



U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele.: (202) 366-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
HEADLINER BREAKFAST GROUP  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
OCTOBER 4, 1988

As election day approaches, we are hearing more and more about our national drug problem and how to combat it. Some dismiss this as campaign rhetoric. I believe, however, that this issue is much too serious to be treated as a political football. I want to talk to you today about the drug problem, and tell you what the Department of Transportation is doing to address it.

Our national population includes 5-6 million regular cocaine users, more than half-a-million heroin users, and at least 18 million pot smokers. The United States imports more illegal drugs than any country in the world; and drugs are cultivated within our own boundaries as well. In West Virginia, the Agriculture Commissioner reports that his state's leading cash crop for 1987 was marijuana, with an estimated value in excess of \$800 million. In comparison, West Virginia's leading legal cash crop for 1987 was hay, valued at approximately \$58 million.

Even these statistics do not adequately calculate the extent to which the drug culture has penetrated our society. Earlier in the summer, the Washington Post reported that elementary school children had invented a new game called "Hustler." The goal of the game is to successfully complete fake drug deals, using play money, pebbles for crack, pencil shavings for marijuana, and ground-up chalk for cocaine. "They do everything like they've seen it," says a Recreation Department counselor, "with the runners, the lookouts, the users, the jumpout squads, everybody." What is most disturbing is that the police and the special anti-drug squads are seen as the bad guys.

Just a couple of weeks ago, I read the tragic story of Enoch Thomas, an 11-year-old boy who worked for crack dealers in New Orleans. Thomas somehow lost one of his employers' crack deliveries; for this, the young boy was shot point-blank

through the head and deposited in a see-through plastic bag two blocks from his home.

This crime is not isolated. The White House Conference for a Drug Free America reports that "drug-related homicides are increasing dramatically across the nation," and that "some murderers are even acknowledging their drug use and exploiting it as a defense." The report continues: "the use of illicit drugs affects moods and emotions; chemically alters the brain; and causes loss of control, paranoia, reduction of inhibition, and unprovoked anger."

As Secretary of Transportation, I have certainly learned more than anyone would ever want to know about the deadly combination of drugs and transportation. I'm sure most of you remember the 1987 Amtrak-Conrail crash in which a Conrail engineer rolled through several warning signals and collided with an Amtrak passenger train. The engineer subsequently admitted that he had smoked marijuana in the cab of the locomotive before the crash. Sixteen people died in that tragedy, and 178 more were hospitalized. Since then, there have been 54 major rail accidents in which one or more key employees tested positive for illegal drug use. Thirty-two people died in those accidents and 357 were injured.

These tragedies are not confined to rail travel. The pilot of a commuter airplane that crashed in Colorado last January tested positive for cocaine. Nine people died in that accident. And in the fall of 1986, when reporters from The Pittsburgh Press interviewed emergency room staffs at area hospitals, 23 cases of flight crew drug abuse were quickly recalled. Twenty of those cases involved cocaine overdose, two were heroin reactions, and one dealt with valium and alcohol. Twelve cockpit crew members and eleven cabin crew members were among those treated by hospitals for excessive drug use. The Press also reported that doctors across the country have said that many other pilots with drug problems are shunning help, fearing they will be discovered and grounded forever.

The American people deserve a drug-free transportation system, and we have been working hard to provide it. I believe that a comprehensive drug testing program -- including random testing -- is the only proven means to identify drug users and discourage others from trying drugs. Thus, I have proposed drug testing rules for safety or security-related positions in the aviation, rail, trucking, mass transit, maritime and pipeline industries. Such testing would take place under strict federal guidelines and with respect for the privacy and dignity of the individual.

The Coast Guard has provided an important example with its own drug-testing program of military personnel: the percentage of those testing positive dropped from 10.3 percent when the program started in 1983 to 2.9 percent last year.

The Coast Guard's most important contribution to the war on drugs has been its determined interdiction effort. Last year, the Coast Guard alone seized 1.3 million pounds of marijuana and almost 13,000 pounds of cocaine. From the beginning of this year through Labor Day, the Coast Guard participated in seizures of 431,000 pounds of marijuana; 28,000 pounds of cocaine; and 86,000 pounds of hashish.

Since last April, the Coast Guard has been operating under the Administration's "zero tolerance" policy. "Zero tolerance" means that simple possession of any measurable quantity of drugs within our territorial waters may result in confiscation of the vessel. Vessels outside our territorial waters will also be seized when an intent to either introduce the illegal substance into the U.S., or export it, is

demonstrated. Simply put, the men and women of the Coast Guard are no longer expected to "look the other way" when they find illegal drugs on board a vessel.

Given these successes by the Coast Guard, I was astounded when the Congress cut \$72 million from the President's FY 1988 request for Coast Guard funds. This forced the Coast Guard to stop 55 percent of its scheduled drug patrols, and Congress lingered until mid-August before correcting this outrage. Meanwhile, this Administration took the rap for the budget cut from our political opponents. Governor Michael Dukakis criticized us for cutting the Coast Guard budget. His wife echoed to the San Diego Union, "The Reagan Administration has cut the funding for the Coast Guard by 50 percent." And Jesse Jackson has repeatedly attacked the Reagan-Bush Administration for that cut in Coast Guard funds -- despite my communicating the truth to all of them on more than one occasion. Just three weeks ago, Reverend Jackson repeated on "Nightline": "This Administration's war on drugs ... has essentially failed ... the fact is as interdiction was increasing there was an attempt to cut back on the Coast Guard by \$100 million and put (their) ships in mothballs."

While I agree with President Reagan that it is counterproductive to turn the drug issue into an election-year tug of war, I won't stand for any disinformation about our dedication to fighting the drug menace.

The Reagan-Bush Administration's "War against Drugs" is not campaign rhetoric. In fact, it was this Administration that, upon entering office, made the drug issue a top national priority. Jimmy Carter had eliminated the White House Drug Abuse Policy Office; Ronald Reagan brought it back and followed through with a series of programs designed to curtail drug supply and demand:

- In 1982, the President set up the South Florida Task Force, headed by George Bush. The Vice-President commanded an all-out mobilization of drug-fighting personnel -- drug agents, special prosecutors, judges, Coast Guard. Their target, South Florida, was the trans-shipment area for more than 80 percent of the cocaine that enters this country. During the first year of this operation, major crime in South Florida dropped nearly 20 percent.

- In 1983, the National Narcotics Border Interdiction System was formed to combat drug smuggling. Since then, annual cocaine seizures have increased twenty-fold.

- In 1984, when the "Comprehensive Crime Control Act" was passed, approximately \$44 million in drug-related assets were seized; by last year that figure had risen to more than \$500 million.

- Since 1981, the federal anti-drug law enforcement budget has tripled; since 1979, federal drug convictions have doubled and prison sentences are 40 percent longer.

State and local law enforcement officials have become increasingly intolerant of drug use as well, and they are pursuing tough, innovative programs to fight it:

- The New York City Police Department routinely stops motorists observed driving through known drug-strips and impounds their vehicles if illegal drugs are found. Police Commissioner Benjamin Ward warns: "If you come to New York to buy crack, bring carfare and be prepared to take the bus back."



- The San Diego Police Department runs a "Walking Enforcement Campaign Against Narcotics." Police officers conduct arrests and drug seizures in targeted neighborhoods until drug activity abates.

