

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-456		332	7	3	10
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education 192 • Education 210-215 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4077-4079 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2285-2294

H-116

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 9
3878-4343**

Friday, May 28, 1971 78.

Will you remark further on the motion. Will the Members please take their seats. Will staff please come to the well. The machine will be opened. Have all the Members voted? Is your vote properly reflected on the voting board? Is your vote properly recorded? The machine will be closed. The Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will announce the tally.

EFH

THE CLERK:

Total number voting 149. Necessary for recommitment 75.
Yea 82. Nay 67. Absent and not voting 28.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion carries. The matter is recommitted to the Joint Committee on Government Administration and Policy.

THE CLERK:

Page 13, at the top of the page of 13, Calendar No. 1174, Substitute for S.B. No. 332, an act concerning instructors of Driving Education.

DAVID LAVINE:

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

DAVID LAVINE:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill does basically two things. It sets out standards for driving school instructors, and it allows driving schools to contract with public and private schools for behind-the-wheel instruction. Basically, now, Mr. Speaker, a driving school instructor has to have a medical examination, a high

Friday, May 28, 1971 79.

school diploma and complete an instructors' course of 45 clock hours. As of July 1st, '71, the instructor would have to take in-service courses until they have completed an 80-hour course. That would be for all instructors who would be licensed after July 1. The...as I indicate...the other important part of this Bill is that it would allow the continuance of driving schools to participate in the education of our youngsters, where they've done such a good job up to now. I would like to just make one further comment. This Bill is a cooperative effort on the part of the Education Committee, the State Department of Education and the driving schools to upgrade driving education and to see that the philosophy and the guidelines of the National Highway Safety Bureau are followed. I would recommend and urge the passage of this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Bill.

JOHN D. MCHUGH:

Mr. Speaker, a question if I may, through you to the sponsor of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

JOHN D. MCHUGH:

A number of schools have their own driving instructors...teachers that work for the schools. Would this have any effect on them?

DAVID LAVINE:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no, this would not have affect on instructors who are already engaged in the education of our

EFH

Friday, May 28, 1971 80.

youngsters, so that it will make sure that they will have a job of employment continuous with the instruction in our school system. EFE

I would like to just add that this Bill is the product of the hard-working participation of the driving schools throughout our State.

JOHN D. MCHUGH:

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Bill. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. The Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Second from the bottom on Page 13, one-star, 1188, H.B. No. 5054, an Act concerning the creation of tenant-landlord Mediation Boards.

ABIJAH U. FOX:

Mr. Speaker, I move for suspension of the rules for the consideration of the favorable report of the Committee on Government Administration and Policy and adoption of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any objection to suspension of the rules. Hearing no objection the rules are suspended.

ABIJAH U. FOX:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Clerk has an Amendment, and with your permission I will describe what it is rather than have it read.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on acceptance and passage. The Clerk has House Amendment Schedule "A". Would the gentleman outline the

S-80
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL.14
PART 5
1921-2435

May 21, 1971

Page 61

signify by saying Aye. The chair is in doubt. Will all those in favor of passage of the bill, please rise, 14 in favor. All those opposed please rise, (my ears have triumphed again, like a finely tuned electronic instrument) it was 14 to 14. We will stand at ease a moment while I think. Lieutenant Governor votes no.

THE CLERK:

Calendar #696, file 997. Favorable report --

SENATOR CRAFTS:

A point of order, Mr. President, would you please announce the results of the vote for the record. Was the motion defeated.

THE CHAIR:

The vote was 15 to 14, the bill is passed. Thank you Senator Crafts. Excuse me, it's pretty obvious that I'm tired - that will help limit the debate - and I'm quite tired. The bill was defeated by a vote of 15 to 14.

THE CLERK:

Calendar #696, file #997. Favorable report Joint Senate Committee on Education, S.B. 332. An Act Concerning Instructors of Driving Education. The clerk has two amendments.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. The major, excuse me -

May 21, 1971

Page 62.

