind the wheel or do minimum standards go further than that?

DR. HIPPI: Well, that's about it and even then, I think you would have to watch it very carefully to see if you set a time where that was the proper thing --

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: What concerns me is that if we pay \$28 to \$80 a pupil, which is a lot of money for these courses, and then we say, "They will have to have," for arguments sake, "twenty hours," and I don't take that as the

Bible, a pronouncement, "and six hours behind the wheel," isn't it conceivable that in some cases that time would be put in, but it wouldn't be in tune with the best quality available for the same cost? How do you lick that problem?

DR. HIPPI: Well, I think you would find variations now in instruction all over the State and it depends upon the leadership that is given, the education that is available, the ideas that are exchanged and the quality of teaching.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Would you leave it to that risk?

DR. HIPPI: Why we do now and I think it works very well.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: But the local people pay part of that tab so they have a very zealous interest in how that money is spent and whether the quality is high.

DR. HIPPI: Well, the most important interest is whether driver education saves lives and it is certainly as deep as any other subject.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: My point is, when we do this in curriculum for History and English and so on, the parents involved, the local businessmen involved who have a strong say on courses and so on, are paying for the major share or a major share of the cost of the program so you have a built-in interest that the best quality comes out of the effort and the expenditure. But if all of the moneys come from an

outside source, you don't have that same self-interest at work.

DR. HIPPI: Actually most people wouldn't know whether it was State supported or locally supported in actual fact. They would be interested in whether their children were getting a good driver education and course. And I believe the teachers would hear very fast and the school system would hear very fast if the course were a poor one or if the teaching were shoddy. Just like any other subject, most people now do not really know the technicalities of how schools are financed.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Well, they vote on those budgets and they express their views pretty strongly.

DR. HIPPI: Most of them wouldn't know when they were voting on those budgets whether they were voting for driver education or voting for American History.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: One other point on the compulsory nature of the course - how would you engineer the law other than the way it is done here, and incidentally paralleled in most other states, which says if you take the course, you get your license at 17 and, if you don't, you get it at 19? Well, that is the compelling reason why they take the course. If it is completely voluntary, don't we run the risk that we will have the same percentages as today or perhaps a little higher that offer and take the course?

DR. HIPPI: I didn't mean that the program should be

voluntary - you would mandate driver education and, therefore, the State pays it --

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I see.

DR. HIPPI: -- but that the curriculum would be subject to variation because of any local ideas that might be contributed to it.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: So you would mandate the requirements of the course.

DR. HIPPI: Sure, that would be all right. That is the main reason that we ask then that the State pay for it because the State mandates it.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: In other words, you mandate it under your theory, but you eliminate this 19 - 17 business.

DR. HIPPI: You lower it until you get the program started because what you will have - you will have an influx of 19 year-olds that very likely most of these programs would find great difficulty taking care of. They won't have the teachers.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: How about the dropout problem? Would you suggest as a possibility that dropouts be permitted to take courses with private commercial driving schools if they are standardized in some way or minimum standards are set up?

DR. HIPPI: That is done in other fields. If the qualifications were as rigid for them as they are for the

public schools, that could be very possible. The other thing is that the dropouts could come back for instruction at a time when they could take it, for example, on Saturdays or in the summer, until they could get it, and I think you will find that it could happen in some cases where a person was an early graduate of a high school, maybe at age 16, that they couldn't take their driver's test. They might have gone off to college some place and provision would have to be made for them to take a driver education program on Saturdays or during the summer or at some other time when they could do it.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much.

DR. HIPPEL: Thank you.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: We have two people here from out of state who have train schedules to meet and I am going to call them out of turn. Judge Edgar P. Silver, Municipal Court Judge of Baltimore, former Member of the Maryland Legislature and sponsor of Maryland's Driver Education Law. Thank you for coming.

J U D G E     E D G A R     P.     S I L V E R: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Now as I recall it, we have met years ago.

JUDGE SILVER: If my memory serves me correctly,



I came to New Jersey when you were Motor Vehicle Director to look over your inspection system.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: You are not in the Legislature now?

JUDGE SILVER: I was appointed Judge two years ago in Municipal Court. I was a member of the Legislature and was Chairman of the Motor Vehicle Committee of the Maryland General Assembly.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: You were in the Assembly when Mr. Jule was Motor Vehicle Director.

JUDGE SILVER: Mr. Jule is now our permanent Motor Vehicle Director and Mr. Jule is now the President of the Motor Vehicle Administrators of America. Because of his tenure, he has been able to stay through the years and develop his programs. That was the bill I sponsored, of which I am proud.

I might say at the time we came up, we felt your inspection system was one of the model-type systemsthat should be looked at. Although Maryland has a garage-type system, I guess with the Federal bill, we will have to get in line with the State of New Jersey.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: We will be glad to have you.

JUDGE SILVER: I appreciate your invitation to come up here. In 1959 I sponsored the bill on driver education in Maryland. It is a non-compulsory bill. It spells out

funds to be given to the State Board of Education to be distributed to the various subdivisions that wanted to participate in the program. We increased our learner's license fee and left the regular driver's fee alone. We raised the learner's license fee from one dollar to five dollars and earmarked the four dollars to be put into a fund known as the Driver Education Fund. I think the program is going along very well.

In the past session, the General Assembly took a further step, to raise the driving age to 18, from 16 to 18, our minimum age being 16 in Maryland, with a proviso that you must have at least 30 hours of classroom instruction before you can get your driver's license. I was not a member of the General Assembly when this bill was passed, but I have with me today, and I would like to recognize at this time, the Speaker of the Maryland General Assembly, the Honorable Marvin Mandell. Although he did not sponsor the bill, he has a great interest in the subject matter and he encouraged me and helped me at the time the original bill was passed. He took time to come up with me this morning. He is going right back to Maryland. The intent of the latest bill, of course, is the classroom phase of it, which can be given in the school without disrupting in any way, shape or form the curriculum problems that are existing.

Our present Superintendent of Schools in the State

of Maryland was a former Superintendent of the County of Frederick in the state and he told me at the time there was a problem on the "behind the wheel" phase as far as scheduling it was concerned, he insisted his high school principals give the "behind the wheel" during the summer months and in the County of Frederick you can only get "behind the wheel" in the summer months. You get your classroom work during the school year. I imagine the theory is that the teacher, being in the school, can teach as many as the room will hold in the classroom phase. With the "behind the wheel" he is limited to several students at a time and that takes up most of his time.

I want to say at the outset also that I am in favor of your bill 100 per cent with certain modifications that I have heard from your educators speaking before me, and there is no question about the fact that no one should teach another person to drive unless the particular person is a professional teacher. I am completely opposed - as a legislator I was and I am even more so as a judge sitting in the traffic court in Baltimore - to anyone teaching another person to drive when they, themselves, have never had any professional teaching background.

Today it is quite possible that in the adult program an individual could have been convicted several times of drunken driving and some major motor vehicle violations, yet

that same individual as long as he has a valid driver's license can teach one of his relatives or friends to drive. I think that is the thing behind driver education and that is to try once and for all to do away with that type of individual teaching all their bad habits to the learner. We had a case in Maryland which our Superintendent of State Police vividly brought to the attention of the General Assembly of an individual who got a driver's license and only had it for five days, but it was a valid driver's license. He then decided to teach his mother how to drive a car, he, himself, having had only five days of driving experience, and it resulted in a fatality on our highways, the car being driven off of a bridge in one of the suburban areas of the state. This points out the importance of having a professional person teach someone how to drive.

In the State of Maryland, our Motor Vehicle Department and the State Department of Education work closely together. The administrator of driver education in the State of Maryland is also the head of our school transportation system, the school bus system, and it is a full-time job just in doing that. He works very closely with Commissioner Jule in developing the programs and, under the new bill that was passed, the curriculum for the classroom phase of it. It is a combined effort of the Motor Vehicle Department and the State Department of Education and I am authorized to say, after speaking to

Commissioner Jule, that he feels that the classroom phase of driver education should definitely be conducted by a full-fledged teacher, one who has been accredited as a school teacher, and in many instances in our state also teaches another subject. The behind-the-wheel instructor could possibly be in many instances an individual who has been certified and approved by the Motor Vehicle Department.

We have a good law in Maryland - and I know you do in Jersey - with regard to persons who are professional teachers in the behind-the-wheel phase of it. It has been working out fairly well. There has been a very tight hold by the Motor Vehicle Department on individuals going into this particular field and I think that it has worked well.

I believe the time has come, with the Federal government now stepping into this picture, that no one will be able to teach another person how to drive, whether a teenager or adult, unless they have some professional background. In fact, I can visualize in the not too distant future a time when the teaching of someone to drive by a relative or friend will be a thing of the past. I think that is probably the motive behind all these driver education bills. I know it was my motive and I don't think we should discriminate by just limiting it to youngsters. I think the time should come when everybody who gets a driver's license should have driver education. I want to point out at this

time that the adult - and there are more people learning to drive as adults than as teenagers - is the great goal we should be moving toward. Almost every family today is a two-car or three-car family. The housewife is now a driver, but the housewife who is given the duty and responsibility to take the youngsters - and today we are living in a car-pool age - is a driver who in many, many instances has not had good driving training. I would say that the importance now being placed upon the youngsters should also be placed in some instances when it can be on the adults.

I would be glad to answer any questions you have, Senator, on this subject and I am not an educator. I am a man who was, like yourself, a legislator and now a member of the bench. But driver education and all related motor vehicle bills in the past 15 years in Maryland have been given my closest attention because I think that the highway problem, the safety problem, is one of the great tragedies in the country.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Judge, I know of your background in this field, of course, through my former association which we have talked about.

JUDGE SILVER: I might say at this point I used to campaign for re-election on this issue alone and never was defeated. So it is always good to be for highway safety.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Tell me, in Maryland where you have a program of high school driver education that is broad, does

it include the parochial as well as public schools?

JUDGE SILVER: Parochial schools do not get funds from the State Board. They may be working out some programs in instances. I think I remember that one Catholic school had a contract with a licensed professional driving school and they were teaching their youngsters that way.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: On the high school dropout problem, do you happen to know how they are currently solving it? You may not be up on it recently, but do you know if they use commercial driving schools?

JUDGE SILVER: Yes. They cannot come back in the high school. We have - I shouldn't speak as an educator - but the Department of Education would, I imagine, have a real problem providing for dropouts that come back to school just to learn how to drive. We supplement that in the State of Maryland with private schools who have standard courses.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Your commercial driving schools can give this course and it is accepted?

JUDGE SILVER: The latest bill passed provided it must be in an approved school, in either a public or private driving school. You use the word "commercial." I like to use the word "professional." I am trying to differentiate between a driving school that is strictly commercial and one that is willing to meet the standards that should be set up for an approved driving school. In most instances, the

dropout would take the classroom phase, which is the only compulsory phase of the Maryland legislation. The classroom phase is given by an accredited teacher who works with the professional driving school. They moon-light. The school teachers moon-light in many other subjects, such as foreign languages. There are many school teachers who teach in the public schools and they work for a private school doing some teaching. My daughter had to get some extra help. She was a little low in Geometry. I had her tutored at home. The tutoring was done by an accredited teacher. He was not in that capacity working for the public school system; he was a teacher doing private work.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Can a student in high school who is not a dropout, one who has matriculated - can he take a course either at school or at a commercial or professional school?

JUDGE SILVER: Under the latest bill passed?

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Whatever your system is.

JUDGE SILVER: We don't have a compulsory 16 - 18. It will not take effect until July 1 of this year. The only compulsory phase will be the classroom phase of it. He can take it as long as the curriculum that that school offers has been approved by the State Board of Education.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: He has a choice of taking it at high school or --



JUDGE SILVER: -- at an approved - I use the word "approved" private school. It must be approved, its curriculum worked out on a joint basis between the Motor Vehicle Department and the State Board of Education. In fact, I don't see how you can completely allow this subject to be in either state agency, the Board of Education alone or the Motor Vehicle Department. It must be a joint venture. It is education, but at the same time it is a motor vehicle subject. You get licensed at the Motor Vehicle Department. I notice that your Commissioner now talks about psychologists being on the staff today. The Motor Vehicle Departments are starting to leave the "antique carriage" and stepping in line with some of the modern techniques, the way it should be.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Judge, you have with you Marvin Mandell who is Speaker of the Maryland Assembly. We are very grateful he came along. Does he have a statement he wishes to make?

JUDGE SILVER: He is one of the greatest Speakers in the State of Maryland. He never says anything other than exactly what he wants to say. He spoke to me prior to this. We went over some of the things I sponsored. He worked closely with me on the Driver Education Bill. I wanted him to come here to see the General Assembly in New Jersey. I can say, without his coming to the microphone,

I had the help of the Speaker. A lonely delegate or a lonely Senator is helpless without the help of those who mean something in the General Assembly and he is traffic-safety conscious to such a point that he did come up here today because he wanted to hear what was going on with regard to this bill.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much, Judge Silver.

We are running a little behind schedule and I would like to hear everybody that is here. I would hate to have those attending have to come back. We will attempt to limit the testimony to ten minutes, if possible.

We will now have a five-minute recess.

[Five-minute Recess]

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: We would like to cover before the luncheon recess Mr. Stewart Meade, Mr. Paul Selby, Mrs. Lyon and possibly Mr. Hassett and Mr. Max. We will make that attempt. I don't know if we can get all of them in, but we will try.

Before going on, I would like to recall Mr. William J. Toth on one point that we discussed here during the break.

Mr. Toth, we had a discussion about costs during the recess and you mentioned something about your feelings about investment by the person involved in the course. I

wonder if you would put that on the record.

MR. WILLIAM J. TOTH: Yes. One of the points you were making in one of your questions was the fact as to whether the local school people have any investment in this. I happen to be a firm believer that where you have some partial investment or whole investment, you are going to watch and supervise this thing more closely. The way this has been accomplished in some areas where the State is paying 100 per cent of the load, many times there is a slight lab fee, as it is referred to, paid by students that are taking a course and people that have used this claim this is at least an investment by the people who are participating.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: To what extent is that fee?

MR. TOTH: It may run \$5 or \$10. Many times in our schools right now there are lab fees for chemistry or for any other thing to pay the cost of breakage and a number of other things that occur.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much.

C. Stewart Mead, New Jersey Automobile Association and Director of Traffic Safety of that Association.

C H A R L E S     S T E W A R T     M E A D: Mr. Chairman, my name is Charles Stewart Mead. I live in Denville, New Jersey. I am here today to speak on behalf of several organizations in support of State legislation to expand and

improve driver education in New Jersey.