- Last May, the Mayor of Tampa, Sandy Freedman, conducted "Operation Crackdown." Mayor Freedman enlisted the help of volunteer demolition crews and, in just four days, they razed 54 abandoned houses suspected of drug activity. All drugs and drug paraphernalia were confiscated and burned. Just two weeks ago, Mayor Freedman launched another attack, destroying 12 drug houses in 12 hours.

Here in Washington, the House has passed a far-reaching anti-drug bill. There are many useful provisions in this bill, including: the death penalty for drug traffickers who kill police officers or other individuals during a drug-related crime; a loosening of the exclusionary rule that bars admission of valid evidence in court; increased legal protections for Coast Guard employees fighting the war on drugs; and improvements to the Customs Forfeiture Fund, directing proceeds derived from Coast Guard seizures back to the Coast Guard for law enforcement expenses. A provision in the House bill offers incentive highway grants for states that require suspension or revocation of licenses of drivers convicted of drug-related offenses. On the other hand, the House bill contains a provision that would severely undercut the Coast Guard's ability to enforce our zero tolerance policy. Congressman Clay Shaw led a valiant, but unsuccessful effort to reverse this situation. We are working with key members of the Senate to be sure that the Coast Guard can do its job.

Lois Herrington, who chaired the 1988 White House Conference for a Drug Free America, concluded that our war on drugs "must be won in the conscience, the attitude, (and) the character of Americans as a people." And, indeed, the drug problem is too big to be solved by one approach, or by one political party, or by one level of government. But through a combined effort, I believe we can prevail. One of the most notable successes we've had is the change in thinking and behavior among young Americans. Fewer high school seniors are trying drugs and the biggest increase in anti-drug attitudes has been found among college students. This demonstrates that our demand-side strategy, which includes the First Lady's "Just Say No" campaign, is having an effect. So we have reason to hope ... and reason to redouble our efforts.

Thank you very much.





U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele.: (202) 366-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
DOT AWARDS CEREMONY  
OCTOBER 5, 1988  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Commander Norman V. Scurria, Jr., has served with distinction as the first Commanding Officer of the Coast Guard Air Facility, in Norfolk, Virginia. Throughout the last two years, Commander Scurria has led the successful formation of the Coast Guard's first airborne drug patrol unit and subsequent effective deployment of the Coast Guard's two E-2C Airborne Early Warning (AEW) aircraft. Starting with just the aircraft, which were transferred to the Coast Guard from the Navy, he dealt very effectively with the U.S. Navy and Grumman Corporation in setting up a maintenance support facility; and he assembled a first-rate team of Coast Guard officers, pilots, and engineering personnel. As a result of his strong leadership, the Coast Guard E-2Cs are patrolling at a rate of 1,000 flight hours per year, far exceeding the normal 600 hour-a-year goal. Commander Scurria has personally flown patrols throughout the southeastern United States, where his unit has played a major role in the successful interdiction of hundreds of millions of dollars of illegal narcotics. His seemingly limitless interest, energy and enthusiasm, along with his proven ability to work with others, have been an unbeatable combination. Commander Scurria's superb performance exemplifies the meaning of the Coast Guard motto, Semper Paratus (Always Ready), and he is well-deserving of the Secretary's Gold Medal.

#####



U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele: (202) 366-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE  
OCTOBER 6, 1988

FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO JOIN YOU IN PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE BRAVE ALOHA AIRLINES FLIGHT CREW. I THINK EVERY AMERICAN WHO SAW THE TV COVERAGE OF THAT AIRPLANE ON THE RUNWAY WAS AMAZED THAT IT LANDED SAFELY. I RECENTLY HAD THE HONOR AND PRIVILEGE OF PRESENTING, THROUGH REPRESENTATIVE PATRICIA SAIKI OF HAWAII, THE SECRETARY'S AWARD FOR HEROISM TO THESE BRAVE AVIATORS. AGAIN, I JOIN YOU TODAY IN SALUTING THEM.

I WANT TO SAY A WORD ABOUT YOUR NATIONAL PRESIDENT, JOHN BAKER. JOHN, AS YOU ALL KNOW, IS A SHY, RETIRING, NON-POLITICAL KIND OF GUY WHO NEVER SAYS ANYTHING BAD ABOUT ANYBODY. SERIOUSLY, THOUGH, AOPA IS EXTREMELY FORTUNATE TO HAVE AT ITS HELM A MAN WHO IS TOTALLY DEVOTED TO HIS ORGANIZATION, WHO HAS A CLEAR MISSION IN LIFE, AND WHO WORKS TIRELESSLY FOR WHAT YOU AND HE BELIEVE IS RIGHT.

DURING THE LAST SIX YEARS THAT JOHN, AOPA AND I HAVE WORKED TOGETHER, BOTH WHILE I WAS DEPUTY SECRETARY AND NOW AS SECRETARY, WE'VE BEEN THROUGH SOME DIFFICULT, CHALLENGING TIMES IN GENERAL AVIATION. INDEED THE DECADE OF THE 1980S MAY GO DOWN AS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT PERIOD IN THE HISTORY OF AVIATION IN THIS COUNTRY. AND DURING THIS PERIOD OF RAPID CHANGE, NOT ONLY HAVE THERE BEEN DISAGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR OVER

-more-



THE FUTURE NEEDS AND DESIRES OF THOSE WHO USE OUR NATION'S AIRSPACE, BUT VARIOUS SEGMENTS OF THE AVIATION COMMUNITY HAVE STRONGLY DISAGREED ON A NUMBER OF ISSUES. THESE CONCERNS HAVE LED TO INTENSE DISCUSSIONS AND DEBATES.

HOWEVER, THERE IS ONE POINT ON WHICH WE CAN ALL AGREE -- WE ALL SHARE A COMMON COMMITMENT TO MAKE OUR NATION'S AVIATION SYSTEM AS SAFE AS POSSIBLE FOR ALL WHO USE IT, WHILE EXPANDING THE SYSTEM'S CAPACITY TO MEET THE GROWING DEMAND OF ALL OF ITS USERS. WE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL ARE WORKING HARD EVERY DAY TO DO OUR PART. ONE ISSUE CRITICAL TO THE FUTURE OF GENERAL AVIATION IS THE ACCURATE TRANSMITTAL OF CURRENT WEATHER INFORMATION, WHICH IS DATA THAT MEANS LITERALLY LIFE AND DEATH TO THE GA PILOT. AS YOU KNOW, THE AUTOMATED WEATHER OBSERVING SYSTEMS WILL PROVIDE YOU WITH CURRENT AND ACCURATE READINGS FOR BAROMETRIC PRESSURE, WIND DIRECTION, WIND SPEED, CLOUD HEIGHT AND VISIBILITY. A CONTRACT HAS ALREADY BEEN AWARDED BY THE FAA FOR 160 AWOS, OR AUTOMATED WEATHER OBSERVING SYSTEMS, AS PART OF THE NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM PLAN. WE HAVE AN OPTION TO BUY AN ADDITIONAL 160 SYSTEMS, BUT THE FAA HAS POSTPONED A DECISION ON EXERCISING THIS OPTION BECAUSE IT IS ALSO WORKING WITH THE NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE ON THE MORE SOPHISTICATED AREA SURFACE OBSERVATION SYSTEMS (ASOS).