THE CLERK:

The clerk has Senate amendment "A" offered by Senator Cashman of the 20th. In line (25) after the word "education" delete the semi-colon and insert a period. Delete lines "26 to 32 --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cashman.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

I think you could dispense with the reading - wave the reading of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

Mr. President, I move for the adoption of the amendment and I will attempt to explain it, this and the amendment that follows deal with the same problem that I see in the bill. The first amendment, amendment "A" is broader than amendment "B". If amendment "A" should fail then I will introduce amendment "B". The bill on line "26" in your file 997, deals with the number of clock hours that a driver instructor shall go to school before being licensed. Later in the bill on line "59" deals with the number of clock hours that one of these licensed instructors must go to school in the succeeding four years. They are talking about, in total, 125 hours of instruction for someone to have the capability of being a

May 21, 1971

Page 63.

driver-instructor. Now 125 hours is more time than is needed for any individual who can read and write to become a commercial, fully rated, instrument flight rules pilot for a multi-engine aircraft. Now what I submit is that the purpose of this legislation, which was drafted in conjunction with the driver education school people is to create what in effect is a new highly restricted profession. They will run it, they will come back here, they are going to ask us for a Commission in the future which they then in the future will undoubtedly put their members on and as a result you're going to have a situation, I am convinced, in a very few years when driver education will be just like the Doctor. It will be a inaudible industry, restricted to a very few people, quote "professional" They probably even put letters after their names and as a result, I as a parent or my brother or uncle won't be allowed to instruct. The purpose of the amendment is to put the old language back into the law and that is the language which says that each applicant shall demonstrate personally to the Commissioner or his Deputy or a Motor Vehicle Inspector in such manner as the Commissioner may direct that he has sufficient skill in the operation of a motor vehicle to insure their safe operation of motor vehicles and satisfactory knowledge of the motor vehicle laws and can impart such skill and knowledge to others. I think that is more than sufficient statutory language to allow the Commissioner to successfully

May 21, 1971

Page 64.

regulate this new industry. I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Questions on the amendment. Will you remark further.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment. This bill was drawn up after a series of meeting with the Department of Education, the Motor Vehicle Department and the individuals concerned with the private driving schools. I don't think that a clock hour requirement is excessive and in keeping with our efforts to cut down on the carnage on the highways, I think the training for these people do receive will pay off when they train young people how to drive a car and I urge that the amendment be defeated.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, I, also, rise to oppose the amendment. This whole bill of course concerns the training for teachers of driver education who teach just ordinary young citizens, or old citizens, who come into their driving schools and also they sometimes teach in the public and private schools of the state. Now these drivers must all, under the present law, and under this law be licensed by the Motor Vehicle Commissioner on the basis of training program as established by the Motor Vehicle Commissioner. The requirements to become a

May 21, 1971

Page 65

teacher-driver education is set forth in this bill or the requirement that has been approved by the Motor Vehicle Commissioner who took part in establishing that. If this amendment should pass, the Motor Vehicle Commissioner will have to establish regulations for training program for a license, very likely it would be what would amount to the same regulation, because he was the one that approved these regulations. They are not unreasonable requirements. I must say that in relation to something that Senator Cashman said, really isn't quite the way it shapes up. He fears that this group will become so dominant and such a little empire, but the truth of the matter is that under present law the State Board - no recording Voice came on. The truth of the matter is that under the present law, the State Board of Education has the authority if you back to the present law, if you accept this amendment, and go back to the present law, the State Board of Education has the authority to set up regulations concerning these teachers of driver education. What they have done and what will be repealed by this law is to say that all drivers teaching driver education in the schools, private and public, shall have to be regular certificated teachers like the teachers we have in our High Schools or Elementary Schools with five years of training in the teachers training institutions. They're the ones that were building driver education into something far above and beyond what most of us think is reason-

May 21, 1971

Page 66.

able. I oppose this resolution, I mean this amendment.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

If I understood Senator Hammer, through you, I think she indicated that if this amendment were accepted we would be going back to the present system now whereby you have to be a certificated teacher. That is not so, under this amendment all the new language in the law that is written in, remains, other than just this one specific area of time actually in the class room for the driver-ed teacher. It's that which I oppose and that amendment can be passed and it will not affect the basic thrust of this bill which is good.

SENATOR MACAULEY:

Mr. President, members of the circle, in reading this bill, I can't help but come to the conclusion in that it is a self-interest bill on the part of the driver-education people. It bothers me, that under this, that a retired state trooper wouldn't even be allowed to instruct people to drive, and this a little ludicrous, I believe.

THE CHAIR:

Questions on the amendment. Will you remark further.

