



Office of Public Affairs Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Tom Blank ·
Dick Schoenfeld
Tel.: (202) 426-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY ELIZABETH HANFORD DOLE
TO THE ANCHORAGE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
JUNE 4, 1983

It is a privilege to be here in the great land of Alaska. I recall that when Alaska was made the 49th state some people in Texas resented being knocked out of first place as the largest state. And so they made some very disparaging remarks about Alaska, whereupon one of your own warned the Texans that if they weren't careful, Alaska might divide into two states and make Texas the nation's third largest state.

But when it comes to scenery as well as size, Alaska is beyond parallel. From Mount McKinley to Glacier Bay National Park with its awesome ice sheets and the magnificent Inland Passage in the Southwest Panhandle, your state is blessed with a unique beauty. I am delighted to have this chance to talk with you today, with the members of the Anchorage Republican Women's Club, the Women's Caucus and the League of Women Voters. It is invaluable to me to be able to meet with groups such as yours which are so strongly involved in important community issues, and to understand your views and concerns.

Because I so value this type of exchange, I have been doing a lot of traveling around the country lately, especially in conjunction with National Transportation Week, two weeks ago. I traveled to Boston, St. Louis and Houston with a lot of stops in between, and I began to feel a little like the old line "If this is Tuesday, it must be Belgium." Today, I was sure I was in Alaska and not Boston when I referred to "Ted" and everyone immediately knew I meant Stevens and not Kennedy.

Senator Ted Stevens is one of the truly great leaders in Washington today. He is a giant in the Senate; a real battler on the Appropriations, Commerce and Governmental Affairs Committees -- a great public servant in the best sense of the term and a true friend of the people of Alaska.

Ted Stevens has played a tremendously influential role in shaping the transportation policies that will carry this nation into the 21st century. He was a leader in achieving enactment of the air traffic controllers pay raise legislation so that those workers who perform a vital function in air safety could be justly compensated. He was a hard worker in the legislative battle over the Surface Transportation Assistance Act -- Washington jargon for the gas tax legislation -- which will allow us to repair and rehabilitate the nation's highways, bridges and mass transit systems.

And on maritime affairs, so vitally important to this state, Ted Stevens is the greatest. He is knowledgeable, outspoken and sensitive to Alaska's best interests, yet always within the context of the overall public interest.

I know that this nation's best interests are a primary concern of those of you here today. I commend you for your active involvement in government and for your willingness to take on some of the toughest issues. Like many of you, I find that being involved in public service is both exciting and rewarding.

We share a further mutual interest in that we are not only working in government but we share the distinction of positions and responsibilities that not too long ago were reserved for men.

I know something about the quiet revolution going on in this country -- because I've lived so much of it in my own life. I can identify with the frustrations Marjorie Karowe must have felt when, as a young attorney, she stood before the bench to enter a not guilty plea on behalf of her client, a young man accused of a minor crime. "Well, who are you?" the judge demanded, "his mother?"

Today Marjorie Karowe is a partner in a New York law firm and president of the Women's Bar Association of New York.

I can identify, too, with Sandra Day O'Connor, who, upon completing law school, was offered a job as a legal secretary and, of course, went on to break the type -- as the first woman appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court. I remember vividly a day in September 1962 when I entered Harvard Law School, one of 25 women in a class of 550 eager students. I'll never forget being accosted by a male classmate on my very first day at Harvard, who demanded to know what I was doing there.

"Don't you realize," he said in tones of moral outrage, "that there are men who'd give their right arm to be in this law school? Men who would use their legal education?" Obviously he felt I was taking the place of a man. And come to think of it, some may have felt that way when I became Secretary of Transportation.

Much has changed since then. Much of the change has been dictated, not by government edict but by the marketplace. For insance, the double digit inflation of the 1970s forced millions of mothers into the workforce for the first time. Divorced women joined the economy at the same time, until we reached the point where 63 percent of women with children between the ages of six and 17 were in America's labor force in 1982. During the last decade alone, the number of female MBA candidates in this country has soared by nearly 800 percent. Today, for the first time ever, there are more women than men enrolled in college -- and a higher percentage of men than women who are without jobs.