THUS, WE HAVE THE DILEMMA THAT WE OFTEN FACE: DO WE BUY MORE OF THE TECHNOLOGY WHICH IS AVAILABLE NOW, OR DO WE WAIT SEVERAL YEARS UNTIL THE NEXT GENERATION IS PERFECTED? I BELIEVE THAT IS A TECHNICAL JUDGMENT CALL THAT SHOULD BE MADE BY THE FAA ADMINISTRATOR, BUT I ALSO BELIEVE HE SHOULD MAKE HIS DECISION NOW. SOMETIMES IN THE PAST THE AVIATION COMMUNITY HAS BEEN JUSTIFIABLY FRUSTRATED BY THE GOVERNMENT'S INABILITY TO MAKE TOUGH DECISIONS. EXTENDED UNCERTAINTY ABOUT WHICH DIRECTION WE ARE HEADED IN MAKES IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR YOU TO PLAN FOR THE FUTURE. THEREFORE, I HAVE ASKED ADMINISTRATOR MCARTOR TO MAKE A DECISION IN THE NEXT 45 DAYS ON WHETHER TO EXERCISE THE OPTION TO DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF AWOS WE BUY.

ANOTHER AREA OF PARTICULAR CONCERN TO ME IS TO KEEP THOSE WHO ABUSE ALCOHOL AND DRUGS OUT OF OUR AVIATION SYSTEM. LATE LAST WEEK INDICTMENTS WERE HANDED DOWN IN TAMPA, FLORIDA AGAINST SOME TWO DOZEN PILOTS FOR FAILING TO DISCLOSE CONVICTIONS FOR DRUG AND ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES ON THE AIRMAN MEDICAL CERTIFICATES THEY PROVIDED TO THE FAA. THESE INDICTMENTS WERE THE FIRST CHARGES TO RESULT FROM A LENGTHY INVESTIGATION BEGUN BY OUR DEPARTMENT'S INSPECTOR GENERAL IN 1986. THAT YEAR THE OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL CONDUCTED AN AUDIT WHICH COMPARED FAA AIRMAN MEDICAL CERTIFICATES AGAINST RECORDS MAINTAINED IN THE NATIONAL DRIVER'S REGISTER. THE RESULTS WERE STARTLING AND, FRANKLY, DISTURBING. OF THE 711,650 PILOT RECORDS STUDIED, OVER 10,000 HAD FAILED TO DISCLOSE DRUNK DRIVING CONVICTIONS TO THE FAA.

UNFORTUNATELY, THE IDENTITIES OF THESE PILOTS REMAINED UNKNOWN BECAUSE FEDERAL LAW AT THE TIME DID NOT PERMIT DISCLOSURE OF THE NAMES OF THE OFFENDERS. I MIGHT ADD THAT PROBLEM HAS SINCE BEEN RESOLVED, AND THE FAA AND THE INSPECTOR GENERAL NOW HAVE ACCESS TO NAMES IN THE NATIONAL DRIVER'S REGISTER. BUT WE DID NOT

-more-



WAIT FOR PASSAGE OF THIS LEGISLATION. RATHER, OUR INSPECTOR GENERAL MATCHED THE FAA PILOTS' MEDICAL CERTIFICATE INFORMATION AGAINST DRIVING RECORDS MAINTAINED BY THE STATE OF FLORIDA AND AGAINST FBI CRIMINAL RECORDS NATIONALLY FOR BOTH DRUG AND ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES. THE INITIAL RESULT WAS ANNOUNCED LAST WEEK BY THE U. S. ATTORNEY IN TAMPA. THE INSPECTOR GENERAL HAS INITIATED INVESTIGATIONS IN THE OTHER 49 STATES, AND HIS OFFICE IS IN THE PROCESS OF TURNING OVER EVIDENCE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR FURTHER ACTION. I DO EXPECT INDICTMENTS WILL EVENTUALLY NUMBER IN THE HUNDREDS.

THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HAS TAKEN SEVERAL OTHER KEY STEPS IN THE WAR ON DRUGS IN THE AVIATION COMMUNITY. WE HAVE ISSUED A RULE REQUIRING AIRCRAFT ENTERING THE AIR DEFENSE IDENTIFICATION ZONE (ADIZ) TO FILE A FLIGHT PLAN AND TO HAVE TRANSPONDERS TURNED ON. WE HAVE ALSO PROPOSED A RULE TO REQUIRE ALL AIRCRAFT ENTERING THE ADIZ TO BE EQUIPPED WITH TRANSPONDERS. THE BATTLE AGAINST DRUGS AND ALCOHOL, OF COURSE, CANNOT BE WON BY THE GOVERNMENT ALONE, AND I WANT TO COMMEND AOPA FOR YOUR EFFORTS, PARTICULARLY IN THE AREA OF INTERDICTION.

ANOTHER PROBLEM OBVIOUS TO THE ENTIRE AVIATION COMMUNITY IS THE DIRE NEED FOR AIRPORT EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT. A MAJOR AIRPORT HAS NOT BEEN CONSTRUCTED IN THE UNITED STATES SINCE DALLAS-FORT WORTH OPENED IN THE MID-70'S. I AM ENCOURAGED BY THE VOTE LAST MAY IN ADAMS COUNTY, COLORADO TO PERMIT ANNEXATION OF LAND BY THE CITY OF DENVER FOR A NEW HUB AIRPORT. THAT REFERENDUM DEMONSTRATED BOTH THE COMPLICATIONS INVOLVED IN AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION AND THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL LEADERSHIP TO AIRPORT PROJECTS. AS WE HAVE SEEN IN DENVER, AND IN THE REGION AROUND CHICAGO, THE STUMBLING BLOCK TO EXPANSION IS NOT MONEY. THE FIRST OPPOSITION TO EXPANDING MAJOR HUB AIRPORTS MORE OFTEN THAN NOT COMES FROM THE AIRLINES ALREADY PROVIDING SERVICE TO THOSE COMMUNITIES. THAT IS IRRESPONSIBLE. IT IS ALSO HYPOCRITICAL, AND I FEEL STRONGLY THAT THE ADMINISTRATION, CONGRESS, AND THE GENERAL AVIATION COMMUNITY OUGHT TO CALL THEM TO TASK FOR THAT.

ONE MEANS OF ADDRESSING THE CAPACITY ISSUE, AND ONE WHERE THIS ADMINISTRATION CAN CLAIM SOME DEGREE OF SUCCESS, IS THROUGH THE AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (AIP). THE AIP WAS REDESIGNED IN THE REAUTHORIZATION BILL LAST YEAR TO INCREASE THE GRANTS GOING TO PROJECTS THAT HAVE AN IMPACT ON CONGESTION. AND, AS YOU KNOW, THE 1987 REAUTHORIZATION BILL PROVIDES FOR SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS FOR SMALL AIRPORTS, RELIEVER AIRPORTS AND GENERAL AVIATION AIRPORTS. THE AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR FEDERAL GRANTS IN FISCAL YEAR 1989 WILL BE \$1.4 BILLION, THE HIGHEST APPROPRIATION EVER.