SENATOR ODEGARD:

Mr. President, I simply like to speak in favor of the amendment as I think Senator Cashman's explanation was eloquent and leaves very little to be said, the texture is one of reasonableness and if we look at the bill without the

May 21, 1971

Page 67.

amendment, I think it's a horrible tendency toward over regulation and I certainly advise that the amendment be passed.

THE CHAIR:

Remark further. If not, all those in favor of the amendment, signify by saying Aye. The amendment is defeated.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

The clerk has an amendment. This second amendment is considerably less of a change in the law. It simply takes out the 80 clock hours in the succeeding four years. It leaves in the original portion allowing the 45 clock hours as in the new language. I think all the previous arguments apply.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, again I rise to oppose the amendment. I do think that this would encourage safety, this type of statute.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, I also rise to oppose this amendment. I would not have any objection into cutting down on the number of hours, not of the original training program, but the updating requirements as set forth in this bill. I would have

May 21, 1971

Page 68.

no particular objections to this, if this circle approved of them, of it, but Senator Cashman has also removed the grandfather clause which takes care of people who now are teaching and have their licenses and I don't think this is quite fair and equitable, so I have to oppose it, this amendment too.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

That was not my intent, Mr. President, could we stand at ease for just one moment.

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection, we will stand at ease.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

In the amendment, Mr. President, that it removes the grandfather clause, I believe all it does is remove the succeeding 80 hours of instructions in the succeeding four years, up to line 76 on page 3.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Perhaps, I'm wrong, but I have it marked. I copied from his amendment, I may have made a mistake, but I have it from line 69 through to line 76 as deleted. Is that not right, Mr. Cashman.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

It was my understanding that there was a grandfather clause elsewhere in the bill. I may be wrong, if so

May 21, 1971

Page 69.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cashman may I make.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

If so, I will withdraw the amendment

THE CHAIR:

Well, I thought that if you wanted to have it heard, we could vote on it and if it didn't pass it's academic, if it does I could rule it substantial and have it referred to the Legislative Commissioner's office to ascertain the facts in this regard. Is that agreeable Senator Hammer.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

That would be fine with me, if it passes

THE CHAIR:

The suggestion is that we vote on it and if it passes I will rule it substantial. It will be referred to the Legislative Commissioner's office and the interested parties can check with the Commissioner to see whether the grandfathers are provided for, and if as I have a suspicion it is defeated it will be academic. Of course that will have no bearing on the outcome. Anybody remark further, if not, all those in favor of the amendment, signify by saying Aye. The amendment is defeated.

SENATOR MONDANI:

I believe I moved for the adoption of the bill,
Mr. President.

May 21, 1971

Page 70.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark,

SENATOR MONDANI:

Well I guess we've gone through it all in the debate on the amendments. It sets up conditions for receiving these licenses, provides that the person will not have been engaged in a crime involving moral turpitude etc., and I urge its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Excellent explanation. Will you remark further on passage of the bill. If not, all those in favor of passage of the bill, please signify by saying Aye. The Ayes have it the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar #697, file # 992. Favorable report Joint Senate Committee on Finance. Substitute S.B. 1675. An Act Concerning the Authorization of Bonds of the State to Provide for Parking Facilities at the University of Connecticut.

SENATOR CUTILLO:

Mr. President, I move adoption of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark,

SENATOR CUTILLO:

Mr. President, this bill reflects on a bond issue

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

EDUCATION

**PART 1
1-330**

**1971
Index**

I have here the last set of bills that I would urge you to report favorably.
HB6348 - An Act Concerning Instruction of Unlicensed Persons in the Operation of Motor Vehicles.

HB6541 - An Act Concerning State Grants for Motor Vehicle Operation and Highway Safety Course.

HB6542 - An Act Concerning Fees when Course is Offered Outside Regular School Hours.

The bills before this committee would in essence accomplish the following:

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Provide for more funding to schools | <u>HB6541</u> |
| 2. Eliminate the charging of fees to students who take the driver education course in public schools. | <u>HB6542</u> |
| 3. Make Driver Education mandatory for obtaining a drivers license for 16-18 year old youth. | <u>HB6348</u> |

All of these bills are worthy of support. We find that private secondary schools are facing real difficulties in obtaining local funding for driver education programs. Many schools are providing only after school hour courses and charging student fees for such courses. This eliminates students who would benefit most from driver education. We should provide all students the opportunity to learn how to survive on our streets and highways. We should support efforts to make driver education available to all eligible youth.