Formerly Director of Driver Education in one of the units of the State University of New York, I have taught driver education for teachers in colleges all over the country. I have taught accident prevention courses for the Army, the Navy, Marine Corps, and helped design a course in accident prevention and efficient vehicle operation for the Post Office Department that reduced the accident experience of the Post Office Department, the rate, from 14.5 to 2.7 in three years.

I am now Director of the Traffic and Safety Department of the New Jersey Automobile Club and Chairman of the Safety Committee of the six New Jersey affiliates of the American Automobile Association, with a membership of some 200,000 New Jersey residents. I am also Director of the Foundation for Safety, Inc., which is supported solely by donations from the members of the New Jersey Auto Club and other interested citizens. In addition, I am Secretary and Treasurer of the New Jersey Driver and Safety Education Association, the professional organization of educators who teach traffic and safety education in the public and private elementary and secondary schools of the State.

I cite this background to show that I represent non-profit civic and service organizations which have no personal, corporate or commercial interest to be served by the

legislation under consideration here today. The objects of these organizations, as spelled out in their charters, are to provide for the benefit of persons interested in motoring and travel, to foster improved traffic and driving conditions for all motorists, and to expand and improve driver and traffic safety education in New Jersey.

In 1936 the New Jersey Auto Club sponsored in Roselle the first driver education course to include instruction at the wheel of the car, and for many years paid out of its members' funds the costs of preparing high school teachers in what was then a new field. Today the AAA continues that cooperation by providing consulting service and guest instructors to teacher preparation institutions in the State.

This discussion of the proposals for legislation in an area of traffic safety comes then from that background of 30 years of work in the field. My own experience in driver and traffic safety education in New Jersey dates from September of 1951.

In relation to the legislation under consideration, it is first desirable to define some terms. The word "professional," for instance, has been mentioned here and will probably be used at other times during the hearing. There are two dictionary definitions; one states, "following an occupation as a means of livelihood or for gain," like a professional golfer or football player. The other applies

to a member of the learned professions like law, medicine or education, which require years of preparation and study for qualification.

"Compulsory" is a term that has been applied to the legislation under consideration here and I think it should be spelled out that the word "compulsory" in this case does not mean a compulsory course in high school; that is, it would not be required for high school graduation. It is intended to be compulsory in so far as obtaining a driver's license at a certain age.

"Standardized program" is another term that has been misinterpreted in some quarters and there has been some discussion here, and I think here it should be defined as "a program meeting or exceeding the standards recommended by the State Department of Education," presumably with the advice and counsel of the Division of Motor Vehicles. Currently these standards, as you know, call for 30 hours of classroom instruction and 6 hours of instruction at the wheel of an automobile, and it is quite likely that the recommendations will increase the time factor. There should be no connotation that the course content and method of instruction are to be dictated by regulation of the Department of Education or by legislation, although the Department should and does provide guidance to school administrators and teachers.

The maintenance of high standards is important.

California recently completed a study showing that they were offering courses of a quality inferior to that recommended by state and national standards, and that the young drivers completing such courses were not doing as good a job of driving as had been hoped for. As a consequence, California is in the process now of improving the quality of its courses and also of its instruction. And improvement of the high school course, of course, requires improvement in the preparation of teachers.

It must be understood here too that the bills under discussion are concerned with public education for the benefit of all citizens and not with private enterprise. Nor do these proposed bills concern solely the young driver.

As a Nation we have built a civilization that requires the use of an automobile. It is extremely unlikely that any of us would live where we now live and work where we are presently employed if a means of personal transportation, the automobile, did not exist. Most of our children will be unable to earn a living without doing some driving each day, and some will depend solely on driving for their own support and later for the support of their families.

They did not ask to be born into a society on wheels. Therefore, it is the responsibility of that society to help them learn to live in the world of traffic we have created for them. And it would be well to bear in mind that

young drivers do not restrict their accidents to their own age group. Thus it becomes a matter of self preservation for each of us to see that young drivers - and I personally would say new drivers of any age, as the gentlemen from Maryland point out - are as well qualified as possible to handle themselves and their cars before we allow them to share with us the inherent hazards our ingenuity has created. We might well begin our improvement in the very early grades.

Incidentally, on that score, I understand that there were some 440,000 new drivers tested in New Jersey last year and somewhere between 25,000 and 30,000 of them had had driver education. So this highlights the problem a little bit.

The Highway Safety Act of 1966 recognizes the need for improvement of all phases of our road-car-driver transportation system that gets most of us to work and back each day, and on which we all depend for personal business and pleasure. Nowhere in the country is the need more vital than in New Jersey, which has the greatest population density and the greatest traffic density of the 50 states. It should not have taken the threat of losing millions of dollars of highway construction funds to stir us to action to improve the quality of driving in our state; but now that the threat is imminent unless we show, as the Act states, "significant expansion and improvement" of our existing driver education program, let us by all means set about providing better



driver education, and more of it, for our young people.

As the Highway Safety Act requires, let's place the supervision of all driver education under the Department of Education so that the necessary high quality of course and instruction may be attained. The item of staff has been brought out before. Let us give the Department of Education the staff to do the job that we will expect of it, with salary levels high enough to attract competent personnel. If the Federal law so requires, and I am not quite sure of the interpretation of that section of the Act, let the Department of Education supervise the commercial driving schools as it now supervises beauty colleges, barber and other schools that are operated for the profit of the owners.

Neither I nor the organizations I represent are greatly concerned with insurance costs and the fact that young drivers who complete the approved high school driver education course may save as much as 15 per cent annually in their insurance premiums. We are glad, though, that the accident records of such young drivers qualify them for the discounts. I learned this week that the insurance companies estimate that a young driver who has not had driver education will pay an extra \$125 between the time he is 17 and 25 in insurance premiums. If there are, as I think there are, 40,000 in public schools alone who are not getting

driver education each year, this means that these kids are paying \$6 million for the privilege of not taking driver education. So the course is more costly if you don't take it than if you do.

To stimulate more young people to enroll in the course, the age difference as established in Senate 174 will serve a purpose. Whether the age spread is one year or two, I think is immaterial.

I haven't mentioned the contribution of the road-car-driver transportation system to the economy of the State. I would like to point out, however, that governmental and business organizations that operate fleets of vehicles find their costs of operation, and their accidents, reduced when they conduct driver education programs for drivers in their employ who are already licensed and experienced.

If business finds driver education profitable, it stands to reason that our highway transportation system will also benefit by such programs. Earlier I mentioned that every citizen has a stake in the driving ability of every other citizen. The increase in the driver license fee called for by Senate 174, if it is determined to be necessary, therefore becomes an investment in self-protection by every driver and should not be considered an expense if the sums so paid are expended to improve driving conditions.

Finally, driver education can improve only one phase

of our three-phase road-car-driver system. But since automobiles don't usually get involved in accidents by themselves, the improvement in accident experience that can be gained by expanding and improving our driver education in New Jersey can be significant to every taxpayer and every user of the highways. Thank you.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you, Mr. Mead.

Mr. Paul Selby, New Jersey Driver Education Association, President.

P A U L     W.     S E L B Y: Mr. Chairman, my name is Paul W. Selby. I am President of the New Jersey Driver and Safety Education Association and a teacher of Driver Education at Cranford High School.

I would like to plead the cause of Driver Education in the high schools for several reasons:

1. I believe sincerely that no other course in our high school curriculum today is more important than driver education. In this course, students are being taught to use their skills today, tomorrow, and for the remainder of their lives.

2. Let us look at the record. While 9.5 per cent of all drivers are under 20 years of age, this group is involved in 14.1 per cent of all accidents resulting in fatalities. The 20 to 24 year age group represents 10.3 per cent

of all drivers but is involved in 17.4 per cent of all such accidents. In other words, this group of drivers under 25, representing 19.8 per cent of our drivers, is responsible for 31.5 per cent of our fatal accidents. This is the worst accident record of any age group, and it will get steadily worse until we make driver education available to every boy and girl prior to the time they are licensed to drive.

Next year more than 80,000 young people will be eligible to apply for drivers licenses in New Jersey. They will be learning to drive and regardless of whether prepared or not, about 95 per cent of them will drive. We must remember that this can affect all drivers and pedestrians. We are as safe as the worst driver on the road allows us to be.

3. High school driver education has proved its worth. Some 33 studies have been made in 23 states comparing the driving records of trained high school students and untrained classmates. The results of these studies indicate rather conclusively that the trained high school students have about one-half as many accidents as the untrained students. Furthermore, a recent study in Lansing, Michigan, showed that young drivers with a driver education background had accident and violation records better than the records of those over 25 years of age. However, the present record of much of our youthful driving population is not very impressive.

Approximately 2 out of 5 are involved in traffic accidents yearly.

What accounts for their poor record? Traffic authorities list the following as some of the leading reasons:

1. Lack of accurate knowledge about driving.
2. Aggressive personality traits.
3. Unsound and immature judgment.
4. Lack of cooperative attitude.
5. Willingness to take risks.
6. Lack of experience, particularly in complex driving situations and emergencies.

If this is true why should we not rule teenage drivers off the road? Such a policy would be unrealistic. Young drivers are going to drive, not only because they want to, but because many of them must. The automobile to American youth is a status symbol, a sign of independence and a sign of maturity. Employment opportunities often depend upon the ability to drive.

It is quite obvious that high school driver education offers the greatest promise since it capitalizes on the peak physical conditions and high interest of young people just prior to their licensing age. In an educational surrounding, it develops the attitudes, skills and understandings required in safe, efficient driving. Most important of all, driver education serves not only this generation of young drivers,

but eventually will raise the level of performance of the entire state and country-wide driving population.

At the present time driver education is not available to all youth. The latest figures released by the Insurance Institute of Highway Safety shows that in New Jersey only about 51 per cent of eligible students are receiving this instruction in approved courses. Most school drop-outs and non-public school students receive no driver education. Provision for these students would be a very strong point in favor of the proposed legislation. Despite driver education's record of life-saving performance, schools are not keeping pace with the teenage explosion. Only an expansion of driver education throughout the State will close the widening gap between youths reaching driving age and those receiving high school driver education.

Does driver education cost or is it a saving? This is an important question. As a result of fewer accidents, savings in dollars and cents accrue to all of us as taxpayers or parents. Paul Blaisdell, director of special activities for the Insurance Information Institute, says that the lack of standard driver education courses in many of the Nation's public high schools is costing American young men, or their parents, millions of dollars each and every year. A country-wide study shows that it costs these young people far more in insurance premiums to be without driver education than the

cost per pupil of a quality course. The average young man who obtains a driver's license without having had driver education in New Jersey will pay an average of \$98 to \$159 in extra automobile liability premiums by the time he reaches 25 years of age.

In other words, the lack of driver education costs from two to five times as much as the cost per pupil of an approved high school course.

Any program which will help to prevent the wanton loss of life, personal injury, human suffering, and property damage will help make New Jersey a better and safer place in which to live. High School Driver Education is such a program and can be made available to every boy and girl prior to the time they reach legal driving age if enough citizens, parents, educators, and legislators take a favorable stand for its support. There is no better time to take this stand than now.

I thank you for affording me the opportunity to appear before you to express my sincere thoughts and beliefs.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you, Mr. Selby.

Mr. Selby, the 51 per cent figure - I take it that is in the public schools only.

MR. SELBY: I believe this is. This is taken from the source that Dr. Stack quoted, the Insurance Institute. I believe, as I say, one very strong point of the proposed

legislation would be provision made for the high school dropout and for the people who are in non-public schools. This is taken care of to a certain extent in some of our communities. In my community, for example, we offer the course during the summer where anyone who is a resident of Cranford is able to take both the behind-the-wheel training and the classroom training, or, if they have had the classroom training in a non-private school, as some of the schools do offer it, they can take the behind-the-wheel. We also do it on Saturdays.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: What about the dropout that might want to take a commercial course? Would you permit that?

MR. SELBY: I have no objection to the commercial school. There certainly is a place for them. Some people accuse us of trying to put the commercial schools out of business. This is far from true. I think, as was mentioned by some other people in their testimony, that if their standards are raised where they are placed under the control and advisement of the Department of Education, this would be perfectly fine.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: For the dropout?

MR. SELBY: Yes.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Those figures you quoted from Mr. Blaisdell of the Insurance Institute, a saving of from



\$9 to \$159 in premiums for a young man's driving life from age 17 to 25 --

MR. SELBY: That's right.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: -- do you have a date on that?

MR. SELBY: Yes, I believe the date on that was 1959 or '60, so the figures would be higher than that now.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I wondered. That sounded familiar to me. Do you know whether an up-to-date estimate is available or where you could get one?

MR. SELBY: I have not seen one; have you, Dr. Stack?

DR. STACK: He has been requested to get that for New Jersey and for New York, but I haven't got the figures yet. It takes time because of the spread. It would be more.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Well, is Mr. Blaisdell now with the Insurance Institute?

DR. STACK: What's that?

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Is Mr. Blaisdell still with the same organization?

DR. STACK: The same organization.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I wonder if he could get it for me?

DR. STACK: He can get it, but it takes time because of the different districts throughout the state and also because of the various types of insurance.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Well, the report I saw was about 1959 or 1960 and it covered every state. It was very comprehensive.

MR. SELBY: I have a copy of that if you would like to have it.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: No, thank you. That I have. Thank you very much, Mr. Selby.

Mrs. Grace Lyon, Past President of the Bergen County Driver Education Association and a member of the Executive Board of the State Driver Education Association, from Ridgewood, I am glad to see.

M R S. G R A C E L Y O N: Mr. Chairman, I am Grace Lyon, head of the Driver Education Department at Ridgewood High School, Past President of the Bergen County Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association, and member of the Executive Committee of the New Jersey Driver and Safety Education Association.

I have taught some form of driver education for 26 years at Ridgewood High School. I have watched this program grow in Bergen County and in the state, as well as in my own school, from a classroom course of 10 lessons to a 30-hour course to the complete course, including 6 hours of behind-the-wheel instruction. For a time there was steady progress, with an increasing number of students being taught each year.

However, recently there has been little progress. Some kind of legislation with state aid is needed in order to make the course available to all students.

In my own school, where we have installed 12 Allstate driving simulators in order to reach more students, and at the same time enrich their learning experience, we are able to give the complete course to just under 50 per cent of our eligible students because of insufficient personnel. Last year, in the state as a whole, we trained 51 per cent of the eligible students.