EVEN THOUGH THERE MAY BE DISAGREEMENTS FROM TIME TO TIME, WE ARE SENSITIVE TO THE CONCERNS OF GENERAL AVIATION. THIS IS ESPECIALLY TRUE WITH RESPECT TO NEW, SOMETIMES EXPENSIVE TECHNOLOGY. THE FINAL RESOLUTION OF THE MODE C TRANSPONDER AND THE TRAFFIC ALERT AND COLLISION AVOIDANCE SYSTEMS ISSUES BOTH, I FEEL, DEMONSTRATE THE FLEXIBILITY OF OUR DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN THIS REGARD. AS YOU KNOW, THE FAA'S ORIGINAL PROPOSAL TO

REQUIRE USE OF MODE C TRANSPONDERS WITHIN A 40-MILE RADIUS OF 254 AIRPORTS WAS SUBSTANTIALLY SCALED BACK AFTER CONSIDERATION OF THE IMPACT IT WOULD HAVE ON GENERAL AVIATION. AND OUR FINAL RULE ON (TCAS) CLEARLY STATES THAT IT WILL NOT BE REQUIRED ON ANY PART 135 AIRCRAFT WITH LESS THAN 10 SEATS AND WILL NOT BE REQUIRED ON ANY PART 91 AIRCRAFT. ALSO, WE ARE FINANCIALLY ASSISTING THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN DEVELOPING AN INEXPENSIVE TCAS THAT WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO WANT IT.

WE HAVE ALSO HEARD YOUR VOICES ON THE CRITICAL ISSUE OF AIRPORT ACCESS. AS YOU KNOW, MASSPORT HAS IMPLEMENTED A NEW LANDING FEE SCHEME THAT AOPA AND OTHERS IN AVIATION ALLEGE TO BE DISCRIMINATORY IN FAVOR OF LARGER AIRCRAFT. LAST SPRING, I DECIDED THE DEPARTMENT SHOULD THOROUGHLY REVIEW BOTH THE INTENT AND THE EFFECT OF MASSPORT'S PROPOSAL. THE DEPUTY SECRETARY WILL RECEIVE A REPORT NEXT MONTH FROM AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ON THE DEPARTMENT'S INVESTIGATION, AND SHE WILL MAKE A FINAL DECISION FOR THE DEPARTMENT SHORTLY THEREAFTER. EVERYONE LOOKING AT THIS ISSUE AGREES THAT THE IMPACT OF MASSPORT'S ACTION EXTENDS BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES OF MASSACHUSETTS, HAVING A DIRECT ECONOMIC EFFECT ON NEIGHBORING STATES AND SETTING A PRECEDENT FOR AIRPORTS AROUND THE COUNTRY. SHOULD OUR INVESTIGATION INDICATE THAT A VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OR OF MASSPORT'S CONTRACTUAL COMMITMENTS HAS OCCURRED, THE DEPARTMENT COULD INITIATE ENFORCEMENT ACTION, WITHHOLD GRANT APPROVALS AND PAYMENTS, OR PURSUE OTHER LEGAL REMEDIES.

ANOTHER PROBLEM, ONE THAT HAS EXISTED FOR 30 YEARS BUT HAS BEEN SERIOUSLY EXACERBATED BY RAPID CHANGES IN AVIATION OVER THE LAST FEW YEARS, CONCERNS THE STRUCTURE OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION. AS I HAVE SAID MANY TIMES SINCE I WAS SWORN IN AS SECRETARY LAST DECEMBER, THE TIME HAS COME FOR FUNDAMENTAL REFORM OF THE FAA. THE FAA IS A UNIQUE FEDERAL AGENCY BECAUSE IT COMBINES THREE DISTINCT, AND SOMEWHAT CONTRADICTORY, MISSIONS. FIRST, IT IS CHARGED WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT AND ENFORCEMENT OF SAFETY REGULATIONS FOR COMMERCIAL AND GENERAL AVIATION. IN THIS ROLE, THE AMERICAN PEOPLE RIGHTFULLY EXPECT THAT THE FAA WILL BE THE "TOUGH COP." THE FAA IS ALSO A SERVICE PROVIDER, MAKING AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICES AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AVIATION. THIS ASSIGNMENT IS MUCH LIKE RUNNING A HUGE AIRLINE, REQUIRING THOUSANDS OF DECISIONS EACH DAY ABOUT WHERE AND WHEN PLANES WILL FLY. WE ALL WANT AND EXPECT MAXIMUM COOPERATION BETWEEN THE FAA PERSONNEL RUNNING THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM AND THE USERS OF THE SYSTEM.

THE FAA FURTHER IS DIRECTED BY STATUTE TO ENCOURAGE AND FOSTER THE DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS AND AIR COMMERCE. AMONG SUCH RESPONSIBILITIES, THE FAA PROVIDES NAVIGATIONAL AIDS FOR DOMESTIC AVIATION AND GENERALLY PROMOTES THE INTERESTS OF U.S. AVIATION.

IN ITS SAFETY REGULATORY ROLE, THE FAA MUST CONSTANTLY BALANCE SAFETY AND TRAFFIC VOLUME CONSIDERATIONS. UNDERSTANDABLY,

-more-

IT IS SOMETIMES DIFFICULT TO MAINTAIN THIS BALANCE. ADDITIONALLY, I THINK WE ALL AGREE THAT FLEXIBILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS TO RAPID CHANGE ARE NOT CHARACTERISTICS OF LARGE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACIES. WELL, THE FAA IS NO EXCEPTION. YET THE AVIATION INDUSTRY, SINCE ITS INCEPTION, HAS BEEN CHARACTERIZED BY RAPID TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES. WITH THESE INCONGRUITIES IN MIND, I DEVELOPED A SET OF CRITERIA EARLIER THIS YEAR AGAINST WHICH I BELIEVE ANY FAA REFORM PROPOSAL SHOULD BE JUDGED:

-- FIRST, IT MUST ADDRESS THE PROBLEM OF RIGID PERSONNEL RULES THAT PREVENT EFFICIENT DEPLOYMENT OF KEY PERSONNEL.

-- SECOND, IT MUST REMOVE THE BURDEN OF ABSTRUSE PROCUREMENT RULES THAT PREVENT TIMELY ACQUISITION OF NEW TECHNOLOGY.

-- THIRD, THE PROPOSAL MUST LIBERATE THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM FROM THE UNCERTAINTIES OF THE FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS AND ENSURE ADEQUATE RESOURCES ON A LONG-TERM BASIS.

-- FOURTH, THERE MUST BE ADEQUATE OVERSIGHT AND MAXIMUM ACCOUNTABILITY TO ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY.