Yet even now, less than one-sixth of those employed in my own field of transportation are women. Fewer than 8 percent of all America's executives and 1 percent of college level teachers are female. And women are nine times as likely to provide administrative and clerical support as technical support in the health, science or engineering fields. Yet in this emerging era of satellite disks and instant communications, the old barriers to professional advancement are beginning to give way.

And this trend, I am confident, will continue. For as our economy evolves away from its traditional reliance on smokestack industries, as we come to place our faith in services and communications and managerial skills, then women who were previously barred from steel mills and auto factories will find themselves in ever greater demand. In the foreseeable future, we will even graduate from the misguided perfectionism best described by author and social critic Marya Mannes, who writes: "Nobody objects to a woman being a good writer or sculptor or geneticist if, at the same time, she manages to be a good wife, a good mother, good-looking, good tempered, well-dressed, well-groomed, and unaggressive."

Another area where we share an interest is that of transportation legislation. Alaska, with its huge land mass, its extensive coastline with its many inlets and bays and its 500-mile distance from the nearest state, elevates the importance of transportation.

We succeed or fail in our transportation objectives, in large part, by how effectively we persuade the Congress and the public of the merits of our proposals. This is never easy. Fortunately, we have come a long way from the days when ancient Greeks decreed the custom that when a man proposed a law in the Popular Assembly, he did so on a platform with a rope around his neck. If his law passed, they removed the rope; if it failed, they removed the platform.

Change is the order of the day at my Department. One of our priorities is the modernization of our Air Traffic Control System, which has been described as the biggest government undertaking since the Apollo Man-on-the-Moon program. The new system will eventually double our capacity in the air through the year 2000. It will cost \$9 billion but save \$25 billion through the end of the century. It will weatherproof our airways and through the most precise landing systems, and equipment to prevent midair collisions, provide us the safest possible air system.

While this modernization program will be costly, the money will come from user fees, not the general taxpayer. The user fee principle is not new -- our Interstate highways are literally built on it. But the extension of that principle to other means of transportation does represent a change in policy, one that is fully consistent with the Administration's position that those who benefit from government-provided services should pay a fair share of their costs. To give you an idea of how far we have come in our user fee philosophy, fully 69 percent of our Department's 1984 Budget will be financed by user fees rather than general revenues. That's up from 45 percent in 1981, when this Administration took office.

There is another significant change affecting transportation in America. We are in the beginning phases of a nationwide program to rehabilitate and preserve our highways, bridges and public transit systems. No patchwork project, this extensive rebuilding program will assure that the high quality surface transportation system we

enjoy today will endure for future generations. The resources for this program come primarily from the recent nickel a gallon increase in the Federal gasoline tax, revenues that are already bring put to work. Although the additional tax only went into effect April 1st, we awarded \$2.9 billion to the states in the first quarter of this year and will fund more than \$12 billion for bridges and highways over the full year -- the highest levels in the history of our highway program. Alaska is eligible for \$141 million this year, up 31 percent from \$108 million in fiscal 1982. Much of the 1983 money has already been obligated, and we will continue to work closely with this state in advancing projects during this fiscal year.

The legislation that increased the gas tax also increased user fees on the heaviest trucks using our nation's highways. The extensive cost allocation study completed last year showed that heavy trucks have not been paying anywhere near their fair share of highway costs. The higher fee schedule set by the new law is being phased in over a five-year period so that truckers and the small independent operator in particular are not hit with a sudden increase. Even with the new fees, however, they will still pay less than their fair share -- an estimated 69 percent by 1985 and only 73 percent when the tax is fully implemented in 1989.

It is our feeling that new truck taxes are offset by the increases in productivity the new law permits. Our best rule-of-thumb calculations show an annual net gain -- by 1985 -- of \$3.2 billion of benefits over costs for the industry as a whole.