Naturally, I believe in the importance of driver education. Suddenly everyone has become concerned with traffic safety and I think the general public is ready not only to accept, but to demand, any measures that will improve our traffic situation.

I am not proud of the accident record in Bergen County this year. But I think the Bergen County Grand Jury is to be congratulated for its recent investigation of the traffic situation and the recommendations it made, including "mandatory driver education."

I believe we have reached a point where every person desiring a license should have a complete driver education course. Making this course available to all 17-year-olds would be a logical starting point. Both classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction are vital. Much can be learned in the

classroom and I do not think the present 30 hours is sufficient time for this.

Over a period of 26 years I have observed that the knowledge learned, the habits established, the skills mastered, and the attitudes developed in a high-quality, complete course are worth every bit of the time, energy and money invested in them. I am sure that the students and their parents will agree with this.

Those who are not completely familiar with such a course might find it enlightening to spend some time observing one and interviewing some of the students involved. Even then these people would not be aware of the many indications the teacher has that he is "getting through" to these students. Many people who have driven for years have little knowledge of traffic laws or their application to certain situations, and they also have many bad driving habits of which they are completely unaware. Students are giving their parents a good second-hand course in driver education.

The complete course involves so much more than is evident to the casual observer. The image presented to the public is that of a car seen around town with a teacher and several students. It is assumed that the course consists of learning the skills necessary to handle that car. Little may be known about the many other aspects of this program. I would like to mention a few.

The teacher is much concerned with attitude, for driving skill has little value if not used wisely and with respect for law and consideration for others on the road. We cannot do much in a short time to improve attitudes. However, I firmly believe that in many cases we shape them for the better, and watching this happen is one of the greatest rewards of teaching.

During behind-the-wheel instruction, where one teacher has two, three, or four students in the car, a remarkable rapport develops between members of this group. This is very conducive to shaping attitudes and making the student aware of his responsibilities. The sensitive teacher knows by the special way he is greeted by these students that he has struck a responsive chord, and how many teachers of other subjects get a sincere "thank you" at the end of each lesson!

Even from fairly large classroom courses comes the evidence that you are "reaching" the students - the fiery essays condemning the teenage show-off driver, the lively discussions on the significance and possible outcomes of so-called "minor" violations, the realization of the chain of good will or ill will which can be created by one driver in a particular situation, the boy who tells you that last night at dinner he convinced his father of the importance of using seat belts on the basis of the facts he learned at yesterday's

lesson, the scrap books containing perhaps fifty articles on every phase of the traffic problem, each carefully documented with a personal comment on the significance for traffic safety. These students are learning to be aware of what is going on, to evaluate developments, to understand their responsibilities, and to take their places as informed citizens, as well as learning to become competent drivers.

Extra-curricular activities often develop from driver education classes. For example, last year students in many Bergen County high schools participated in a county-wide survey on "Use of Turn Signals." Through observations made at intersections, they found that 53 per cent of the drivers did not signal properly.

At Ridgewood High School a Traffic Safety Group was formed three years ago. Students work after school hours on all kinds of projects promoting traffic safety. Each year we have a Holiday Safety Campaign and hand out safety tags. The theme for this year's campaign is a result of the turn signal survey and we are aiming to promote better use of directional signals. The Kiwanis Club is cooperating with us by supplying stickers which drivers can place on their instrument panel to remind them to signal properly. Five thousand tags with these stickers are being handed out by students in Ridgewood. I have brought some which I would like to distribute to you.

Parents who know what driver education has to offer are demanding this instruction for their children. In schools where it is not now possible to include all eligible students in the program, because of inadequate facilities or personnel, teachers find it impossible to justify offering instruction to some and having to deny it to others who want and need it.

Every 17-year-old in New Jersey should be given an opportunity to receive the necessary knowledge, to be trained in the proper habits, be taught the necessary skills and be guided in developing desirable attitudes through a driver education course. If we believe that every person has a right to an education, how can we deny 49 per cent of the young people of our state the opportunity to learn about the life and death matter of survival on our streets and highways? Thank you.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Mrs. Lyon, you have had 26 years in this field. What do you think of the feasibility of some discussion of traffic safety in earlier school years?

MRS. LYON: I don't quite understand your question.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Well, the present courses are designed for sixteen and one-half year olds. What do you think of having traffic safety instruction on a short-time basis, an hour or two, in earlier school years in the elementary schools?

MRS. LYON: Yes, I would approve some of this.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Do you know of any such attempts in New Jersey in your experience?

MRS. LYON: No, I don't.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you.

We will try to complete the testimony of two more witnesses before we break at one.

Mr. Edwin Max, New Jersey State Safety Council.

C. E D W I N M A X: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: My name is C. Edwin Max and I am the Administrative Assistant for the New Jersey State Safety Council. Prior to coming with the Council, I was with the American Automobile Association and the State Traffic Safety Council of New York, and during those 16 years, my primary responsibility was in the field of traffic safety. I will try very briefly to review some of the Council's observations concerning driver education in New Jersey.

In '65-'66 some 51 per cent of the public school students completed a course in driver and traffic safety education. Three of our larger cities - Newark, Jersey City, and Trenton - reported very little instruction. Information for non-public schools is limited, but in 1964-'65 reports from 23 states indicated that only about 10 per cent received this instruction. This means that very few students in



non-public schools are receiving the benefit of this vital instruction.

Much of the objection to driver education results from the high cost of instruction. There are two methods of paying instructional costs: one, through the State Foundation Program where states provide funds for their school system. For example, Delaware contributed more than 75 per cent of the schools costs; New Jersey paid for 21.2 per cent, and is one of 20 state which supports its driver and traffic safety education through the foundation method. Now this approach considers the driver and traffic safety education program to be an integral part of the school curriculum and is subject to a wide range of formulae and philosophies which affect its distribution.

The other method is special financial support. This method considers driver and traffic safety education as a special subject in the school curriculum calling for special methods of state financial support. The District of Columbia and 30 states follow this procedure and utilize one of the following methods for acquiring funds: appropriation from the general state funds, vehicle registration fees, driver license and learner's permit fees, or fines from traffic law violations. The seven leading states in the number of students trained utilize special financial support. New Jersey ranks 18th.

The cost of instruction may be reduced through the use of such teaching innovations as simulators, driving ranges and television. New Jersey has few simulators and no ranges. States with special financial support seem to utilize these methods more readily than those using the foundation method.

In 18 states the completion of an approved course is recognized in setting the minimum age of eligibility for the regular driver's license. In 12 states the advantage is two years. In five states it is one year, and in one it is five months. Several other states are considering similar legislation. Michigan attributes its leadership in the number of students taught to this type of legislation. We do not have this type of legislation presently.

The New Jersey State Safety Council would like to stress one point. It recognizes the value of financial support as well as granting an advantage to those who complete the course successfully in obtaining their driver's license at an earlier age, that reaching a greater number of students is important, but a quality program should be the primary requisite. The certification requirements, for example, in New Jersey are low when compared to the rest of the Nation. New Jersey requires three semester hours. The leading states require from nine to eighteen semester hours of preparation.

So in reviewing the recommendations of the Council,

we favor financial support, we favor increasing the minimum licensing age, but providing for a license at age 17 to those completing a course of instruction, and we emphasize upgrading the quality of the program in the State, which would increase teacher certification requirements, revise and standardize - by "standardize," I mean to recommend minimum standards for the course of study as well as utilizing the most effective teaching methods and aids, such as simulators, ranges, and TV and other methods which are proven to be effective.

That, Mr. Chairman, completes my report.

Now I do have some additional information. In fact, I collaborated with Dr. Stack about a year ago on an article in New York, entitled "Why Driver Education is Needed." At that time I researched through the Insurance Information Institute the cost of insurance in Suffolk County. Now the cost of insurance for young drivers is extremely high in Suffolk County. But perhaps this will give us some of the costs that are involved. This is for 1965. It is a little more updated than the other information that we had mentioned. These figures are for liability insurance alone and do not include collision or other optional insurance coverage. If the 15 per cent discount was applied in Suffolk over a nine-year period to age 24, it would mean a potential saving of \$276.75 on liability insurance costs for the family car or

\$420.10 on a car in which the young driver is the owner and principal operator. The saving is even more attractive when you add the potential savings on collision and other coverage subject to the driver education discount.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Just let me get that. It was \$276.75.

MR. MAX: -- on liability insurance costs for the family car.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: And on a youth-owned --

MR. MAX: That is \$420.10.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: That is from age 17 to age 25.

MR. MAX: No. In New York the minimum licensing age is 16. Now Suffolk does have 17 minimum age. I am sorry. It is Nassau that has the 17 minimum. It is 16 in Suffolk to age twenty-five, over a nine-year period.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: It's a lot cheaper than the cost of the course, isn't it?

MR. MAX: It certainly is.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: This question of standardization or standards of courses is coming up all the time. To what extent would you recommend that the State take a hand in the course materials and type of studies?

MR. MAX: We feel that it is extremely important for the State to supervise the driver education program at the secondary level, which would involve standardization of course content - minimum, this is - minimum standards, and that

adequate supervision should be provided.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: You mean supervision by the State?

MR. MAX: By the State, yes.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: And how about this suggestion that there be a research and development unit in continuous operation?

MR. MAX: I feel that this is extremely important. I think that a research and development unit should function and continually revise and upgrade the course content of instruction. I think that perhaps many of us who have been in the field are living in the past and there have been tremendous changes made in the application of driver education. Many of the innovations are not being utilized.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: And many I am sure will develop as we go along.

MR. MAX: Yes.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: What of the idea projected on the recall of Mr. Toth of a fee, a laboratory fee, to be paid by the student? What do you think of that? He was talking about \$5 or \$10.

MR. MAX: This is for --

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I don't know if you caught the testimony. We were talking about costs and the amount of subsidy from the state and so on, and it was suggested by

Mr. Toth that there may be some benefit if the student were charged a "laboratory fee," as is done in chemistry and physics, of \$5 or \$10 for the course.

MR. MAX: I see no objection to this.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Do you see any value?

MR. MAX: It might be very helpful in reducing the over-all cost of the program. I don't know what the exact cost is, but I would estimate that it is somewhere between \$50 and perhaps \$75 or \$80. I mean, this is a variable that is dependent upon the teacher's salary and so on. But I think that one of the drawbacks to the program has been the lack of financial support and perhaps this would be an avenue that could be explored, charging a laboratory fee.

MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: It is against the law. It is plowing an unfertile field.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I am sorry. I would be glad to call you to the stand in a moment. All right?

And has the Council or have you personally given any study to attempts to discuss traffic safety in elementary schools?

MR. MAX: Yes, the Council feels very strongly that safety should be taught on the elementary level. I feel that these are the very important years. They are the formative years, especially as far as safety education is concerned, and

it should be done starting with kindergarten right on through the secondary level. I think this is one area that has been very neglected.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: What of the school dropout, how do you handle it?

MR. MAX: Well, I don't have the answer to that, Senator, but I feel that attention should be focused on the school dropout because the school dropout perhaps would have more need for a program of driver education because he might have to apply himself in earning a living driving a truck.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: That is a very good point.

MR. MAX: I think that the dropout must be considered. The mechanics involved in doing this - perhaps through some of the vocational schools - I don't know specifically, but I feel that this area should be explored and considered in this legislation.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: How about the commercial or professional driving schools?

MR. MAX: I feel that a commercial school, if it is properly licensed and supervised with certain standards, would be desirable for this particular purpose.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: How about the private and parochial schools - have you had any discussions on that?

MR. MAX: Well, this is an area that perhaps could

best be approached by providing the instruction for the youngsters in the public schools. And many states utilize this type of approach to their non-public school eligibles. It does present certain problems from the standpoint of cost and the mechanics of giving the instruction. In many areas it is done during the summer months or after the school day.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much.

MR. MAX: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Now it is one o'clock. We missed having Mr. Hassett testify before we break for lunch. But I would like to call on Mr. John Callery, Principal of the Bordentown Regional High School, who wanted to make a comment as to the laboratory fee idea.

J O H N     C A L L E R Y: I am John Callery, Principal of Bordentown Regional High School, Bordentown, New Jersey.

I just wanted to address my coment to the idea of charging supplemental fees. This is illegal in any phase of school work in the public schools of New Jersey. You probably read in the newspaper last week where Deputy Commissioner Clayton mentioned this fact in connection with such things as the purchase of gym suits, contributions to school trips and things of this type.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Well, they are breaking the law in some towns then because I have been paying for my kids' field trips and, frankly, I will continue to pay. But I



suppose it is handled in some side way.

MR. CALLERY: Yes, it is.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: -- that the school doesn't touch the funds.

MR. CALLERY: We have all been guilty of this.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Maybe they have asbestos gloves when they handle the \$10. At any rate, they get around it. One observation though, if it is the law, the law, of course, can be changed.

Two questions - one, whether that would be an advisable method of offsetting costs or fostering interest by the student in what he is learning if he has to put up the \$10. I got thinking about it as Mr. Toth and I were talking and thought if my child had to pay a \$10 laboratory fee for driver education, I would probably have him earn the \$10 in order to take the course - I guess a lot of parents would - and it might have some benefits in his attitude. What do you think about that feature, the law aside?

MR. CALLERY: Well, it would probably pose a hardship on many children. There are children, of course, of indigent families who can't even afford to participate in the school lunch program without help. I would think this would be restrictive, particularly in our large cities.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: As they say on television, "Would you say one dollar?" But your point is well taken. That

hadn't occurred to me in the primary discussions.

Thank you very much, sir.

We are going to break for lunch. Now we have several more witnesses and I want very much to give everyone the courtesy of being heard today. So let's try to be back in time to start promptly at two o'clock.

[Recess for lunch.]

Afternoon Session

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: John J. Hassett. [No response.]

Ralph J. Jackson, Director, Driver Education Division,  
Allstate Insurance Companies.

R A L P H J. J A C K S O N: Thank you, Senator.

I would like to address myself initially to some parts of the bills as I read them. In Bill 174, Section 1, Lines 4 through 6, two things came out, and that is, that at age 17 in many cases, although the Juniors are usually 17, you will have 17-year-old Seniors, and in this instance you are taking the student who has only one year left in school and saying that he has to fit the driver education program into that particular year or take it at 16 when he is not legally able to drive. This is one of the problems that New Jersey is going to have in accomplishing this law because of the 17 year licensing age.