THE ONLY WAY TO PERMANENTLY FREE THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM OF THE DEBILITATING RED TAPE THAT HINDERS IT IS TO BREAK THE OPERATION OUT OF THE FAA AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. I BELIEVE A MUCH BETTER JOB OF MODERNIZING AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL AND KEEPING PACE WITH GROWTH COULD BE DONE BY A QUASI-PUBLIC CORPORATION ALONG THE LINES OF AMTRAK. AS YOU MAY KNOW, HOWEVER, I ALSO BELIEVE THAT THE REGULATION OF AVIATION SAFETY SHOULD REMAIN WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

THIS BELIEF STEMS FROM MY RECOGNITION THAT WE ARE MORE LIKELY TO HAVE THE SAFEST SYSTEM POSSIBLE IF THE REGULATION OF AVIATION SAFETY IS SUBJECT TO THE CHECKS AND BALANCES INHERENT IN BEING PART OF A CABINET DEPARTMENT. I KNOW THAT JOHN BAKER CONSIDERS DEPARTMENT OVERSIGHT OF SAFETY ISSUES TO BE MICROMANAGEMENT OF THE FAA'S BUSINESS. BUT IT WAS THIS "MICROMANAGEMENT" THAT GOT US, AMONG OTHER THINGS, MORE AVIATION SAFETY INSPECTORS, AND STRICTER CABIN SAFETY RULES. ALSO, WE ARE ANXIOUSLY AWAITING THE RESULTS OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD (NTSB) INVESTIGATION OF THE RECENT CRASH AT DALLAS-FORT WORTH. MY PREDECESSOR HAD PUT SUSTAINED PRESSURE ON THE FAA TO ISSUE A SERIES OF CABIN SAFETY RULES THAT HAD BEEN KICKING AROUND INSIDE THE FAA FOR YEARS. ONE OF THEM REQUIRED FIRE-BLOCKING MATERIAL IN SEAT CUSHIONS TO SLOW DOWN A FIRE AND GIVE PASSENGERS A MINUTE OR TWO MORE TO ESCAPE. THE DELTA 727 HAD SUCH CUSHIONS, AND THE NTSB SHOULD BE ABLE TO TELL US TO WHAT EXTENT THEY HELPED IN THE SEEMINGLY MIRACULOUS ESCAPE OF MOST OF THE PASSENGERS AND CREW. I ALSO BELIEVE AVIATION WILL DO MUCH BETTER IN THE ANNUAL BUDGET BATTLES WITH OMB AND CONGRESS WITH A CABINET SECRETARY AS ITS SPOKESMAN.

THUS, I GREATLY REGRET THE FAILURE OF CONGRESS TO COME TO GRIPS WITH BASIC FAA REFORM THIS YEAR. S. 1600 WAS LARGELY COSMETIC, AND IT DIDN'T GO ANYWHERE. AS IT BECAME APPARENT LAST SPRING THAT CONGRESSIONAL ACTION WAS UNLIKELY, I ORDERED A STUDY OF WHAT REFORMS WE COULD MAKE ADMINISTRATIVELY. A TASK FORCE CO-CHAIRLED BY ADMINISTRATOR MCARTOR RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN THE MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE OF THE FAA BY CENTRALIZING DECISIONMAKING IN



FAA HEADQUARTERS TO BRING SOME CONSISTENCY TO ITS ENFORCEMENT PRACTICES, AS WELL AS IMPROVEMENTS IN PERSONNEL PRACTICES, PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES, BUDGETING AND RULEMAKING PROCESSES. THIS TASK FORCE, BY THE WAY, INCLUDED A MEMBER OF AOPA WHO WORKS IN THE DEPARTMENT. THESE CHANGES ARE BEING PUT IN PLACE RIGHT NOW, BUT BASIC STATUTORY REFORM IS STILL NEEDED. I HOPE THE NEW CONGRESS WILL MAKE THIS ISSUE A PRIORITY.

I AM ALSO EXTREMELY DISAPPOINTED THAT CONGRESS HAS NOT ACTED TO ADDRESS THE TORT LIABILITY CRISIS IN GENERAL AVIATION MANUFACTURING. INSURANCE COSTS HAVE ESCALATED BY 500 PERCENT SINCE 1981; AT THE SAME TIME SALES HAVE FALLEN BY MORE THAN 90 PERCENT -- FROM APPROXIMATELY 17,000 PLANES IN 1979 TO LESS THAN 1,500 PLANES IN 1986. AND WHILE CONGRESS PROCRASTINATES ON THE RESOLUTION OF THIS URGENT ISSUE, GENERAL AVIATION MANUFACTURERS IN EUROPE ARE POISED TO INVADE U.S. MARKETS. WE SUBMITTED REFORM LEGISLATION TO CONGRESS, BUT NO ACTION ON OUR BILL WAS TAKEN. THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ALSO OFFERED SUPPORT TO THE GLICKMAN AND KASSEBAUM BILLS; BUT, UNFORTUNATELY, THEY ALSO APPEAR TO HAVE LITTLE CHANCE OF PASSAGE IN THE FINAL DAYS OF THIS CONGRESS.

WITH A NEW ADMINISTRATION AND A NEW CONGRESS TAKING OFFICE IN JANUARY, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU CONTINUE TO HOLD THE GOVERNMENT'S FEET TO THE FIRE ON ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE TO GENERAL AVIATION. YOUR EFFECTIVE ADVOCACY ON BEHALF OF YOUR INTERESTS AND THOSE OF AVIATION AS A WHOLE ARE VITAL TO THE ONGOING PROCESS OF IMPROVING THE SAFETY AND CAPACITY OF OUR NATIONAL AVIATION SYSTEM. BASED UPON AOPA'S RECORD TO DATE, I AM CONFIDENT YOU ARE UP TO THE CHALLENGE.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

# # # #



U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele.: (202) 366-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
AMERICAN SHORT LINE RAILROAD ASSOCIATION  
OCTOBER 7, 1988  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

Over the last two weeks I have participated in a number of very positive railroading events. A week ago today, Union Station in Washington reopened. It has been fully restored to its former glory and is once again the jewel in Amtrak's crown. I also visited the new museum that is being built at the old Southern Railroad warehouse in Spencer, North Carolina. Just yesterday, I accepted a check for \$26.4 million from Drew Lewis as repayment of a loan from the Federal Railroad Administration to the KTY. Union Pacific has purchased the KTY, so Mr. Lewis, who had issued the loan as Secretary, also made sure it was repaid. If every former government official took the same approach, the federal deficit would be a lot smaller.

Thus, my visit with you today gives me the opportunity to complete two weeks of very pleasant duty with respect to the railroad industry.

Since the Staggers Act was passed in 1980, there has been, as you know, a dramatic economic turnaround in your business. The economic vitality of large, Class One railroads has been restored. But nowhere in the industry has growth and job creation been more evident than with small railroads. Indeed, employment in your industry is up by 50 percent since 1979. This parallels growth throughout the U.S. economy, much of which, I believe has been spurred by lower tax rates brought about by the Reagan-Bush Administration, and economic deregulation, which we have had to protect and defend.

Since the current economic expansion began a record-breaking 71 months ago, some 18 million new jobs have been created. That's about equal to the combined populations of New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia, Detroit, and

Atlanta. By the way, I've been able to add Atlanta to that list in just the last two months. These are good jobs, too; more than 90 percent of these new jobs are full-time, and more than 70 percent of them pay in excess of \$20,000 per year. More Americans have jobs than ever before, nearly 117 million as of the end of August.

Start-ups of new businesses like yours have played an important part in this expansion, from Mrs. Fields' Cookies to General Motors' giant Saturn project. In fact, new businesses have been responsible for nearly 13 million of those new jobs. There were 684,000 new business incorporations last year alone, a 28 percent increase over 1980. Like the rest of the economy, the primary source of growth in the railroad industry has not been the old, large, established railroads -- which have continued to consolidate -- but with your short lines.