I urge you also to report favorably on SB332 - An Act Concerning Requirements of Driver Education Courses.

We have a need to provide expressway or multiple lane access highway driving experiences for students enrolled in our driver education courses. Most of our young drivers will and do spend considerable time driving on expressways. This requires certain skills. We are not allowed, at the present time to instruct them, in an actual vehicle, how to drive correctly upon these highways. Connecticut is the only state which prohibits student drivers from gaining such experiences. It is not necessary to mandate one hour of the required six clock of behind-the-wheel instruction be on a multiple-lane-limited-access highway but rather to provide for this experience. The driver education teacher should be allowed to decide when and if the student is ready for such experience.

Another bill on Driver Education which we would ask you to report on unfavorably, is An Act Concerning Certificates Necessary to Teacher Employment.

Teacher certification for driver education teaching presently calls for a teaching certificate and a three semester hour course in driver education at an approved

I can foresee if this bill is enacted a dark ominous picture of school principals, administrators, teachers, and even janitors being placed, moved, or elevated because of who they know and who their friends are rather than what they know and what their ability is. Only my children and other children can be hurt. So I would like to urge this committee to file an unfavorable report on HB6451. Thank you.

Rep. Mary Griswold: Barbara Kenny.

Barbara Kenny: Madam Chairman, members of the Committee I am a resident of Hartford and Legislative Chairman for the Parent Teachers Association of Connecticut an organization with some 100,000 paid members.

I would briefly speak in support of several bills this morning. We would support SB332 requiring driver education courses to include behind-the-wheel training on a limited access highway. Those of us who have had young people know, and the rest of you can imagine what it is to have our youngster take driver education, get a license as a qualified driver and then go out into a major non-access highway which is the most dangerous² driving. We feel this should be included in driver education.

I didn't realize that you were hearing all bills on driver education this morning so I have not the bills nor numbers with me but I would say for the PTA that we support teachers of driver education that they should be qualified and not necessarily certified. We are interested in having the parental right to teach children driver education ourselves be retained. We would support HB5746, An Act Concerning Free Instructional Supplies and Equipment. Non supplied materials often required by some teachers or boards of education often put undue pressure on parents and it is an obvious embarrassment to those youngsters who can't afford it. If passed it would tend to have boards of education put some breaks on teachers who would press special requirements on students unless they were truly important to that course.

We support HB5739, Concerning Innovative Educational Programs. Problems of education today are such that present methods are all too unsuccessful. Public education must innovate or fail.

We support HB5743, Concerning Reading Improvement Programs. Our ranks are filled with children who are not learning and have not learned to read. These children have two and one half strikes against them - society is a complete loser. We would further say that we hope that you will give favorable reports to these bills and if you do we certainly intend to press them in the appropriations committee as an organization and as individual members. Thank you.

Rep. Lavine: Just a general question. I would like you to reflect the point of view of the PTA in assessing how they feel previous innovative programs have worked out in the State of Connecticut since you are, in fact, suggesting that we go along with new ones.

Barbara Kenny: We feel that those that have been evaluated successfully should be continued and in those areas that still need better methods that there should be continuous innovation. It should be a growing thing.

Rep. Lavine: Are you satisfied with the evaluation methods?

Barbara Kenny: That is a tough question. Sometimes, yes and sometimes, no.

Rep. Mary Griswold: Thank you, Mrs. Kenny. Mr. Edward Carroll of the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Mr. Edward Carroll: I would like to direct my remarks to bill number 332 which would allow the instructions of an unlicensed operator on limited access highways. We object to this. We feel that....

Rep. Griswold: Mr. Carroll may I ask are you speaking for the Department of Motor Vehicles?

Mr. Edward Carroll: I am. We feel that a person should be licensed before they receive such instructions on a limited access divided highway. We feel there are certain safe guards built into our examination both with regard to their physical qualifications and the fact that they have to pass a law test and we feel that it is in the interest of public good to require that they be licensed.

Rep. Griswold: Senator Mondani.

Senator Mondani: We have similar measures in the Transportation Committee and I think we have been over this a few times. What concerns me is that a youngster receives his automobile license and he is allowed to drive on any highway in the state of Connecticut and he may never have legally driven on a multiple lane limited access highway. Is it not possible to set up an area in the state - certain limited access highways where they could drive while they are getting their training at particular times so that they won't be a hazard to the people who are driving and yet they will know what it is like to drive on this type of highway. I'm talking mainly about the relationship of speed, or slowing down, the exit ramp, entering, the flow. What concerns me is that old things; They can go up to Motor Vehicle on the old Route 9, go in and get the license, and cut right out on 91. There is no way of limiting that license to say they can't do this. What...or how are we going to overcome this?