I am not one of the people who believe that driver education should be used as a way of keeping students from dropping out of schools, but as one of the gentlemen pointed out earlier, those students who drop out are usually those who are going to take jobs which require them to drive so that the exposure that we have to them on the road is very significant.

Section 1, Line 6, provides a two-year setback in

order to allow the schools to gear up and also to allow those youngsters who will later be 19 to take driver education while they are still in school. I think New Jersey is going to run into a little bit of a problem with this one too, and that is, that before we can talk about a good program in the high schools, we have to talk about a good program in the colleges, the teacher preparation of the driver education teachers.

Now earlier one of the witnesses referred to the fact that a Motor Vehicle Department study out in the State of California showed little significant difference between the performance of the driver education students versus the non-driver education students when you were measuring it in terms of violations and accidents, but that the State Driver Education Association and the State Department of Public Instruction out there had already recognized the inadequacy of their program and increased their teaching certification standards from three college credits to twelve college credits and that they were already in the process at the time of that study of upgrading their program. Now next to California, the state that stands out in this country as being sort of ahead of the rest, as the public views them, in driver education, is the State of Michigan. They were the first one to come up with the so-called 18-year-old law, the law which provides that you get your driver's license two years earlier

with driver education. California followed Michigan in this respect, and they followed Michigan's mistake and I hope that the State of New Jersey won't follow both of them in making the same mistake. It was basically this, that they provided a two-year setback, but made no particular provision, no specific provision, for the preparation and certification of the teachers. The result was that just prior to the effective date of the law, both states held crash programs of teacher preparation. They held them on the basis of a single three-college credit course and this resulted in a tremendous number of, let's face it and call it what it really is, poorly prepared teachers. Now these teachers for as long as they stay with the school system will continue to teach under the grandfather clause. The only relief that these states have from this likelihood is that in the Federal standards when they are set, they say that the grandfather clause will not prevail and set some specific set of standards for who will be certified to teach driver education if Federal funds are going to be used. Lacking something like that, they will continue to teach, some of them on the basis of a course that lasted no longer than three days to a week. That is hardly enough to make a professional driver education person out of a teacher.

Now the present standards in the State of New Jersey are the same, a single three-hour course. I don't profess to be

knowledgeable about what is offered in the way of driver education teacher preparation courses in the state. And if I overlooked one that is offered, I am sorry. But it is my understanding that at present the only school which is offering more than the single three-college credit basic driver education course is Montclair State Teachers College.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: You say three hours. You mean three hours per week for a semester?

MR. JACKSON: I meant three credit hours, three college credits.

Now if New Jersey follows Michigan and California into this problem, they can anticipate about the same result, which is better than no driver education, but not as good as the citizens of this state deserve.

In bill 175 - let's see, someone already commented on the gap. That was the Motor Vehicle Director. Miss Strelecki commented that if they did it at pure 16, there would be a six-month gap before they could drive.

This matter of the level of financing - \$28 is low. I don't agree with what has been suggested earlier. Let me say that I would like to suggest another alternate to either 100 per cent support or 50 per cent support, and that is that most of the states in this country right now with three exceptions are those that provide state reimbursement. It is provided on the basis of 100 per cent support, in other words,

all actual costs up to a stated limit of \$30, \$35, \$40, \$45. Now what this does is it helps that school district that is so poor in funds that they just can't come up with the money to start a driver ed program. That is not just confined to the real small towns. It even happened in Chicago. Chicago had such an acute problem of supplying funds for the salaries of teachers in the already-entrenched subjects in their curriculum that Superintendent Benjamin Willis would not permit another subject, in this case, driver education, to be added. And we spent about nine years trying to get driver education as a part of the program in Chicago. It was only when the State Legislature revised the law which provided \$40 reimbursement for those giving the course, to say that it would be \$32 for behind-the-wheel and \$8 for the classroom phase, that the City of Chicago was able to accumulate the starter funds necessary to get the program under way. Their program isn't a great one yet, but at least they are started and they are headed in the right direction. But if they had to come up with even as much as \$10, \$15 or \$20 a student, there wouldn't be a program in Chicago today. And I am afraid this might be true of some of the school districts in New Jersey.

Line 5 of Section 3 in Bill 175, has a very good word that I am sure is not there by accident, and that is that the reimbursement will be on the basis of the number

of students enrolled. Some of the states have made the mistake of saying the number of students that pass the course, and, as you can well imagine, there is a very high rate of passing in those states because you have to pass the student to get the money. This is a good word to hang on to.

On line 7, the word "private" as applied to schools is subject to a great many interpretations around the country and I think it was Dr. Stack suggested some alternate wording to bring that into focus as to just what it was that was really meant there.

I would like to ask for consideration of some elements that are not currently in the bills. One is that there be some financial consideration for the State Supervisors and for local supervision. One of the gentlemen before me referred to the fact that the person responsible for driver education in his state was also responsible for school bus transportation. Frequently they have health and safety education and other subjects assigned to them. This is important enough and it is demanding enough of the man's attention and his energies that it be his sole responsibility and, if some of these funds collected, either through the motor vehicle license or whatever method is devised, were to be devoted to a single-purpose, full-time Supervisor for the supervision of driver education and an adequate staff



it would be most helpful. An adequate staff would mean enough people to get out and be sure that the program is being offered the way you intend it to be given.

There was some discussion earlier about whether or not the curriculum should be dictated or whether just general standards. I think the State would be forgiven if they were a little more specific in the case of driver education than they are in the other subjects. Biology, English, Latin and these other subjects have been in the curriculum a long time. The teacher preparation in the colleges prepares the teachers very well for what is expected of them at the high schools. But our current level of teacher preparation in driver education since it is a new subject is not that well developed and in this state is a single three-credit course. As a result, I think these teachers, to really give the program you intend when you supply reimbursement, will need more supervision, more direction, at least during the initial stages.

I don't like to harp on it, but I keep coming back to this matter of quality. The quality of the teacher's preparation is going to dictate the quality of the course that he gives. I would like to give one example that is tied in to driving simulation which was referred to at one time as a mechanical device that helps in saving money. Fortunately, the National Education Association's definition of simulation

goes way beyond that and nothing should be put into the high school program simply to save money. It has to offer something of value to the students. But in simulation, when you bring into a school system, they frequently look on it as what is going to be the easiest part of the system because here it is with these nice color films and all of this fine equipment and now with this teaching machine, the teacher can relax. Nothing is further from the truth. Simulation as one of the newer techniques in driver education is more demanding of the teacher, more demanding of his personal energy and his preparation, than any other phase of driver education. He has more opportunities per class hour to work with his students and bring points to their attention and work with them on their correction than in any other phase. That even holds true for the on-the-street driving because the simulation films are purposely designed to bring a rapid sequence to the events, all of which are meant to bring a specific teaching lesson. But if you put a poorly prepared teacher in there to run this, then the student is going to have to settle for cents on the dollar for value and I am sure that is not what you had in mind when you went to the work to design these bills.

Thank you very much, Senator. Do you have any questions?

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you, Mr. Jackson. I

appreciate your coming.

MR. JACKSON: You're welcome.

Mr. John Hassett.

J O H N     J.     H A S S E T T: Senator Parsekian, my name is John J. Hassett of Washington, D. C. I am the Washington Representative of the National Professional Driver Education Association with offices at 1629 K Street, N.W. in Washington. At this hearing I am also representing the New Jersey Professional Driver Education Association.

The National Association is composed of several hundred operators of professional driver training schools throughout the United States and Canada. The Association itself is eight years old and has been dedicated to the upgrading and improvement of the professional standards of the commercial driver education business throughout its history. The New Jersey Association was founded in 1952. It is a recognized state-affiliated association with the national organization.

One of the principal activities of our State and National Association has been the encouragement of state legislatures to establish rules and regulations for the licensing and control of driver training schools. We congratulate you, Senator Parsekian, and your Committee for your long-standing interest in this area of traffic safety and education. You may recall that during your term of office

as Director of Motor Vehicles for this State, our State Association asked for stricter regulation and licensing of commercial driver training schools. The Department issued those regulations and we believe they have had a beneficial effect on traffic safety education in New Jersey. About 150 schools in New Jersey and some 527 instructors are now under the regulation of the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Although it isn't generally recognized, the Nation's commercial driver training schools actually educate a substantial number of drivers every year in the operation of motor vehicles. The National Association estimates that approximately 2,000,000 people in the United States learn to drive with the aid of professional driver training schools. In this State, only about 40 per cent of high school students, according to the information we have, now have the opportunity to take driver education in the classroom due to a shortage of school funds. The remaining 60 per cent are trained either by their parents or friends, or by professional driver training schools at the expense of the parents or the youngsters themselves.

Both the National and the New Jersey Associations support the proposed measure, Senate Bill 175, to provide a standardized program of driver education, conducted and administered by the State for public and private schools. We have two observations to make regarding this bill: First,

the State should not exclude the use of commercial driver training schools in administering this program. We believe that parents should have the choice for their youngsters of either the school program or a professional program given at the convenience of the student. We recognize that those parents or students who elect to use professional driver training schools for the education of their youngsters are saving the taxpayers money and are providing a release valve for the overcrowded public school driver training facilities. Furthermore, we believe that, given this choice, many parents and students will select the commercial driving schools.

We do not think it necessary to amend or modify this bill, S 175, to spell out this option. Instead, we will suggest an amendment to the second bill, S 174, which should take care of it.

Our second comment on S 175 is this: The amount of money in this bill, \$28 per pupil for each person enrolled, appears to be inadequate. The cost of high school driver training has been calculated in some states as high as \$80. We have one compilation which tallies the figure at \$67.75 per student. This includes only the wages of the instructor, maintenance, gas and insurance on training cars, which are furnished free by auto manufacturers.

We therefore suggest that this Committee give thought to a study of the actual public cost of driver education in the

public schools and that the funds eventually authorized for such a training program meet the realistic minimums.

A corollary to this is our speculation that the proposed method of obtaining additional monies by raising license fees may not produce sufficient revenue. In Michigan, for example, where compulsory driver education has been in effect for five years, the Driver Licensing Fund in 1965 could not provide the required \$25 per student. The sum of \$21.40 per student was paid by the State, and local taxes had to be levied to make up the balance.

We turn now to Senate Bill 174, which amends Section 39:3 to 10 of the Revised Statutes, raising the driving license age to 19 years, except upon presentation of a certificate that the applicant has completed a course in driver education and has passed such tests as were required. Both the National and the New Jersey Associations are in favor of this bill, with one suggested amendment. We respectfully submit that a small addition be made to the bill on page 1, line 9, after the words "driver education,". We propose the insertion of the following additional language: "or from a professional driving school approved by the State Department of Motor Vehicles,". This amendment will permit broadening of the law to accommodate students who have completed training courses either in the public schools or in licensed, regulated professional driver training schools.

At the present time, in addition to those students who cannot get into the present high school courses, there are many other young people under the age of 19 who must be accommodated in their quest for a driver license and for adequate training to justify licensing. One group we would have to label "drop-outs", either voluntary or involuntary. Many of these so-called "drop-outs" are actually hardship cases - youngsters who must work to support their families and who cannot spare the time to take driver training during the daytime hours. Commercial driver training schools provide facilities for handling cases of this kind at any time, day or night.

The bill as presently written also will not adequately cover students attending private schools, which also are usually handled on an after-hours basis, very often at times and places inconvenient to private school students. Another large group of young people in the State of New Jersey are service men and women. Some may have entered service before learning to drive. Some of these may even have operator's licenses to drive military vehicles, but they cannot drive off the base, since an armed forces license has no standing outside the military reservation. In either case, armed services personnel should have available to them the option of learning the traffic safety laws of this State at a professional driver training school so they can obtain a license to drive

on the roads and streets of New Jersey.

This brief amendment to S 174 will take care of such exceptional situations. Without this amendment, many deserving and perhaps needy young people will be denied licenses, or put to considerable inconvenience to obtain them.

We wish to point out that we are not asking for receipt by professional driver training schools of any public funds. We simply ask that citizens have the option of sending children to public driver education facilities at taxpayers' expense, or sending them to commercial driver training schools at their own expense.

We would like to congratulate you for your foresight and courage in proposing these bills. It takes courage because you are venturing into an area of traffic safety which is likely to be controversial and which may cost many tax dollars. We salute your foresight because we are confident your legislation is headed down the safer road now being charted by the new Federal Highway Safety Administration.

Section 402 of the Federal Highway Safety Act of 1966 provides that each State shall have a highway safety program approved by the Secretary of Transportation which must:

"(E) provide for comprehensive driver training programs, including (1) the initiation of a State



program for driver education in the school systems or for a significant expansion and improvement of such a program already in existence, to be administered by appropriate school officials under the supervision of the Governor as set forth in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph; (2) the training of qualified school instructors and their certification; (3) appropriate regulation of other driver training schools, including licensing of the schools and certification of their instructors; (4) adult driver training programs, and programs for the retraining of selected drivers; and (5) adequate research, development and procurement of practice driving facilities, simulators, and other similar teaching aids for both school and other driver training use."

When Congress passed the historic Highway Safety Act last summer, it made clear its intent that both high school driver education and professional driving training schools should participate in the programs. The House Public Works Committee report on the bill spells this out on page 9 as follows:

"In addition to the driver education courses given in public schools, privately operated commercial driver training schools exist in most States and are controlled by regulation in about half of the States. Obviously, the option for both students and adults to obtain driver training through private means should be available, provided the quality of the training is required to be maintained at a prescribed level."

Within the next two months, proposed Federal highway safety standards will be announced affecting State regulation of commercial and private driver training schools, certification of driver training instructors, recommendations for minimum driver licensing ages and, possibly, requirements of

training prior to licensing.

I was fortunate enough to attend a briefing in Washington last week at which Dr. William J. Haddon, the Federal Highway Safety Administrator, and Mr. Alan Boyd, the Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation, discussed the staffing and operation of the new safety agency. As you know, the agency issued proposed standards for automobile safety on Saturday, December 3rd.

At the briefing on December 6th, Dr. Haddon indicated that proposed standards covering about nine other classifications under the National Highway Safety Act would be forthcoming by February 15th. Our Association has pledged its support for the Federal safety program and is eagerly awaiting release of those standards which may affect our members.

Dr. Haddon also indicated that there are shortcomings in present standards of driver education. In answer to a question, he said, "We don't regard these shortcomings as the basis for turning the program off, but rather as the basis for appropriate research to determine whether course content should maximize our investment. We will devote a fair amount of research dollars for that purpose."