Small railroads are once again the backbone of America's rail industry, largely due to economic deregulation. Around the time Union Station first opened in 1907, there were more than 1,000 small railroads in the United States. But by 1979, the year before Staggers, their number had dwindled to only 236. Only 46 new railroads were formed from 1970 to 1979. In contrast, approximately 200 small railroads have begun operations since 1980; in fact, more than 40 percent of the small railroads in business today have started operation since 1980. Your new companies have added nearly 18,000 miles to the total track in operation by small railroads -- approximately half of it by new regional railroads, another 40 percent by local railroads, and the remainder by switching and terminal railroads. This is especially significant since many of your companies have started on lines purchased from Class One railroads where track conditions had severely deteriorated and economic risk was great.

It is not hard to see why small railroads have flourished since the Staggers Act. With pricing flexibility and the right to enter into contracts with shippers, it is easier for you to get bank loans to purchase equipment and finance track improvements.

Just as other parts of the economy are flourishing due to specialization, so is the railroad industry. While the large, Class One railroads still operate our major trunk lines, regional and short lines supply feeder traffic. The division of labor has become so pronounced that it is very much like a wholesaler-retailer relationship. You pick-up and deliver to the destination and deal with individual shippers, while Class One railroads "wholesale" their long-distance services to you. Approximately 85 percent of your traffic is handled in conjunction with other railroads. This is not unlike the pattern we have seen in recent years in the airline industry, with small, regional carriers -- so-called commuter airlines -- developing to serve markets that cannot be served economically by large airlines geared toward serving major long-distance routes.

As short line owners, you have another distinct advantage over Class One railroads, and that is you operate under generally less restrictive work rules. While a typical Class One railroad carries an engine crew of at least four people, many of you are able to operate safely with just two. Workers benefit from this flexibility just as much as their employers. I read recently that the 107-mile Rochester Southern Railroad gave qualifying employees an \$1,889 bonus on the railroad's second anniversary -- their share of the profits from increased business.

Because of federal labor protection rules that forced larger railroads to provide up to six years of salary to workers on lines being abandoned or sold, many large railroads found it economically necessary to simply let unprofitable lines



deteriorate. Federal law allowed an exception to this forced compensation for employees of new railroads. So a big railroad would simply let low-density lines go downhill bit by bit, laying off small numbers of employees at a time, until the cost of labor protection dropped low enough to proceed with abandonment.

Since 1982, the Interstate Commerce Commission has consistently refused to impose any labor protective conditions on sales of rail lines by Class One railroads to entities creating small railroads, recognizing that such restrictions would hurt the economic viability of these transfers. Partially as a result of this policy, the miles of rail line abandoned annually dropped sharply, from 5,151 in 1982 to only 1,932 last year; there was also a corresponding increase in the sale of low-density lines to new short-line and regional carriers, from only 25 in 1982 to 70 last year.

Unfortunately, two recent decisions by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals have cast a pall over the small railroad industry. In Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad v. Railway Labor Executives Association, the court refused to stop a strike intended to prevent the ICC-authorized sale of its rail system. In a subsequent decision, the court held that the ICC's authority over labor protection does not alter a selling railroad's collective bargaining obligations under the Railway Labor Act. As a direct result of these misguided decisions, the sale of marginal rail lines to new carriers has been brought to a standstill. There are several similar cases pending in other Appeals Courts, but the Supreme Court is likely to review this issue in its current term.

I hope that the Supreme Court will rule in favor of the railroads on this issue, but the fact that the very fate of your industry is tied up in the court system points to the fundamental flaws in the Railway Labor Act itself. No other industry is required to provide such ridiculous, costly employee benefits. The recent plant-closing legislation, which this Administration let become law only under strong protest, is trifling by comparison. The next Congress ought to take action to eliminate this damaging law, which neither protects jobs nor small communities served by short-line and regional railroads.

Getting appropriate congressional action will be no easy task. In recent months we have fought a difficult battle against efforts to repeal much of the Staggers Act. We won a key vote in the Senate Commerce Committee only two weeks ago by a vote of 10-9, but the CURE coalition has vowed to resume its attack on a deregulated rail industry in the next Congress, despite the obvious benefits of Staggers.

While the Reagan-Bush Administration has been a strong advocate of economic deregulation, there are areas where federal legislation and regulation are entirely justified, particularly where public safety is at issue. One area where we are moving aggressively on regulations and legislation is in the war on drugs. The American people are demanding tough, resolute action against drug users and drug sellers. And rightfully so. Drugs have turned societal values upside-down.

For example, elementary school children in Washington this past summer could be found playing a game called "Hustler." The goal of the game is to successfully complete fake drug deals, using play money, pebbles for crack, pencil shavings for marijuana, and ground up chalk for cocaine. A city Recreation Department counselor told the Washington Post: "They do everything the way they've seen it -- with the runners, the lookouts, the users, the jumpout squads, everybody." What is

most foreboding is that the special police anti-drug jumpout squads are the bad guys in the game.

These kids are not just playing a game -- they are rehearsing what all too often becomes real-life. In the neighborhoods where "Hustler" is played, drug dealers -- often only teenagers themselves -- enjoy a perverse, misbegotten celebrity. It is the drug dealers who drive the fancy cars and carry big rolls of cash, while those who toil at honest jobs struggle to make ends meet.

Young people in our most distressed neighborhoods are drawn by the easy money, and often die for their misdirected ambition. Just last month, I read about 11-year-old Enoch Thomas, who was shot point-blank in the head when a drug deal went bad. Young Enoch, it seems, had been working in New Orleans as a crack runner since age nine. In his last drug deal, he lost his shipment somewhere along the way. His bosses executed him and left him in a clear plastic bag two blocks from his home. Drug-related crimes of this sort are on the rise in virtually every major city.

Illegal drug use is not a "victimless" crime. Innocent people are often caught in the drug-culture cross-fire. I am sure you all recall the January 1987 Conrail-Amtrak crash in Chase, Maryland, where a Conrail engineer under the influence of drugs rolled through several warning signals and collided with an Amtrak passenger train, killing sixteen people and injuring another 178. Since January 1987, there have been 59 major rail accidents in which one or more key employees tested positive for illegal drug use. Thirty-three people died and 360 were injured in those crashes.

Drug use is just as much a social ill for transportation as it is for society-at-large. Thus, I have proposed drug testing rules for key personnel in the rail, aviation, pipeline, mass transit, maritime, and trucking industries. We do not need to witness any more drug-related accidents to know that testing is necessary.

As you know, there already are regulations for pre-employment, reasonable cause, and post-accident testing for rail carriers, although small railroads with fewer than 15 safety-critical workers are exempt from pre-employment and reasonable cause testing rules. We will soon announce final regulations covering random testing. The Department recently announced a final rule on certification that signals in locomotive cabs have been tested prior to departure; we determined that that particular rule places no real burden on small railroads. Thirteen other regulations are currently being developed under the Act. It would be premature for me to comment in detail on pending regulations. However, let me assure you that all of these new regulations will be designed and administered with sensitivity to the special needs of small railroads.

We have had a civilian-employee drug testing program at the Department of Transportation for a year. All employees in safety or security-related positions, myself included, are subject to the same standard. We know that random testing works. Five years ago, the Coast Guard random testing, and the percentage of those testing positive has dropped from 10.3 percent when the program began to 2.9 percent last year.

Like many other issues we face at my Department, these drug testing regulations are a delicate balancing act. On the one hand, we have a duty to protect public safety. But we must also be cognizant of the burdens we ask the private sector to carry. As President Reagan noted in his annual report to Congress on the economy,

government regulation neither can nor should be viewed as a substitute for responsible individual action. The challenge is in finding where to draw the lines. Your success is a tribute to your efforts, and it is also in large part because the federal government has kept out of your way as much as possible, and that is an important lesson.