Mr. Edward Carroll: Senator, you are correct in your statement that they come down on an old two lane highway and leave by 91 and we would

very much like to have them get instruction after the license is issued. But we would like to determine that they are qualified to hold the license and are sufficiently good drivers to operate on the secondary highways before they get out there on the limited access highway. I think you may have read of the accident recently up on 91 where it was due to fog and we are afraid with an inexperienced operator out there it could be a real manence.

I think with regard to your specific suggestion I don't know if it would be the highway department or the State Traffic Commission would be better able to comment as to utilization of the limited access highway for this purpose of giving instruction.

Senator Mondani: I was thinking of in my own area which is the new Route 9 which during the peak time is heavily travelled but isn't later during the day when many of these young people would be able to go out with a controlled car - dual control - when they would learn to enter the highway and exit the highway properly. It would get the speed relationship and so on and know when they are slowing down.

What concerns me is I can see your point that they are hazards and yet they are more of a hazard if we just allow them to drive. If we could match the two - traffic safety and the other - to get together on this and see if there were some way of accomplishing the two things. You know, keeping them from the highways because....

Mr. Carroll: I understand your objective and I think that many others here have the same objective. We are all interested in safety. We may feel differently as to what is safe and what is unsafe.

I would like to point out that in this specific bill it makes no mention as to when they can go out on these limited access divided highways so the first hour could be spent out there. Obviously, no teacher would take them out there, but I do think that it is a short-coming. I understand that there are other bills which provide I think after the fourth hour of instruction that they get out there. We would still be opposed to it. We would like to demonstrate that they are capable of the holding of an operator's license and so, therefore, we feel that they should be licensed out there before they receive such instruction.

I understand that there are a number of schools that presently do this. That following the issuance of an operators license they have the driver education instruction teacher does take them up on these highways and gives them certain instruction.

I know that previous speakers have spoken on measures apparently dealing with measures on driver education. I don't feel sufficiently prepared to take

the time of the committee to discuss any of these, but I would like, if I may, to send written comments to the committee with regards to them.

Rep. Griswold: Mr. Edward Bonessi.

Mr. Edward Bonessi: Madam Chairman, members of the committee I am Assistant Professor of Southern Connecticut State College and a former driver education teacher for a few years in several high schools and colleges.

I am here to speak on several of the bills and first, of all I would like to give SB484, 485, 486 - all dealing with contracting with commercial schools with boards of education.

I would like to first clear up a few mis-conceptions about contracting. This is not what we call "proformance contracting" as we are beginning to see in education today where highly qualified companies made up of individuals with qualifications go into a school system and will submit to a proformance contract and guarantee that the student will achieve a certain level of learning. The company would not be paid for their services if not achieved. This contract that we are referring to in these three bills that I have just mentioned are far from this type of contracting. Because, first of all we are attempting to contract with a type of education -the so-called private or commercial driving schools - which to begin with has no educational foundation, no educational requirements to insure the capability of doing the job. Secondly, I feel that if we were to allow this type of thing it would close the door on the teacher possibility or the use of the para-professional in the field of driver education which, for instance, Teaxas is experimenting with right now and seems to be having success with it. The difference between these contracts for para-professionals would be with the para-professional we would seek out individuals who possess the potential and the aptitude to work along with the high school driver education program. In fact, in the State of Texas they were giving the para-professional more training than they were giving the high school driver education teacher. With this type of a program we could possibly work closely and coordinate both the classroom and the behind-the-wheel phase with the high school teacher being the master teacher and the para-professional working under the tutilage of him. But once we come in with our contracting of these bills....that these bills propose, we almost close the door....and in some cases I know this has already been done.....we close the door, on any type of coordination between the two phases of the program. It has been shown that when the program of driver education is broken down into two phases and run by two different bodies with completely different requirements the results are practically zero. So I would like to say at this time that I am opposed to these three bills. I hope that the committee would vote unfavorably on them.