Mr. Chairman, we also feel there is need for improvement in both public and commercial driver education standards. On the commercial side, we would like to see New

Jersey establish a driver educational course requirement for all professional instructors, such as that now in force in New York State.

Now if this Committee wishes, we would be glad to comment further on these bills after the release of the new Federal standards, if they are affected or could be further strengthened in any way.

Thanks to the Federal Act, and to forward-looking bills such as these in New Jersey and in other States, commercial driver education schools are becoming recognized for their quality and acceptability. Within recent months, three underwriting organizations - the National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters, the National Automobile Underwriters Association and the Mutual Insurance Rating Bureau - which are three of the largest groups of underwriters of insurance in the country, have accepted a commercial driving training course as qualifying high school students for a 10 per cent discount on their auto insurance rate. That would also include those up to 25, of course.

The National Safety Council is now working very closely with our Association to set up seminars for driver improvement programs, offering their facilities and staff to members of our Association.

The NPDEA has a standardized nationwide course of behind-the-wheel instruction, which goes far beyond the

license requirements, of course. It includes approximately 32 hours of training, of which about ten or twelve would be considered basic to the obtaining of a license. The others would get them into the specialized or even expert class of drivers. We have our own textbook written by college educators and endorsed by safety leaders. We have dedicated instructors who, at their own expense, have attended out-of-state driver training programs for their own improvement, Excuse me. That is not driver training. That is classroom and behind-the-wheel instructor training programs. They devote their full time to driver education and they know that the driving and safety record of their students is the true measure of their teaching skills.

Our support of these bills is proof that we have no quarrel with high school driver education. We do believe that it is not necessary to have a college degree in order to teach people to drive cars. The Federal Aviation Administration does not require a man to have a college degree to teach people to fly, a much more complicated and demanding process.

Standards for teaching in non-academic, non-public schools do not require college degrees for instructors of art, barbering, beauty culture, real estate, drafting, music or practical nursing, to mention a few. We believe there are plenty of students, young and old, who want to learn to drive and

who should have that opportunity at qualified, regulated institutions of their choice. We also know that more and more states are providing their citizens with this opportunity. Among them are Massachusetts, Maryland, Connecticut and California.

For your consideration, I have brought along copies of the new California State law which goes into effect on July 1, 1967 and which substantially conforms in its intent to what we are proposing for New Jersey. This Act specifically includes commercial driver training schools in its administration of the driver license laws affecting teenagers.

Of particular interest is the last paragraph of this law, which says: "It is the intent of the Legislature by the provisions of this Act to require education and training before licensing. The expressed belief of the Legislature is that highway accidents can and must be reduced through the education and training of drivers prior to licensing."

We echo that intent and we ask your Committee to echo the intent of the legislature of the State of California to require meaningful education and training of prospective drivers before licensing, to broaden the scope of this intent to cover all young people seeking a license, not merely those who may be accommodated by a high school driver

education program, to provide the initiative and impetus toward greater traffic safety by increasing the skills of future drivers of this State and, at the same time, to protect and encourage the system of free enterprise and the spirit of open, honest competition between public and private driver training systems. You will be carrying out your principal responsibility as legislators, to provide for the common good of the citizens you represent. Thank you.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you for a careful presentation.

So in essence, you would support a means of driver education being set up for high school students, asking only that they have the option to take the course at a commercial school if they so desire --

MR. HASSETT: Yes, sir.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: -- and they would have to pay for it themselves. It wouldn't be by State subsidy.

MR. HASSETT: That is correct, sir.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much.

MR. HASSETT: Thank you, sir.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Mr. Eugene J. Fanning, Assistant Registrar, Motor Vehicles, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Thank you for coming all the way from Massachusetts, Mr. Fanning. I appreciate it.

EUGENE J. FANNING: Thank you, Senator, for inviting me. I was very much interested in this meeting this morning and now.

As I understand it, I am to tell of our experiences in Massachusetts with the driver education program, both in the high schools and in the commercial driving schools.

A little bit about my background - I joined the Registry of Motor Vehicles in 1927 as an Inspector of Motor Vehicle Traffic. In 1944, I was promoted to the position of Supervisor of Special Services in charge of the driver education program which had just been started. I was in charge of that program from 1944 to 1963 when I was promoted to the position of Assistant Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

Senator, I would like to first of all offer evidence of the legal authority of the high schools and the commercial schools to give safety education and driver education. Safety education and driver education are authorized under Chapter 71 and Section 13 (d) on page 122 of this book here; and school safety patrols are authorized under the same chapter, Section 48 (a); driver schools are authorized under Chapter 90, Section 32 (g). May I offer this as evidence?

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Yes, sir. Thank you.

MR. FANNING: We have in Massachusetts a total of 251 public high schools. 214 are town or city supported.

37 are regional. We have in addition to that 196 parochial and private high schools. 101 of these are in the Archdiocese of Boston. The Archdiocese of Fall River has 12 high schools; Springfield, 11; and Worcester, 16. There are 56 private - and I suppose I should call them non-denominational private schools in the state. We have in addition to that 19 colleges, non-denominational, and 7 Catholic colleges. In addition, we have 10 state teachers colleges. That is the background of the educational institutions in Massachusetts.

Last year we issued 12,789 driver education certificates to public high schools; 1,671 to regional high schools; parochial high schools, 978; and private schools, 392; evening high schools, 200; college, 1; and summer courses in high schools, 165. We issued through the commercial driving schools over 24,000 certificates. According to the State Department of Education, we have 64,000 eligible students during the year 1964 and '65. 137 public high schools offer a complete course in driver education. 23 regional high schools offer the same course, as do 20 parochial high schools, 7 private schools, 5 evening high schools and 1 college.

In Massachusetts if a school desires to have the students in the driver education course examined for a driver license and they can guarantee us a full day, which would be 18 applicants, we send an inspector to the high



school to conduct the driver license examination and also to conduct the learner's permit examination. Last year we conducted 5,219 learner's permit examinations at high schools. Man-hours performed by examiners was 522; man-days examining, 87; on road tests, we conducted 3,826; man-hours performed by examiners, 1,275; man-days examining, 212 1/2.

On commercial driving schools, we have 316 commercial driver schools licensed. We have 1,624 instructors, licensed instructors, 456 of which are qualified to give classroom instruction also. 218 commercial schools are engaged in the full driver education program. 98 commercial schools are engaged in the limited-participation program. 10 high schools use commercial schools for behind-the-wheel training.

I would like to explain about the limited-participation program. The limited-participation program is where the high schools give the classroom instruction and the driving schools give the driver instruction.

I would like to say a word, if I may, about the situation in Massachusetts. The Registry of Motor Vehicles in 1944 established a driver education section. Prior to that, we had a safety education section. In the safety education section, our men who had been specially trained went from school to school, especially in the elementary levels, and gave lectures on pedestrian safety. The driver education

section, therefore, limited its work to the high schools. When we started, we certified the teachers and we arranged regional conferences for the teachers. We also were instrumental in having the Driver Education Teachers Association, an association of high school driver education teachers, formed.

In 1944, we asked a group of educators to meet with officials from the Motor Vehicle Department and we published an outline of a course of study. This was regularly updated until 1959. At that time, the Department of Education appointed a coordinator of driver education for public high schools.

I want to say that I was very much impressed with what Dr. Stack said this morning about hiring a good supervisor, a man who knows his business. The man that was appointed in Massachusetts had recently completed a driver education course for teachers. He had never taught the subject. He has never had the course outline updated and he has never held a regional conference of teachers since 1959 when he took over his present position.

Supervision of a driver education course is necessary, whether it is given in a high school or in a driving school. It is very, very important that somebody supervise the instructors and that goes for the high school program as well as for the driving school program. Also the record of the person who is

going to teach the course should be thoroughly checked.

In Massachusetts, we issue a driver education certificate for students. This certificate, issued by the Registry of Motor Vehicles, entitles the holder to a reduced rate on their automobile insurance premium. We check the qualifications and the probation record and the driving record of every teacher, whether he is in the high schools or in the commercial driving schools. The Department of Education, of course, must issue a teaching certificate for those who teach in public high schools. But in addition to that, they must get a supplementary certificate from us showing that the person has a good driving record, has no criminal record, and has completed a driver education course for teachers.

That is one of the drawbacks in Massachusetts, the lack of training facilities for teachers. At the present time, we have three institutions which offer a teacher-training course. One is the University of Massachusetts. It has its own car. It has its simulators and it meets the national standards for a driver education course for teachers. In addition, it is a requirement there that the student teacher train a boy or a girl who has never done any driving up to the point where he gets his license and until the student has received his license, the professor will not certify the instructor as a teacher. The same holds true at Springfield

College. Those are the only two colleges who offer a teacher preparation course. The University Extension, a division of the Department of Education, offers a teacher preparation course, but it doesn't give any driving instruction and there have been many complaints from high school teachers that what they need is instruction on how to teach driving.

We have several high schools which give the driving instruction after the regular school day. No school in Massachusetts, and I assume in New Jersey, can require a fee for instruction given during the regular school day. But after school they can and they do. The fee has varied from \$20 to \$30.

We've had difficulty in getting teachers in the high schools because many teachers are not interested in this subject. And I think that if a program was inaugurated on a statewide basis which would require that all boys and girls of driving age should receive their instruction in high school, it would be impossible to meet this requirement.

Dr. Stack mentioned one of the three states where the principal city does not give driver education. I am sorry to say that Massachusetts is one of those. Boston does not give any driver education instruction in their public high schools. The burden falls on the driving schools.

I would like to quote some rates for 1967 on the insurance rates and this is for the City of Boston: A person

who is not the principal operator or owner and who has had no driver training, the fee for compulsory liability insurance is \$351; a student with driver training who is not the principal owner or operator pays \$222.50, a saving of \$128.50 to the student; an owner or principal operator without driving training, the insurance fee is \$374.50; with driver training, \$304, a saving of \$70.50. These are for males only. A male married with one or more children gets a flat fee of \$234. A female without driver training in Boston pays an insurance fee of \$193, whether or not she is the owner or operator.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: I wonder if you could just submit that schedule rather than read it off.

MR. FANNING: I will be glad to do that.

I would like to say this, that in my experience I have found some very excellent instructors who were not college graduates. They had, however, taken a teacher preparation course in driver education. I find that the person who has the proper instruction in teaching driving, if he has the right attitudes and the aptitude for it, can do an excellent job.

I think all teachers must be supervised. I know at one time we were checking on a certain high school and this teacher had three students out in the car. They were supposedly getting driving instruction. We found them in a

drug store, all having an ice cream soda.

Of course, commercial driving school instructors too have their faults. They probably cut corners as well as the high school. What I am trying to emphasize here is that supervision is necessary and I believe that the supervision should be shared jointly by the Department of Education and the Motor Vehicle Department. I think that in the preparation of an outline, which should be updated regularly, that both departments should be represented and have a say in what is to be taught. The Motor Vehicle Department has the knowledge of how the accidents occur, what kind of violations you meet on the road, etc., and the schools have the teaching methods. A combination of those should prove a very happy combination. Without it, I don't think you are going to get anywhere.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Fanning. We appreciate your coming all the way down here to testify. Thank you, sir.

We have nine more witnesses and we have only till four o'clock to complete the day.

I will call the remaining witnesses, but I am going to ask you again, in view of the time, to make your testimony as brief as possible for the balance of the day.

Dr. William Warner, Department of Education, State of New Jersey.

D R.      W I L L I A M      W A R N E R:      Senator, I will follow your suggestions. I am William Warner, Director of Secondary Education of the State Department. In my capacity as Director, I head the office that is responsible for the general supervision of all public high schools in the State and upon the request of the private, parochial and independent schools, we also extend our supervisory activities to those schools.

I will not attempt to read into the record any justification for driver education as an essential part of the curriculum. For the past 16 years, as part of my work in secondary education, I have been a strong believer in this and have supported programs. While our record is not as great or not as good as we would like to see it, I do think that the progress that we have made in this State without any support directly in the way of financial encouragement has been one that we need not be ashamed of. Seventy-five per cent of our public schools do offer a complete program of driver education and 31 per cent of our independent schools likewise do.

I will not read any of the statistics concerning driver education into the record because a very comprehensive report on these statistics is prepared annually by the Bureau of Traffic Safety and the Department of Education working cooperatively. I would suggest, however, that that data be

included in the record as a valuable source of information concerning the status of driver education in New Jersey.

We have worked very cooperatively with the Bureau of Traffic Safety, which as you know, Senator, was formerly in the Bureau that you headed, and I am sure that you would agree that this has been a mutually advantageous cooperation. For over 30 years we have offered classroom courses in safety education, going back to the days when Leo Welch was a pioneer in this field, and encouraged it in the schools, and for the last nearly 20 years have been working with the "behind the wheel" and with the Bureau of Traffic Safety, the Section headed by Mr. Ford. So I say at the State level we have been working cooperatively with experts in the field of driver education and I feel that the advice that has been given is consistent with the best thinking in this field.

We do have problems, however. Our problems in the field of driver education I would say were basically the lack of understanding by some segments of the public as to the place this subject has in our schools. I might also add that some of our educators are not aware of the importance of this, but this number, I am pleased to say, is decreasing each year. We have had a lack of staff in the State Department of Education to extend the kind of help and cooperative assistance that we would like to the schools. This extends beyond mere supervision. The cooperative work, I think, is



equally as important as supervision. We have had the problem of lack of time in the school day with the crowded curriculum that is developing as a result of the many demands that are being made upon students in all fields.

But I would say the biggest problem that we have had in this State and one I think all the others could be satisfied if this were met is the lack of money to support the program. Most of this was due, however, I believe, to the inadequate system of State financing which prior to our sales tax placed New Jersey probably down about 47th in the Nation in the support of education at the state level.

Senator, we in the Department of Education strongly support the kinds of proposals that will extend driver education to more and more of the youth of our State. We would suggest, however, approximately seven items that need to be considered in the drafting of the bill or any amendments that might come.

We would support any proposal that regards safety education for school-age youth as a function of the State Board of Education and of local boards of education.

We would support any proposal that recognizes that the instruction of youth in school must be done by certified teachers first with adequate training in safety education, including "behind the wheel."

We would support any proposal that would insist that the driver education be offered during the school day and supplemented, not supplanted, by after-school, Saturday or summer programs.

We would support any program that requires a classroom course of 30 hours, supplemented by a 6-hour course in "behind the wheel" exclusive of time spent in the cars in observing.