U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele.: (202) 366-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
LOS ANGELES HERALD-EXAMINER BREAKFAST FORUM  
OCTOBER 18, 1988  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

The election is now only three weeks away, and we are hearing more and more about the national drug problem and how to combat it. Many dismiss this as mere campaign rhetoric, and there is some truth to that. However, this issue is far too grave to be treated as a political football. I would like to lay out some facts about the drug problem, and what my Department is doing to combat it.

The distortion of values wrought upon our society by illegal drugs is deeply disturbing. For example, elementary school children in Washington this past summer could be found playing a game called "Hustler." The object of the game is to successfully complete fake drug deals, using play money, pebbles for crack, pencil shavings for marijuana, and ground up chalk for cocaine. A city recreation Department counselor told The Washington Post: "They do everything the way they've seen it -- with the runners, the lookouts, the users, the jumpout squads, everybody." What is most foreboding is that the special police anti-drug jumpout squads are the bad guys in the game.

These kids are not just playing a game -- they are rehearsing what all too often becomes real-life. In the neighborhoods where "Hustler" is played, drug dealers -- often only teenagers themselves -- enjoy a perverse, misbegotten celebrity. It is the drug dealers who drive the fancy cars and carry big rolls of cash, while those who toil at honest jobs struggle to make ends meet.

Young people in our most distressed neighborhoods are drawn by the easy money, and often die for their misdirected ambition. Just last month, I read about 11-year-old Enoch Thomas, who was shot point-blank in the head when a drug deal went bad. Young Enoch, it seems, had been working in New Orleans as a crack runner and lookout since the age of nine. In his last drug deal, he lost his shipment

somewhere along the way. His bosses executed him and left him in a clear plastic bag two blocks from his home. Drug-related crimes of this sort are on the rise in virtually every major city. In fact, here in Los Angeles about three-quarters of those arrested for major crimes test positive for illegal drugs.

One factor certainly contributing to this upside-down value system is that some highly visible role models for these kids are drug users, and when caught using drugs seldom suffer any serious consequences. In recent weeks, the National Football League has suspended 18 players for drug use. Many of these players are back on the playing field after 30-day suspensions; if caught again, some of them will be barred from the NFL for life. But this is a threat of dubious deterrent force, since after one year they may reapply for the right to play. Other professional leagues have similarly lax drug policies. The penalties for drug use seem hardly more severe than the 2-game suspension imposed on Jay Howell for having pine tar in his glove.

Handing out veritable slaps-on-the-wrist for drug use sends the wrong message to America's young people. These 30-day suspensions tell them, "Don't worry about using drugs. Nothing will happen to you. Laugh it off." The gruesome reality is that drug use causes people to lose their jobs, their families, and sometimes their lives. Just last week, Dave Croudip (CREW-dip) of the Atlanta Falcons died of an apparent cocaine overdose. The NFL and other sports organizations can no longer duck their responsibility to their athletes and to the American people.

The policy for athletes should be straightforward. If you are using drugs and come forward to enter rehabilitation, fine, the leagues will be there to help. But if you use drugs and get caught, you're out, permanently. No 30-day suspension with pay, no coming back for reinstatement next year.

There are between 5 and 6 million cocaine users in this country, and 18 million marijuana users. These people have made the United States a leader in an area in which all of us would like to take last place: we import more illegal drugs than any country in the world.

The demand for drugs, partly fueled -- intentionally or not -- by celebrity users, has sometimes surrealistic effects on society. For example, West Virginia's leading cash crop for 1987 was marijuana, with an estimated value in excess of \$800 million. In comparison, the state's leading legal cash crop for 1987 was hay, valued at approximately \$58 million. The same is said to be true in a number of other states, including California.

That absurd statistic would seem almost as amusing as it is disturbing. But there's nothing funny about it, because drug use is not a victimless crime. Innocent people are frequently caught in the drug-culture cross fire. The impact of drug use upon public safety is too often ignored in the debate -- and not just from drug-related crime. A study by the University of Maryland's Shock-Trauma Center revealed that more than one-third of the patients admitted to the center as a result of serious accidents between July 1985 and May 1986 had been under the influence of marijuana at the time of the accident.

Some of you may recall the January 1987 Conrail-Amtrak crash in Chase, Maryland, where a Conrail engineer under the influence of drugs rolled through several warning signals and collided with an Amtrak passenger train, killing 16 people and injuring another 178. Since January 1987, there have been 59 major rail



accidents in which one or more key employees tested positive for illegal drug use. And there is ample evidence of drug use in other transportation industries as well.

Drug use is just as much a social ill for transportation as it is for society-at-large. Thus, I have proposed mandatory drug testing rules for key personnel in the rail, aviation, pipeline, mass transit, maritime, and trucking industries. We do not need to witness any more drug-related accidents to know that testing is necessary.

The purpose of random drug testing is two-fold. First and foremost, we want to identify drug users and remove them from jobs where they pose a threat to others. Secondly, we know that the war on drugs cannot be won by simply throwing drug dealers in jail; we have to make it clear that illegal drug use is unacceptable, and that there will be immediate consequences for those who choose this reckless form of so-called recreation.

We have had a civilian-employee drug testing program at the Department of Transportation for a year. All employees in safety or security-related positions, myself included, are subject to the same standard. We know that random testing works. The Coast Guard began random testing five years ago, and the percentage of those testing positive dropped from 10.3 percent when the program began in 1983 to 2.9 percent last year.

Drug testing is but one element of the Reagan-Bush Administration's long-term effort to use our full legal authority to attack the supply and demand sides of the drug problem. Earlier this year, we began enforcing a "zero tolerance" policy toward drug abuse. For the Coast Guard, which is part of my Department, zero tolerance means that simple possession of any measurable quantity of drugs within our territorial lands or waters may result in confiscation of the vessel where illegal substances are found. Vessels will also be seized outside our waters when an intent to either introduce the illegal substance into the United States, or export it, can be shown. Through the end of September, the Coast Guard made 61 arrests for possession of personal quantities of illegal drugs and seized a total of 114 vessels. During the same period, the Coast Guard participated in seizures of 438,000 pounds of marijuana; 32,000 pounds of cocaine; and 86,000 pounds of hashish. These seizures involved drugs with a total street value in excess of \$2.2 billion. The seizures would have been far higher had Congress not cut the President's budget request for 1988 by \$72 million. That very short-sighted action forced a reduction in patrols of more than 50 percent. Although the President and I promptly asked for congressional approval to transfer funds to the Coast Guard from other accounts, it took Congress six months to take that simple action.

Under the zero tolerance policy, the men and women of the Coast Guard are no longer expected to "look the other way" when they find illegal narcotics on board a vessel. In a sense, all we are doing with zero tolerance is enforcing existing law. But we are also doing something much more important. We are recognizing that enforcement of our laws against drug use is essential if we are going to reduce the market for the dealers and smugglers. We are saying to well-to-do suburbanites, who often buy drugs from dealers in inner-city neighborhoods where our school children now play "Hustler," that they may no longer use those drugs with impunity on their boats.