For example, the law also permits the use of tandem trailers in all states, on the Interstate System and on certain primary highways designated by my Department.

In your state, the interim designation of truck routes made on April 5 included roads newly classified as belonging to the Interstate System. The Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities has requested that we de-designate those Interstate routes which cannot safely accommodate the large trucks. We have endorsed that request because those routes were not constructed to Interstate standards originally. The interim route system in Alaska now includes 470 miles of Interstate highways. We will continue to work with the states to reach agreement on a final route structure that is mutally acceptable and provides adequate access to freight centers.

These are just some of the winds of change blowing across the landscape of American transportation. Another is deregulation. I recall that in the early 1970s, when I was serving on the Federal Trade Commission, we were among the first in Washington to question the merit of continued government economic regulation over industries that had long ceased to be monopolistic and were, in fact, naturally competitive.

Since then, we have come a long way in putting this deregulation philosophy to work. And, while some dissenting comments can still be heard from time to time, I think there is a broad consensus that deregulation has been good for the industry and the public alike. It is clearly transforming the way airlines, railroads, intercity bus operators and trucking companies do business. Under the restraints of Federal regulation, none of these freight or passenger carriers could compete on price. None could set its own routes. None could enter or leave a market without government approval.

Obviously, in any particular mode, deregulation might cause temporary dislocations during the transition to a more competitive world and we will be sensitive to those dislocations.

Overall, we firmly believe that deregulation has served the best interests of the public. In the long run, we are convinced it will prove equally beneficial to the industries involved. In aviation, for example, the major airlines have been able to restructure their routes to make more efficient and productive use of their equipment. They have vacated markets better suited to the regional and commuter carriers, but contrary to the fears expressed before deregulation, this has not generally caused small communities to lose service. In 74 communities where the major carriers eliminated service between November 1978 and May 1981, total departures actually increased by 26 percent, as smaller, more competitive operators moved in or expanded existing service. According to a CAB study, convenience of service — times of departure, number of flights and availability of connecting flights at hub airports — generally improved in those communities.

In intercity bus transportation much has been said about the possibility of abandonment of service since President Reagan signed the Bus Regulatory Reform Act. What has not been generally noticed is the other side of the coin. In the first four months after passage of the Act, the ICC received 85 applications for new or expanded service. We thought that was encouraging. We find now that eight months after the Act was passed, some 137 applications for new or expanded service have been made. This compares to an average of 40 applications per year during the five years before regulatory reform.

Regulatory reforms also have enabled our nation's railroads to compete more effectively, operate more efficiently -- and generate the best profits the industry has seen in years, even in the face of a poor economy. In trucking as well, rate reductions today are widely available along with a variety of new types of price and service options. As a matter of fact, we are preparing to proceed with "Phase Two" of the surface transportation deregulation program which would, in effect, eliminate most of the remaining Interstate Commerce Commission regulatory authority over the motor carrier industry, domestic water carriers and freight forwarders.

We are also encouraged by the prospects for maritime reform. I have testified before the Congress in support of deregulatory legislation which will minimize the government's intervention in maritime affairs, strengthen our Merchant Marine and help to put U.S. carriers on an equal footing with foreign carriers. The Senate has approved a bill similar to our proposal, and we hope to see early action in the House. If we get the maritime legislation we want, and believe the nation needs, it will mark the first regulatory reform of the industry in 67 years.

Another area getting a great deal of our attention is Conrail, that "other railroad" we own back East. When the Reagan Administration took office, Conrail was losing more than \$100 million a year -- which was financed with Federal subsidies. We don't believe the government belongs in the railroad business, and we obtained legislation from Congress that allows the railroad to operate more efficiently and lets us sell it to the private sector. Conrail is today a much-improved, well-performing railroad, and has begun to show an operating profit. We will continue our efforts to return it to the private sector where it properly belongs. In my talks, I usually ask if any one wants a railroad, but you already have answered that here -- and it's not Conrail we're talking

about. I'm glad to assure you that we support the transfer of the Alaska railroad back to the state. With the invaluable help of Ted Stevens we convinced Congress to pass the Alaskan Railroad Transfer Act this past winter. The U.S. Railway Association is expected to complete its valuation of the railroad by September, ahead of the October 14 deadline. And we hope to complete the transfer by next year.