Fifth, we would support any program that follows guidelines established by the State Board of Education in cooperation with experts in the field of traffic and safety education, and at the same time recognizes variations in local conditions and points of emphasis in the course.

We would support any program that is supported financially from general State funds and not dedicated sources of revenue.

Lastly, we would support a program that provides for adequate staffing at the State Department of Education level.

I appreciate this opportunity, Senator, to share with you our feeling about this important subject. We recognize it as a legitimate part of the curriculum and can assure you and the members of your Committee that we in the Department of Education working cooperatively with the Bureau of Traffic Safety in Motor Vehicles would like to see

this extended.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you. You have covered a lot of ground.

May I ask you a question, Doctor. On that sixth point, did you mean that the system suggested by the bill of an extra fee on the license would not --

DR. WARNER: The sources of revenue, Senator, I think could be any basis. However, we would not feel that this should be a dedicated fund and that only those funds that are available in that be made available.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Oh, I see.

DR. WARNER: I was in Wisconsin this summer at the national meeting on this item and we saw many cases that preceded us where states had had dedicated funds, Michigan particularly, where the funds were drying up.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: You were worried about the inadequacy.

DR. WARNER: That's right. We would want a continuing support.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: The second point, Dr. Warner - there was some testimony earlier about eliminating the grandfather clause for driver education teachers. What would you say about that if we got into a comprehensive system in New Jersey? Would you retrain those teachers or what?

DR. WARNER: Senator, you recall that we introduced

a grandfather clause approximately eight years ago for the classroom course. Up to that time we had no real certification requirements. Now any teacher of driver education, whether it is a classroom course or behind the wheel, must have the same course. So there would be no need for grandfather clauses now because no one is teaching who is not certified.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Suppose the standards were changed in some way. I suppose you would then expect to retrain.

DR. WARNER: The general experience with State certification has been that the grandfather clause does apply.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Oh, it does apply, even if there is a change in the requirements?

DR. WARNER: That's right.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Wouldn't you recommend a retraining in that instance?

DR. WARNER: I think it might depend on the nature of the basis. I make no apologies for the quality of work done in our schools.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: That is not my point.

DR. WARNER: I mean, there are people who feel we need to improve the standards for teacher education and I agree we need a continuing program. I wouldn't want to see

anything happen that would hold this back such as a shortage of teachers. I think this would need to be reviewed very carefully and any regulations that were adopted should be consistent with the realities of the availability of teachers. Certainly I am in favor of improving. I think the question of blanketing present instructors in terms of any changed standards ought to be reviewed very carefully based on the nature of those changes.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much, Doctor.

Donald D. Van Heemst, New Jersey Association of Independent Insurance Agents.

D O N A L D     D .     V A N     H E E M S T :     Mr. Senator, ladies and gentlemen: My name is Donald D. Van Heemst. I am from Prospect Park, New Jersey. However, I represent the New Jersey Association of Independent Insurance Agents.

We would like to compliment the Senator and the legislative bodies for their concern with the current traffic problems. We wish to go on record as being in favor of these bills because they will undoubtedly save lives and would make the following comments, which unfortunately are off the cuff. I was not aware until Monday just past that the hearing was to be held today, so these are, as I say, off the cuff.

If six hours behind the wheel is to be considered,

we would urge the possible inclusion and utilization of commercial driving schools to increase the minimum number of hours behind the wheel, the cost of which is to be borne by the student or guardian to offset a possible burden to the school district. We doubt very much if a student presently experiences six hours behind the wheel. The reason I say that is, from personal experience, having witnessed a particular program that is in effect up in our area, three youngsters sit in the back seat and one behind the wheel and then the instructor immediately next to him or her, and I doubt if these four students in that particular automobile actually do receive six hours behind the wheel.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: They don't log that six hours in their observation time. The six hours is logged actually behind the wheel. So the student who goes in a car with a teacher and, say, three students gets three times six or eighteen hours in the car and six hours behind the wheel. That is the proper standard of the course.

MR. VAN HEEMST: That I will agree with. That is the proper way, but we question whether --

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: The point is - you question whether it is done.

MR. VAN HEEMST: Exactly.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: That is something to be left to proper standard enforcement.

MR. VAN HEEMST: We also would agree that the earlier a student is indoctrinated with driver education, the more successful the ultimate driver will be. It is a known fact that the ages from seven to fourteen are the most impressionable years in any youngster's life. We would compliment the New Jersey State Police for their program which is geared to elementary students and perhaps this particular program could be enlarged upon on the elementary level.

We also like very much the suggestion that those without a driver education certificate not be granted a driver's license until age nineteen. However, we would suggest that consideration be given to increasing this age to twenty-one and those with a driver education certificate be licensed at the age of eighteen or nineteen. This opinion is based solely upon loss experience as compiled by the insurance companies, as well as by local safety officers who claim that the majority of careless and reckless driving, speeding and stop-street violations are incurred by youngsters from the ages of seventeen to twenty-one.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Let's go back a minute. You mentioned the State Police program.

MR. VAN HEEMST: Yes.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Now I know they go in for bicycle safety.

MR. VAN HEEMST: Yes.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Do they go in for traffic safety?

MR. VAN HEEMST: Yes, they do, sir.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: -- driving and so on?

MR. VAN HEEMST: Not driving necessarily, in fact, not at all, I would assume. However, they do go in on the basis of safety patrols.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Crossing the street and so on.

MR. VAN HEEMST: Exactly. And this is where I indicate that perhaps it could be enlarged upon to perhaps indoctrinate.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: -- to include an emphasis on, "When you drive, at a future age."

MR. VAN HEEMST: That's right. When you get to that age, etc. Since young people are rather anxious to obtain their driver's license as soon as possible, we are confident that many more persons will avail themselves of a compulsory approved driver training program, particularly the young person who falls into this age category, a dropout, or coming from another country, classified perhaps as an immigrant, plus other classifications.

We further realize this might not prove to be too popular with the youngster, some using the argument that if we can die on our country's battlefields, we should be



granted the privilege to drive. Now this is true to a point and being an elected official myself, I appreciate that votes are involved. This is true to a point. However, we think it is more patriotic to die for one's country on a battlefield than behind the wheel of an auto, possibly taking the lives of innocent victims with them.

We must also admit the auto manufacturers will oppose this, since their big market is the newly-licensed, seventeen-year-old driver. On the other hand, this type of action would result in less autos on already-congested highways driven by immature and inexperienced drivers.

We would agree too that adults seeking their first license be required to take an approved course exactly as the youngster. It has also been stated in our insurance industry that those drivers with a driver education certificate no longer necessarily have less accidents or convictions than those without a certificate. This is not to imply that driver education is on the down-grade, but that the program must be up-dated.

I personally like Mr. Toth's point of a partial payment by the participant. It always seems that when someone has invested some of their own money in a given project, they more readily apply themselves to that particular project.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you, Mr. Van Heemst.

Freeholder Eugene E. Walsh of Bergen County.

[No response.]

Mr. Gerard Donohue, Bergen County Catholic  
Education Association.

G E R A R D      D O N O H U E: Senator, you will have  
to forgive me if I go over some ground that was discussed  
earlier today, but I just arrived and therefore I think  
it best that I read the prepared statement that I have.

The Bergen County Catholic Education Association  
would like to express its thanks to Senator Parsekian for  
affording us this opportunity to present some views on Senate  
Bills 174 and 175. We recognize the need for, and the  
value of, the proposed legislation. But we do feel that  
certain inequities exist in S 175 with respect to non-public  
youngsters. We acknowledge the significance of this and  
other recent legislative proposals which have taken note of  
the requirements for the welfare and safety as well as non-  
sectarian educational needs of non-public school children.  
It is our conviction that what inequities may be found in  
S 175 are unintentioned and certainly not with any purpose  
to place the non-public school children at any disadvantage  
in this vital area of safety for all the residents of New  
Jersey.

It has long been the conviction of the undersigned  
that the cost of driver training is not properly a cost to

be borne by our public school budgets. Rather is it a responsibility of the public safety function of the State and the cost of such needed safety programs should be paid in full by the Division of Motor Vehicles. Senator Parsekian is to be applauded for his present approach to the financing of the driver-training program, but the bill does not go far enough and therein lies a defect as we see it.

In the case of a public school child enrolled in an approved driver-training program, the Division of Motor Vehicles will pay the actual cost or the first \$28 of the cost of such program, whichever is the lesser, to the school providing the training. Any additional cost would be paid from the local public school. However, with respect to non-public school youngsters, all costs over \$28 would have to be paid by the parents of these pupils.

According to a statement of the New Jersey Education Association issued on November 22, 1966, a study made by the NJEA School Finance Committee in 1964 showed that the average cost was estimated to be \$70 per pupil. They suggested that in 1967 the average cost would be increased to almost \$80 per pupil. They go on to say that they object to having local property owners pay the bulk of this cost, which is the difference between \$80 and \$28. We, as parents of non-public school youngsters, even more strongly object to individually bearing this additional cost to provide needed safety

instruction for our children.

Now S 174 makes mandatory a course in driver training for persons between 17 and 19 years of age before applying for a driver's license after July 1, 1969. It is simply not equitable to put into effect such a mandatory law and at the same time place an unequal financial burden on non-public school children vis a vis public school children. We simply must not have a law which contains mandatory provisions, but which fails to provide equal opportunity for all to fulfill those provisions.

The proposed measures, S 174 and 175, will clearly place at a serious financial disadvantage all non-public school children and their parents and they should be amended prior to reintroduction into the next session of the Legislature.

There exists in S 175 another feature to which we must offer our objection. In section 1, the purpose is characterized as being "increasing the safety of those using the public highways of the State and decreasing the dangers now incident to the use thereof." This is indeed an excellent purpose and one to which all should subscribe. The bill, however, limps a trifle here since it excludes from its coverage those children who live in New Jersey, drive in New Jersey, but who attend school in neighboring states. These youngsters are just as much a hazard to the safety of

New Jersey residents as are those who attend schools within the State. Provision should be made for them to receive driver training on the same basis as all other youngsters residing in New Jersey. Unquestionably such an arrangement poses some administrative problems and will, perhaps, require regional programs on Saturdays, holidays and evenings in certain northern and southern counties. The legislative committee of the Bergen County Catholic Education Association is presently determining the numbers of youngsters who attend secondary schools outside the State.

In closing may we express our genuine pleasure at the opportunity to present our views and include our heartfelt wish that a bill, or bills, equitable to all the children of New Jersey evolve from this hearing.

Thank you, sir.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much.

Oscar W. Knade, Jr., State Federation of District Boards of Education of New Jersey, the Executive Director.

D R.    O S C A R    W.    K N A D E,    J R.: Senator Parsekian, thank you for the promotion.

I am Oscar Knade, Jr., Assistant Executive Director of the Federated School Boards and I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before you to present the recommendations of the State Federation of District Boards of Education regarding driver education for New Jersey high school students.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Mr. Knade, may I interrupt one minute.

DR. KNADE: Yes.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: You have given this for the record. Could you give us an oral presentation based on it in the interest of saving time.

DR. KNADE: If you wish, certainly.

First of all, the Federation is convinced that no program of action that we have seen in schools or research that we have been able to uncover seems to provide better results in insuring more competent drivers in terms of their driving skills and their attitudes about driving than driver education programs. The research that we have seen seems to indicate that about 50 per cent fewer accidents - that is, students who have completed driver education programs have about 50 per cent fewer accidents and injuries as compared with students who have not had such preparation.

As you well know, many boards of education in New Jersey already provide driver education courses for their high school students. However, many of them do this at State expense and when school budgets are rejected or when town councils and municipal governing bodies, and what have you, cut budget requests of boards of education which have fallen into their hands through rejection by the voters of the budget or through inability of the local board to exercise any fiscal

autonomy, frequently an expensive program, such as driver education, is dropped. We have had recent experience in Saddle Brook in Bergen County where other expensive programs were dropped because of budget cuts.

Previous witnesses have referred to the National Highway Safety Act of 1966 and I am sure you are aware of the effect that this program will have on driver education programs throughout the United States and the impetus it should give to establishing of such a program in New Jersey.

Since 30 states plus the District of Columbia already provide special financial support for driver education, we think it is time now for New Jersey to assume a leadership role and provide some kind of special financial support for driver education programs.

Ordinarily the State Federation of District Boards of Education opposes attempts by the Legislature to mandate curriculum items. We feel that curriculum decisions should be left up to local boards of education. However, since many forward-looking boards have adopted driver education programs and many more would like to offer these courses, we think the Legislature should consolidate this progress at the local level and consolidate it at the State level by establishing a State-aided minimum program of driver education which would be operated by public boards of education and made available to all students in the State.

Now S 175 is intended to accomplish this goal, but we think that it has some limitations which, if not overcome, will limit the amount of support from local boards of education and the implementation of the goals of this legislation.

We agree with many of the previous witnesses that standardization is a term that ought to be dropped from the bill. Standardization results too often in mediocrity. We feel the State ought to set minimum requirements for an approved program for State aid purposes and that the minimum requirements should be established in consultation with the Division of Motor Vehicles, the State Department of Education and local boards of education which have established driver education programs.

Now another problem in the bills is that Senate 175 provides that the Director of the Division of Motor Vehicles would be authorized to enter into a contract with any approved private school in the State for the purpose of giving a driver education course. The Director would also be empowered to provide State Aid payments to such schools.

Since many private schools are established and supported by religious organizations, payments of State funds to such schools could well be in violation of the first and fourteenth amendments of the United States Constitution. The Federation believes that the American tradition of



separation of Church and State should be vigorously safeguarded and that funds raised by general taxation for educational purposes should be administered by public officials and should not be used to support any privately-operated schools or programs of study.

Therefore, we suggest that S 175 be amended to provide ~~that~~ driver education programs be made available to all high school pupils of the State of eligible age, but that such programs be operated by public boards of education.

In the area of finances, the figure of State Aid provided in S 175 is \$28 for each pupil enrolled in a State-aided driver education course. The Federation is unable to determine what relationship, if any, exists between the \$28 figure and the actual cost of driver education programs. If the \$28 figure is meant to represent the cost of a minimum program of 30 hours of classroom instruction and 6 hours of actual driving experience, as recommended by a number of authorities and generally accepted in a number of our sister states which provide special aid for these programs, we figure the cost figure has been woefully underestimated.