The next bill I would like to talk on would be HB6541 which is an increase of the state grant from \$10 to \$50 and you will notice in proposing this besides the fact that the cost of everything has gone up and in order to get the high

schools to expand their programs we have also included in this bill the possibility of eliminating the breakdown of \$10 for class and \$10 for the behind-the-wheel because this has a tendency to dis-associate the two phases of the program. We feel that if the school is going to do a good program they have to consolidate the two phases and one of the ways of doing it will be the reward of getting a better grant to do a better job. So I would urge the committee to rule favorably on HB6541.

I would also like to vote favorably on HB6542 dealing with Public Schools not being allowed to charge a fee for driver education. As it stands right now a public school can charge the difference between the cost of the program and the \$20 grant. There is a connection between HB6541 and HB6542 in that if a grant is increased it will not be necessary to charge the parent this additional amount and once again will consolidate the program. There is, however, a clause in this act stating that private and parochial schools may charge this fee if they are not eligible for this grant.

Then I would like to speak on HB6348, The Elimination of the Parent Training Program. First of all this is of no offense to the parents. Many times they probably do have the capability of teaching their sons and daughters. But let's think first of all about the part of the parent in training young people. Their part is when the child is growing up. The training of attitudes, the development and respect for law - regulations and so forth - and the respect for other people. They are all also part of this program as the student is learning. In most cases I send a letter to the parents asking if they felt they were capable. And only after we felt the student had good enough control of the car that they could take their youngsters out and just practice maneuvers that have already been practiced, and we even gave them areas to use, we would appreciate this by the parent. Only if the parent felt capable. But, the parent's big part comes after the drivers license. In other words set up a close type of program. Because no young boy or girl is ready after six hours to go out and drive alone. They still need some licensed operator with them, preferably the parent to ride with them, to give them that feeling of confidence and experience. So there are many places that the parent fit into the program, but for God's sake not in lieu of driver education.

Another ironical factor about this is that the parents can take a youngster out and bring them on any secondary highway, any crowded secondary highway, which in my estimation today is even more dangerous than your limited access highway - because these highways originally were never built for the volume of traffic that we have today - and these parents don't even need a dual control on the car. So this in itself is a dangerous factor. By the parent is ready to give the student help the student would not need a dual control. But I think we are actually fostering a dangerous action by asking parents to take their youngsters out. I am an instructor with 20 years of experience and believe me I wouldn't take a youngster out without a dual control on my car.

Finally, on HB...SB332 that Mr. Carroll just spoke on for the Motor Vehicle Department - Limited Access Highways - I would like to say that this is a problem in that the students do need this type of training. There is no doubt about it. I do, however, think that there should be a little more clarity in the bill stating that a determination of the course if the instructor felt the student was capable he could then proceed to give him some experience on limited access. Now for the many years I have taught in high schools first of all we took the students out in groups of three's and four's with myself driving on observation after they had all the classrooms series on theories and visual aids and so forth. So then on the turnpike - on the approach to the entry way and so forth, acceleration lanes, breakdowns, so forth. The use of the clover-leaf and the diamond shaped intersection. This was an observation ride. Then we license them by the Motor Vehicle Department who came to our school. Then we took them out for one post session. Then we asked the parent to follow up. Now this is one way of getting around this and still doing it legal. But at the same time I would say that I would like to see this included. Even if it has to become a post one more hour besides the six to give the youngster this type of training.

I would like to just say one thing in closing. I feel that bills like contracting are only going to add to the confusion and I have travelled around the country quite a bit on safety meetings and Connecticut unfortunately has the dubious distinction of having more conflicting rules and regulations in bills on driver education than any other state. If you will look at your final objective as to what we could achieve from driver education - how do we achieve it when we have several different types of programs using personnel with all different types of backgrounds, different qualifications.

I would like to leave with the committee and with the clerk several documents; 1) is a resource curriculum guide which is one of the most up-to-date and latest pieces of material in the field of driver education. This will show you the extent of the total program. I would also like to leave a copy of the judges decision for the State of Illinois on the commercial driver school vs. the State of Illinois where it was shown that the commercial schools would have to meet the same standards as high schools. I would also like to leave a copy of the Teacher Preparation on Driver Education to show you how we have been trying to do...planning to do with high school teachers. We are not satisfied with our own program. We are constantly trying to upgrade it.

Look at the commercial driving schools record from 1958 to the present and find out how much their educational qualifications have increased in training for them. You will find out it is zero, it hasn't changed at all.