To conclude, let me say that in my book, there is no more important responsibility for the Secretary of Transportation than <u>safety</u>.

Highway traffic deaths last year were down, by more than 10 percent from 1981. In looking for an explanation, we certainly can't overlook the crackdown on drunk driving. It all began, as I'm sure you know, with a groundswell of public opinion deploring ineffectual laws, lax enforcement and lenient judges which together had led us to believe that death was something we had to learn to live with, almost as a price of our mobility.

Aroused citizens groups, led initially by Candy Lightner and women and men united under the "Mothers Against Drunk Drivers" organization, began a forceful lobbying effort and turned a host of state legislatures around. Last year alone, drunk driving laws were tightened in 20 states. Thirty-eight new laws were enacted. Forty states this year either have already enacted tougher drunk driving laws or have such laws up for consideration. The Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving, appointed early last year to focus public awareness on the extent of the problem, has made a number of very solid recommendations and the Commission's term has been extended. Women concerned about transportation-related deaths and injuries have made -- and are making -- tremendous contributions in the areas of safety and driving responsibility.

A drunk driving bill has been introduced in this session of the state legislature, which includes raising the drinking age from 19 to 21, and to increase the penalties for second and subsequent driving while intoxicated offenses. I urge all of you to support this important legislation.

Additionally, the Alaska Highway Safety Planning Agency, in cooperation with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, will sponsor a Drinking Driver Program Management Course in Anchorage in July. The course will feature lectures, workshops and panel discussions on the problem of drunk drivers and how local officials and concerned citizens can organize and operate an effective program.

We know now that we can make a sizeable dent in the fatality rate and in the number of serious injuries. Along with an aggressive drunk driving program, we are engaged in a nationwide effort, with private sector support, to encourage greater use of safety belts. And we're seeing some encouraging results. According to our latest survey we have gained more than two percentage points in compliance -- no small achievement when you consider that every one percent increase means about 200 lives saved and 3,000 injuries prevented. A bill has been introduced in the Alaska legislature to require children under four years of age to use a safety seat and for children four to six years of age to use a safety seat or safety belt. This is similar to legislation that has already been passed in other states that is helping to save children's lives every day.

These are some of the areas we are working on in Washington. When the Reagan Administration came to Washington in January 1981, it was as if we were entering a new frontier in government -- to reverse the policies of the past and ensure this

country's sound economic foundation. Alaska has contributed to America's frontier image with its modern day lure of large masses of undisturbed wilderness areas. As women working in areas traditionally held by men -- I am the first woman Secretary of Transportation and the first woman to head a branch of the armed services, the U.S. Coast Guard -- we are continuously making progress through the political process.

As women, we are used to frontiers.

In New York, they are celebrating the 100th Anniversary of the Brooklyn Bridge, which was built with the help of Emily Roebling, who acted as chief engineer when her husband became ill. And today there's Brooke Knapp who flew a Lear jet around the world in 50 hours, breaking the record for light business class jets by more than half a day. She now runs her own charter airline company in Los Angeles.

"We dwell in possibility," Emily Dickinson wrote nearly 150 years ago.

But for most women, success today is achieved by dwelling in the <u>improbable</u>, by challenging the odds and overcoming the conventional wisdom.

So today let us continue to strive for the day when the improbable becomes the probable. Back in June 1965, when I graduated from Harvard Law School, I was welcomed somewhat uneasily into a circle still known as "the fellowship of educated men." I've seen enormous progress since then. I've seen the circle expand, and opportunities open up.

And I am convinced that today's women stand in the reflected light of a rising, not a setting sun. Our day has barely dawned. Like this great state itself, our dreams are just beginning to be realized. We dwell in possibility -- but we challenge the improbable.