You have heard previously estimates of \$60 to \$80 per pupil, \$70 on the average. Now if any fixed amount, even if it is higher than the \$28 figure proposed in S 175, is adopted today, tomorrow it will be inadequate. As you well know, each year an increasing amount of the cost of the State

program will be shifted to local taxpayers each year.

The Legislature in the past has recognized this kind of problem in adopting State Aid formulas for high cost, special educational programs which it wishes to encourage, by sharing a percentage of the cost with local boards of education. For example, the most recently-enacted legislation in this regard is Chapter 29 of P.L. 1966, providing for the education and training of handicapped children. The State pays 50 per cent of the cost of their education. In the area of adult education supervision, the State pays two-thirds of the cost of salaries. In the area of pupil transportation, the State pays 75 per cent of approved costs.

Using such a pattern of support keeps the state-local financial partnership on a dynamic basis and encourages local participation in the programs. This kind of flexibility should be built into the aid provisions of S 175.

Last month, our Educational Finance Committee reviewed financial aspects of a state-aided driver education program. The Committee felt that providing driver training to all high school pupils was imperative and that rapid and complete implementation of a State program could be accomplished only with a high level of State support.

Therefore, we are recommending to you that the

State support a minimum driver education program to the extent of 75 per cent of full cost of classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction. The reason we are not saying 100 per cent, but 75 per cent, is because we feel, as you have remarked earlier, that if a local district manages the program, it should be responsible for putting up some of the share of the money simply to guarantee that prudence and economy and efficiency will be exercised in the expenditure of these funds.

DR. STACK: Could he repeat that statement?

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Could you repeat that?

DR. KNADE: It was off the cuff, Senator.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: He said he thought that the cost should be shared by the local school districts in order that they would take --

DR. STACK: On what percentage basis?

DR. KNADE: On a 75 per cent State-supported basis and 25 per cent local sharing.

We would suggest one additional provision here and that is ~~that~~ since school districts vary considerably in the number of high school students attending non-public schools, those with a large proportion of private school pupils might find it difficult to finance even their 25 per cent share of the program. I can cite two examples - Jersey City and Elizabeth - and there are others, particularly in Bergen

County. Therefore, we recommend that the state reimburse local school districts for the full cost of approved driver education training provided for private school pupils.

Now there is one other last item I would mention; that is, the revenue source for implementing S 175 or its '67 replacement. The bill suggests a one dollar increase in driver license fees. In 1964, it was estimated that this increase would provide an additional \$3,500,000 in 1965-66. This would be an amount of money sufficient to furnish full state aid for driver education courses at \$70 per pupil for 50,000 pupils. If the \$28 per pupil aid figure provided in S 175 were retained, only about \$1,400,000 would be utilized to fund the state program.

With this disparity, we have come to the conclusion we would like to recommend to you that all revenues realized from increases in driver license fees be committed to state support of approved driver education programs operated by local boards of education. We further recommend that you consider, if need be, other sources of revenue such as other states have utilized - increases in learners' permit fees or a portion of fines from traffic law violations or vehicle registration fees.

We wish to commend you, Senator, and the Law and Public Safety Committee for your recognition of the importance

of this legislation and we hope our recommendations will be helpful to you in your consideration of the bill.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you. It is a very helpful paper. Thank you very much.

DR. KNADE: You're welcome.

[The complete written statement submitted by Dr. Knade can be found on page 151 of this transcript.]

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: John E. Kane, General Motors Corporation, Supervisor of Safety.

J O H N     E.     K A N E: Thank you, Senator.

My name is John Kane. I am the Director of Safety for the Ternstedt Division of General Motors Corporation in Trenton, New Jersey. I am here today representing Mr. L. J. Grimaldi, our plant manager, who is the Chairman of the Mercer County Traffic Safety Committee.

Industrial accident prevention over the years has taken great strides and has played a most prominent part in making employes safer on the job than they are in their own homes or on the highways. Statistics for many years prove that people are injured far less frequently on the job than they are off the job.

Those of us who have been engaged in accident prevention work in industry can pinpoint specific factors and policies which have brought about a safe industrial environment.

Any list of such factors and policies would place education and training at the top for importance. The value of training and education in safe job performance is undisputed.

Training sessions in all phases of industrial activity have become more widely and more effectively used than ever before.

The parallel between our industrial success with these educational training methods and the success which can be achieved with driver education is too apparent to be ignored. The results which have been obtained in the industrial environment can be obtained on our highways. The tragic loss of life and maiming of workers, which began with the industrial revolution, has been reduced so substantially that it is obvious we can do the same for drivers.

As in industry, education and training in the skills and attitudes necessary for safe vehicle operation cannot be entrusted to unskilled instructors. Driver education must be formalized as part of the educational process in order to produce skilled and safe drivers. Many of the lives lost in the early industrial accidents can be traced directly to the improper education and training of an employe on a potentially dangerous piece of mechanized equipment. So it is with our drivers. Many of the highway fatalities can be traced to the fact that the potentially dangerous vehicle has not been operated in a safe and skilled manner by the driver.

The proposed driver education program offers us a method of teaching every high school student, through a formalized study and through a practical exercise course, the necessary skills and attitudes which may save his life, or my life, or your life. This program will provide the future driver with the most modern scientific education on safe vehicle operation.

Thousands of improvements have been made on vehicles and highways since the automobile came into use, yet the process of educating drivers remains haphazard and unrefined. The vital training of high school students in driving skills cannot be left in the hands of relatives or friends, who themselves may set a poor example.

The basic principle of formal education and training applied so successfully in the prevention of industrial accidents can - through the proposed program - become just as effective in preventing highway accidents. It is imperative that this legislation be enacted. Driver education courses are a vitally important part of the traffic accident prevention program. No other method shows such promise for eventually producing both a state and a nation of safe drivers.

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Kane. I am particularly grateful for those who are testifying for

waiting so long.

MR. KANE: That's all right.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Mr. F. Kenneth Schultze of the New Jersey Automobile Club. (No response.)

Mr. Jackson of Allstate wishes to add a brief item to the record.

R A L P H J. J A C K S O N: Thank you very much, Senator. I appreciate your indulgence.

In shuffling through my papers to omit comments that had been made by others, I passed over something I meant to mention.

I would like to address myself to the matter of program quality. Just as in your science courses where they combine the classroom element and laboratory phase as closely as they can so there is a transfer of learning from one element of the program to the other, there should be in a quality driver education program an integration of the various elements that are offered in such a program. The practice in many states of offering the classroom phase of driver education in one year and the laboratory, behind-the-wheel phase, in another year is detrimental to the transfer of learning, and particularly where they are using some of the more sophisticated teaching techniques, such as driving ranges or simulation. They should take care not to separate



this from the actual in-car driving lest they lose the transfer of learning.

There is another factor that works against the offering of a good program almost as strongly as teachers qualified on the basis of a single course and that is the practice followed in Michigan of offering darned near the whole driver education program during non-school hours. In the 1965-66 school year, only 28,000 were taken care of during the regular school day. Some states have found it convenient to offer driver education to the private, parochial, and other non-public school youth during non-school hours, and this would seem to be one way of handling the problem without becoming involved in constitutional matters. But to handle the bulk of the public school students this way is to demand that a lot of teachers qualify on this subject and then handle it as only a very incidental part of their teaching - that they do the driver education after they put in a full day's work. I don't think this gives a fair spin to the students. Some of the teachers in Michigan are working as long as 14 hours a day and I question whether the student the 14th hour is getting what he is supposed to be getting in driver education.

I would like to point out that we have only one basis at Allstate for liking driver education so well and that is, even though we offer a discount to the trained young

driver, we are able to make money on that particular class of drivers. We are losing money heavily on the untrained young drivers in spite of the fact that their rate is higher than for the trained young drivers. Thank you.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you, sir.

Mr. T. Donald Cairns, Memorial High School, Cedar Grove, New Jersey.

T. D O N A L D C A I R N S: I am T. Donald Cairns, Memorial High School, Cedar Grove, New Jersey, but I live in Clifton.

Senator Parsekian, I think to some extent in the course of the day we have gotten away from what is probably the central question: How are we going to stop killing 50,000 people a year? I think we all agree, or most of us do, that one of the most effective ways is through a drivers training program.

Right now we are addressing ourselves to training young drivers and most new drivers are young drivers. In the long range, I suppose we should consider training all drivers. I have tried to express to my students something along this line, that maybe what we say in driver education class sounds a little different, but we are trying to change the driving habits of the United States, one person at a time, person by person. It seems that the public high school at

this point is about the most universal way to do this.

We understand the problems of some students being enrolled in other kinds of schools.

I have a few questions after listening to what happened today. It seems strange that we never do a cost study on Latin or Advanced Science, Physical Education or Health, but we are very, very concerned with a big cost study on driver education. I don't understand why it is so different from the rest of the curriculum. American History, English, Health are required in the State curriculum. Every school must teach them but no school board to my knowledge is saying that the State must pay 100 per cent of the cost of those courses.

I think another thing that we seem to get confused about - our biggest problem is not finding cars or supplies or things like that, but quality teachers and to have quality teachers, we need good certification requirements. We have to start with a person who has had experience in all other realms of education as well as just maybe this three credits of driver education. I think we need to consider some other things.

The bill as it is written now says Juniors, but in many schools we will find at least a fairly significant percentage of students are 17 by the time they are Sophomores.

I think we have to investigate raising the \$28.

That seems awfully low.

We have to encourage local boards and private and parochial schools to do this.

Now how to encourage a school board or the administration of a local school to do this is kind of a difficult process. Many groups have tried it in many, many different fields. I think that the approach that seems to work best is to do it on the level of professional educators. In no way are we meaning to say that the Division of Motor Vehicles is doing anything wrong; they are certainly doing a very positive and fine job. But when you are trying to deal with the administration of a school, it seems the best way to get a good response is through the Department of Education. As I understand it, that also would comply with the suggestions of the Federal legislation that is being proposed.

I would also urge that we get to the idea of making this a somewhat separate department. Unfortunately it seems to me, driver education is lumped with a great many other things and there isn't time. We can pick that up I think from Dr. Warner's report that that is one of the problems they have had.

For the long range, maybe we should consider up-grading certification standards and consider training all drivers no matter what their age. Thank you very.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you, Mr. Cairns. Are you

a driver education teacher, Mr. Cairns?

MR. CAIRNS: Yes.

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Commissioner Fred M. Rosenberg, New Jersey Youth Commission, and also the Safety Director of the Motor Club of America.

F R E D M. R O S E N B E R G: Thank you, Senator.

I realize that we have a limitation this afternoon because of the time and I have therefore chosen to read two or three salient elements of my testimony, following which I would like to present this testimony to the Committee for inclusion in the record. As I say, I will make this quite brief.

I have thoroughly reviewed this legislation and have presented my findings to both of the organizations which I represent today: the New Jersey Youth Commission of which I am a member, and Motor Club of America, the largest organization of motorists in New Jersey. I should like to point out that both - unrelated though they may be - concur with my views concerning this legislation and have asked that I make my presentment in their behalf.

For the past twenty years, Motor Club of America has called for a compulsory driver education bill in New Jersey. My predecessor has contributed much in this regard, and since I have taken his place as Safety Director, I too have

tried to bring the situation before the public and the New Jersey Legislature. As you may know our most effective medium is the MCA official publication, MOTOR CLUB NEWS, and I have taken the liberty of making some of our past issues available to you. These will, I hope, help document the case I hope to present today.

I should like to indicate that there are certain items which we have covered rather extensively, items such as standardized curriculum, financing, leadership from the top, public support, and these, as I say, are available in the public record.

The one I would like to read is the one we have termed "Reservations."

I am obligated by the majority vote of the New Jersey Youth Commission to offer the following two reservations regarding passage of S 174 and S 175:

This body would like assurances that local school districts would not be burdened financially if these bills were enacted; and it would respectfully request an understanding of how teacher training would be handled to meet the requirements of a compulsory driver education course in the individual school districts. Regarding the latter, it is recognized that the future of driver education is tied in with the teacher - the quality of teaching - the imagination and integrity of the course - and, of course, the dedication

of the instructor. The New Jersey Youth Commission recommends that teacher training be incorporated as a vital element of a compulsory driver education program in New Jersey in order to assure qualified teachers and supervisors.

Safety has become the most talked about item in the halls of the State and Federal legislatures; and at the same time it is passed over as old hat, routine stuff, tiresome, boring. I often wonder why. We know, on one hand that our highway deaths far exceed our death toll in Vietnam. Yet, they don't seem to evoke the same sympathy or public dismay. We know that a Ralph Nadir can light a few fires and stimulate some legislation. Yet the safest car doesn't assure me that the driver will wear his seat belts, won't drink, or will drive defensively. Why then are we faced with this paradox?

One reason is education - or lack of it. We must give our State's teenagers the opportunity of learning how to drive as well as presenting them with all of the ramifications that go along with this responsibility. We believe that passage of S 174 and S 175 is a step in the right direction - it is as important as a jetport, air pollution or mass transportation. Motor Club of America and the New Jersey Youth Commission endorse this legislation and firmly seek its approval at the earliest possible date.

Thank you.

[The complete written statement submitted  
by Mr. Rosenberg can be found on page 158  
of this transcript.]

SENATOR PARSEKIAN: Thank you very much, Mr.

Rosenberg.

We have a few minutes left. If there is anybody  
else who has been here waiting to testify that didn't sign  
the paper, I would be pleased to hear them.

There is no response, therefore I am adjourning  
these hearings. We may have to have one other day or part  
of a day after the first of the year to hear people who  
wanted to testify, but were unable to come today.

Thank you all very much for coming and for so many  
of you staying all through the proceedings.

- - - -



# State Federation of District Boards of Education New Jersey

407 WEST STATE STREET, P. O. BOX 909, TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08605

PHONE 695-3469 (AREA CODE 609)

MRS. RUTH H. PAGE  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

OSCAR W. KNADE, JR.  
ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

ROBERT R. LUSE  
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC RELATIONS  
AND PUBLICATIONS

## STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE STATE FEDERATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF EDUCATION

PREPARED FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING ON SENATE BILL 175  
(DRIVER EDUCATION)

by

Dr. Oscar W. Knade, Jr., Assistant Executive Director  
State Federation of District Boards of Education

Senator Parsekian and members of the Hearing Committee:

I am Oscar W. Knade, Jr., Assistant Executive Director of the State Federation of District Boards of Education. I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before you to present the recommendations of the State Federation of District Boards of Education regarding driver education for New Jersey high school students.

The Federation, through its Executive Committee, Educational Finance Committee and Delegate Assembly, has given considerable time and study to the matter of state-aided, standardized programs of driver education programs made available to high school students. There seems to be little doubt that America's youth must be taught to drive safely if the automobile is not to become a threat to our economy and national welfare.

(over)

66-421  
12/14/66

The National Commission on Safety Education of the National Education Association says, "It is estimated that one out of every two people will be killed or injured in an automobile accident during his lifetime. Approximately 40,000 people are killed annually on our streets and highways and millions more are injured at a cost in excess of \$6 billion." In the light of these significant statistics, it is obvious that one of the greatest problems facing the American public today stems from the improper use of the automobile.

No program of action to date seems to provide better results than driver education in secondary schools. Research has shown that students who have completed driver education programs have about 50 percent fewer accidents resulting in deaths and injuries as compared to students who have not had such preparation.

Many New Jersey boards of education already provide driver education courses for their high school students and more than 35,000 students complete such courses annually. However, boards whose budgets have been rejected by the voters or who must meet demands for higher teacher salaries and other financial pressures often eliminate driver education from their curricula to cut education costs.

The federal government has recently taken direct action to assure an expansion of driver education programs in the various states. The National Highway Safety Act of 1966 directs states either to begin a state program of driver education in school systems or to provide for "significant expansion and improvement of such a program already in existence." States which fail to comply by January 1, 1969 will be

penalized by losing ten percent of their regular federal highway aid and cannot claim their state allotments under the \$267 million provided over three years in the Act.

Currently 30 states and the District of Columbia have taken leadership at the state level and have provided special financial support for driver education programs. It is time New Jersey joined the ranks of the majority of our sister-states. We feel this is imperative, not just to obtain federal highway aid which is available to us nor simply to do what most other states are doing, but to take positive action toward assuring New Jersey's citizens that its youth will be competent in their driving skills and attitudes.

Ordinarily the State Federation of District Boards of Education opposes attempts by the Legislature to mandate curriculum on the grounds that curriculum decisions should be left up to local boards of education. However, since many forward looking boards have adopted driver education programs and many more would like to offer such courses, the Legislature should consolidate such local progress at the state level by establishing a state-aided minimum program of driver education to be operated by public boards of education and made available to all pupils in the state.

Senate bill 175 is intended to accomplish this goal, but it has several limitations which must be overcome if full local support and participation are to be realized. We respectfully recommend the following amendments to S-175 or its 1967 replacement:

(over)

1. Standardization often results in mediocrity. State approval of a course of study should insure minimum requirements only. Local boards of education should have sufficient leeway to develop improved or advanced course materials and instructional techniques in driver education. We suggest that the term "standardized" be omitted from S-175. Instead, provision should be made for the State Board of Education to establish minimum program requirements in consultation with the Division of Motor Vehicles, the State Department of Education and local boards of education which have established driver education programs.

2. Senate bill 175 provides that the Director of the Division of Motor Vehicles would be authorized to enter into a contract with any approved private school in the state for the purpose of giving a driver education course. The Director would also be empowered to provide state aid payments to such schools.

Since many private schools are established and supported by religious organizations, payments of state funds to such schools could well be in violation of the first and fourteenth amendments of the United States Constitution. The Federation believes that the American tradition of separation of Church and State should be vigorously safeguarded and that funds raised by general taxation for educational purposes should be administered by public officials and should not be used to support any privately operated schools or programs of study.

Therefore, we suggest that S-175 be amended to provide that driver education programs be made available to all high school pupils

in the state, but that such programs be operated by public boards of education.

3. Senate bill 175 provides that the state will reimburse school districts (or private schools) up to \$28 for each pupil enrolled in a state-aided driver education course. The Federation is unable to determine what relationship, if any, exists between the \$28 figure and the actual cost of driver education programs. If the \$28 figure is intended to represent the cost of a minimum program of 30 hours of classroom instruction and six hours of actual driving experience, as recommended by the Third National Conference on High School Driver Education and generally accepted in a number of our sister-states, the cost figure has been woefully underestimated.

Estimates made in 1964 placed the actual cost of such programs at \$60 to \$80 per pupil. Even if the state aid payment per pupil were to be set at a higher level, the fixed dollar amount would have no flexibility and would soon be inadequate. An increasing amount of the cost of the state program would be shifted to local taxpayers each year.

The Legislature recognized this problem in adopting state aid formulas for high cost, special educational programs which it wishes to encourage, by sharing a percentage of the cost with local boards of education. For example, educational programs for handicapped pupils are supported by the state to the extent of 50 percent of approved costs. The state support level for adult education supervision is two-thirds of salary costs and state aid for pupil transportation is 75 percent of approved costs. Using such a pattern of support keeps the

(over)

state-local financial partnership on a dynamic basis and encourages local participation in the programs. This kind of flexibility should be built into the aid provisions of S-175.

Last month, the Federation's Educational Finance Committee reviewed financial aspects of a state-aided driver education program. The Committee felt that providing driver training to all high school pupils was imperative and that rapid and complete implementation of a state program could be accomplished only with a high level of state support. The Committee felt also that some local financing would promote prudence and economy in managing driver education programs.

Because of the high cost of this type of program, the Committee recommended to the State Aid To School Districts Study Commission on November 22, 1966 that the state support a minimum driver education program to the extent of 75 percent of the full cost of classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction. We reiterate that recommendation now, with one additional provision.

Since school districts vary considerably in the number of high school students attending non-public schools, those with a large proportion of private school pupils might find it difficult to finance even their 25 percent share of the program. Therefore, we recommend that the state reimburse local school districts for the full cost of approved driver education training provided for private school pupils.

4. Senate bill 175 provides that the revenues required to support the state-aided driver education program will be derived from a \$1.00 annual increase in driver license fees. In 1964, it was estimated

that this increase would provide an additional \$3,500,000 in 1965-66, an amount sufficient to furnish full state aid for driver education courses at \$70 per pupil for 50,000 pupils. If the \$28 per pupil aid figure provided in S-175 were retained, only about \$1,400,000 would be utilized to fund the state program.

We recommend that all revenues realized from increases in driver license fees be committed to state support of approved driver education programs operated by local boards of education. We further recommend that consideration be given to additional sources of revenue to support the program. Other states have secured financial support for such programs from vehicle registration fees, learners' permit fees or a portion of fines for traffic law violations. New Jersey could utilize these additional sources of revenue if needed to provide full support of approved driver education programs.

The Federation commends this Committee for its recognition of the importance of driver education legislation. We hope our recommendations will be helpful to the Committee and the Legislature in its deliberations.

###

Trenton, New Jersey

December 14, 1966

TESTIMONY: PUBLIC HEARING ON COMPULSORY  
DRIVER EDUCATION IN NEW JERSEY

Fred Rosenberg, Member, New Jersey Youth Commission

Safety Director, Motor Club of America

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE -

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to appear before you today to give the following views on S-174 and S-175, the bills which, if passed, will make driver education a prerequisite for a driver's license in this state.

I have thoroughly reviewed this legislation and have presented my findings to both of the organizations which I represent today: the New Jersey Youth Commission of which I am a member, and Motor Club of America, the largest organization of motorists in New Jersey. I should like to point out that both - unrelated though they may be - concur with my views concerning this legislation and have asked that I make my presentment in their behalf.

For the past twenty years, Motor Club of America has called for a compulsory driver education bill in New Jersey. My predecessor has contributed much in this regard, and since I have taken his place as Safety Director. I too have tried to bring the situation before the public and the New Jersey Legislature. As you may know our most effective medium is the MCA official publication, MOTOR CLUB NEWS, and I have taken the liberty of making some of our past issues available to you. These will, I hope, help document the case I hope to present today.

The New Jersey Youth Commission, on the other hand, has recently entered the safety picture with the establishment of a teenage accident prevention committee. Last year about this time, we held a youth conference here in Trenton and over 1,000 students and driver education teachers were in attendance. We learned much from the reactions of the youngsters that day



Testimony Add 1

as well as from follow-up questionnaires.

We have heard over the years that driver education on a national basis could save thousands of lives; the number varies with the statistician. Utopia in my estimation would be the establishment of such a universal nation-wide program. But we are all experienced enough to realize that Utopia is often unattainable or, at best, a long time in coming. So it is then, that we must begin in our own backyard - in New Jersey. For if we can prove that compulsory driver education can save some lives, prevent some injuries, decrease the property damage resulting from auto accidents, then I believe that New Jersey, like Connecticut, may be looked upon as a model. . . . that we might be emulated in other states. . . . and that ultimately this Utopia might be attained.

It wasn't too long ago that driver education was met with criticism and a complete lack of enthusiasm. It is our feeling that this negativism has changed and that more and more educators have come over to the driver ed side. The reasons, I feel, are best summarized by William J. Sanders, Connecticut Commissioner of Education whose remarks in this regard are worthy of entry in the public record.

"I am convinced that this incredibly rapid shift of position is due not only to increased concern with traffic safety, although this is important, but, indeed, to the enthusiasm with which youth have been approaching Driver Education courses in those schools where programs are available. Nothing succeeds like success. The motivation of such students is without question. They want to drive and they want to know how to take care of cars. They will read the assignments, they will pay attention in class, they will follow instructions to the

letter, and they will behave beautifully - their capacity for self discipline is admirable. And why not? A great and good end is immediately in view! Here is an award that is available, not only to the good athlete, or to the exceptional scholar, but to any student of ordinary ability who will comply with the requirements of the course - this award is the license to drive an automobile. There is no more universally motivated course in the curriculum. Youth who read any book only with reluctance will master the texts in Driver Education. Those who regard the courses in citizenship with boredom learn courtesy, fair play, respect for the rights of others and respect for the law and acquire other important civic attitudes in courses in Driver Education when it is taught by a qualified and enthusiastic teacher.

They also learn many other things. They learn a good deal of science - at least much of science that previously seemed unrelated now makes a substantial impression upon them. The physiological effects of alcohol and fatigue, principles of physics, concerning momentum, inertia, the transformation of energy in the internal combustion engine, and the impact of this engine upon our culture, all make sense when they are learned while qualifying to drive an automobile."

As a former high school teacher in this state, I have seen first hand the teenager's anxiety as he counts the days and the hours until he turns 17; happily, I have seen many of these kids respond positively to responsible

driver ed courses. I have also seen the negative side of the picture, the side in which the teenager gets behind the wheel with no training other than the mechanics of the moving vehicle, and wreaks havoc on our highways. I know of one story particularly, in which a group of children was returning from a football game in a car driven by a youngster who had previously dropped out of school and had no formal driver education - the story has an all too familiar ending: a head-on crash and five young lives snuffed out.

We cannot MAKE a child responsible any more than we can change the personality that has been molded in the home since birth. But we do have a responsibility - a selfish responsibility if you will - to do the best we can to make these youngsters better drivers and thus hopefully to save us the personal heartache of an accident involvement caused by an untrained youngster.

I recently had the good fortune of visiting with the Safety Officer of McGuire AFB, and we discussed this very subject. He told me that every airman, every officer on the base had to take a rigorous driver ed course before being allowed to drive a military vehicle; in addition, this was backed up by a program of community information and education (in this case "community" related to the base). In the year gone by, there was not one accident on the base, and 94% of the entire complement had been accident-free in the total driving picture. The military situation, of course, is quite different, but the end result is more than conclusive.

Compulsory driver education in New Jersey, must, in our estimation, have certain requisites in order to make the program fully effective. Salient

among these are:

(1) STANDARDIZED CURRICULUM - the state must establish a driver education program with adequate classroom AND behind the wheel training. This standardization is called for in the legislation under consideration today. However, it is our feeling that certain elements of the classroom program should be spelled out, even though it is not our intention to enumerate all phases of it. These include the vehicle (mechanics, operation and maintenance plus the sociological effects upon our lives and culture), the driver (physiology and psychology), an understanding of the motor vehicle laws and, of course, behind the wheel training.

(2) FINANCING - we are particularly pleased at the wording of S-175 regarding the financing of driver education in New Jersey. The fact that this is spelled out and *it is* *shown* that no burden will be placed on the school district is of great importance to us and we firmly favor this method of financing the program.

(3) LEADERSHIP FROM THE TOP - it is our feeling that in order for this program to be successful and effective, complete support and endorsement must be forthcoming from all elements of government - from the Executive to the Legislative. This leadership will certainly be an inspiration to the school districts, administrators, teachers and pupils.

- (4) PUBLIC SUPPORT - in addition to the "Leadership from the Top" concept, a strong and continuing show of support must come from the state's insurance firms, industries, PTA's, auto clubs, service organizations etc. To this end, we would ask the communications outlets in the state to lend assistance in making the driver ed story known. . . .to bring the program into public focus and, in concert with governmental leadership, help to present a picture of unanimous endorsement of this vital program.
- (5) RESERVATIONS - I am obligated by the majority vote of the New Jersey Youth Commission to offer the following two reservations regarding passage of S-174 and S-175. This body would like assurances that local school districts would not be burdened financially if these bills were enacted; and it would respectfully request an understanding of how teacher training would be handled to meet the requirements of a compulsory driver education course in the individual school districts. Regarding the latter, it is recognized that the future of driver education is tied in with the teacher - the quality of teaching - the imagination and integrity of the course - and, of course, the dedication of the instructor. The New Jersey Youth Commission recommends that teacher training be incorporated as a vital element of a compulsory driver education program in New Jersey in order

Testimony - Add 6

to assure qualified teachers and supervisors.

Safety has become the most talked about item in the halls of the state and federal legislatures; and at the same time it is passed over as old hat, routine stuff, tiresome, boring. I often wonder why. We know, on one hand that our highway deaths far exceed our death toll in Vietnam. Yet, they don't seem to evoke the same sympathy or public dismay. We know that a Ralph Nader can light a few fires and stimulate some legislation. Yet the safest car doesn't assure me that the driver will wear his seat belts, won't drink, or will drive defensively. Why, then, are we faced with this paradox?

One reason is education - or lack of it. We must give our state's teenagers the opportunity of learning how to drive as well as presenting them with all of the ramifications that go along with this responsibility. We believe that passage of S174 and S175 is a step in the right direction . . . it is as important as a jetport, air pollution or mass transportation. Motor Club of America and the New Jersey Youth Commission endorse this legislation and firmly seek its approval at the earliest possible date.

Thank you.

BRODART, INC.	Cat. No. 23-221

**BRODART, INC.**

Cat. No. 23-221