The American Civil Liberties Union and other opponents of tough drug law enforcement complain that confiscation of property is too much punishment for the crime of possessing minor amounts of drugs. But punishment must be sufficient to



deter wrongdoing. It is unlikely that many people would risk their \$100,000 boat for the sake of smoking \$20-worth of marijuana. We know from reports from the field that zero tolerance is in fact deterring drug use.

On the state and local level, law enforcement officials have become increasingly intolerant of drug use, and have found tough, innovative ways to discourage it. In Delaware, for example, motorists stopped by state police for traffic violations on Interstate 95 are frequently searched. If drugs are found, the suspect's cash and/or his car may be seized. The cars are either converted for undercover police use or sold at auction, with the proceeds going toward the purchase of other police vehicles.

Last May, Tampa Mayor Sandy Freedman initiated "Operation Crackdown." Enlisting the help of volunteer demolition crews, in just four days they razed 54 abandoned houses suspected of being havens for crack dealers. All drugs and drug paraphernalia were confiscated and burned.

And First Lady Nancy Reagan's "Just Say No" campaign is having a positive impact on millions of young people, with tangible results. Recent polls have shown that drug use among young people is dropping off. For instance, since 1980, there has been a steady decline in the percentage of high school seniors using marijuana and hashish; and for the past three years, cocaine use among high school seniors has also been decreasing. A different study found that the biggest increase in anti-drug attitudes is found among college students. These findings are extremely encouraging.

I think everyone here knows there is no glory in the drug culture. We have got to educate our young people and rehabilitate those who seek help. But there can be no compromise in punishing drug users as well as drug dealers. If the penalties are great enough, more young people will never smoke that first joint or buy that first vial of crack. That alone may be worth the effort.

The federal government cannot solve this problem by itself. Ridding our society of illegal drugs will require a coordinated, determined effort by people at all levels of government, leaders in private industry, and by those who act as role models for millions of Americans. This is much more than a series of cases against individual pushers and users. It is about preserving for our people an uncorrupted environment in which to raise their families, safe neighborhoods where kids can play baseball instead of "Hustler" and where their parents may go about their daily business undisturbed by crime. Abraham Lincoln said of slavery, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." So too with the drug problem. Partisan squabbling only gives the drug pushers an advantage. But if we stand together against drugs, and if we are willing to sustain our efforts to enforce laws against use as well as dealing, we can make real progress in our efforts to control this menace to our people.



U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele.: (202) 366-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
LOS ANGELES HERALD-EXAMINER BREAKFAST FORUM  
OCTOBER 18, 1988  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

The election is now only three weeks away, and we are hearing more and more about the national drug problem and how to combat it. Many dismiss this as mere campaign rhetoric, and there is some truth to that. However, this issue is far too grave to be treated as a political football. I would like to lay out some facts about the drug problem, and what my Department is doing to combat it.

The distortion of values wrought upon our society by illegal drugs is deeply disturbing. For example, elementary school children in Washington this past summer could be found playing a game called "Hustler." The object of the game is to successfully complete fake drug deals, using play money, pebbles for crack, pencil shavings for marijuana, and ground up chalk for cocaine. A city recreation Department counselor told The Washington Post: "They do everything the way they've seen it -- with the runners, the lookouts, the users, the jumpout squads, everybody." What is most foreboding is that the special police anti-drug jumpout squads are the bad guys in the game.

These kids are not just playing a game -- they are rehearsing what all too often becomes real-life. In the neighborhoods where "Hustler" is played, drug dealers -- often only teenagers themselves -- enjoy a perverse, misbegotten celebrity. It is the drug dealers who drive the fancy cars and carry big rolls of cash, while those who toil at honest jobs struggle to make ends meet.

Young people in our most distressed neighborhoods are drawn by the easy money, and often die for their misdirected ambition. Just last month, I read about 11-year-old Enoch Thomas, who was shot point-blank in the head when a drug deal went bad. Young Enoch, it seems, had been working in New Orleans as a crack runner and lookout since the age of nine. In his last drug deal, he lost his shipment

somewhere along the way. His bosses executed him and left him in a clear plastic bag two blocks from his home. Drug-related crimes of this sort are on the rise in virtually every major city. In fact, here in Los Angeles about three-quarters of those arrested for major crimes test positive for illegal drugs.

One factor certainly contributing to this upside-down value system is that some highly visible role models for these kids are drug users, and when caught using drugs seldom suffer any serious consequences. In recent weeks, the National Football League has suspended 18 players for drug use. Many of these players are back on the playing field after 30-day suspensions; if caught again, some of them will be barred from the NFL for life. But this is a threat of dubious deterrent force, since after one year they may reapply for the right to play. Other professional leagues have similarly lax drug policies. The penalties for drug use seem hardly more severe than the 2-game suspension imposed on Jay Howell for having pine tar in his glove.

Handing out veritable slaps-on-the-wrist for drug use sends the wrong message to America's young people. These 30-day suspensions tell them, "Don't worry about using drugs. Nothing will happen to you. Laugh it off." The gruesome reality is that drug use causes people to lose their jobs, their families, and sometimes their lives. Just last week, Dave Croudip (CREW-dip) of the Atlanta Falcons died of an apparent cocaine overdose. The NFL and other sports organizations can no longer duck their responsibility to their athletes and to the American people.

The policy for athletes should be straightforward. If you are using drugs and come forward to enter rehabilitation, fine, the leagues will be there to help. But if you use drugs and get caught, you're out, permanently. No 30-day suspension with pay, no coming back for reinstatement next year.

There are between 5 and 6 million cocaine users in this country, and 18 million marijuana users. These people have made the United States a leader in an area in which all of us would like to take last place: we import more illegal drugs than any country in the world.

The demand for drugs, partly fueled -- intentionally or not -- by celebrity users, has sometimes surrealistic effects on society. For example, West Virginia's leading cash crop for 1987 was marijuana, with an estimated value in excess of \$800 million. In comparison, the state's leading legal cash crop for 1987 was hay, valued at approximately \$58 million. The same is said to be true in a number of other states, including California.

That absurd statistic would seem almost as amusing as it is disturbing. But there's nothing funny about it, because drug use is not a victimless crime. Innocent people are frequently caught in the drug-culture cross fire. The impact of drug use upon public safety is too often ignored in the debate -- and not just from drug-related crime. A study by the University of Maryland's Shock-Trauma Center revealed that more than one-third of the patients admitted to the center as a result of serious accidents between July 1985 and May 1986 had been under the influence of marijuana at the time of the accident.

Some of you may recall the January 1987 Conrail-Amtrak crash in Chase, Maryland, where a Conrail engineer under the influence of drugs rolled through several warning signals and collided with an Amtrak passenger train, killing 16 people and injuring another 178. Since January 1987, there have been 59 major rail



accidents in which one or more key employees tested positive for illegal drug use. And there is ample evidence of drug use in other transportation industries as well.

Drug use is just as much a social ill for transportation as it is for society-at-large. Thus, I have proposed mandatory drug testing rules for key personnel in the rail, aviation, pipeline, mass transit, maritime, and trucking industries. We do not need to witness any more drug-related accidents to know that testing is necessary.

The purpose of random drug testing is two-fold. First and foremost, we want to identify drug users and remove them from jobs where they pose a threat to others. Secondly, we know that the war on drugs cannot be won by simply throwing drug dealers in jail; we have to make it clear that illegal drug use is unacceptable, and that there will be immediate consequences for those who choose this reckless form of so-called recreation.

We have had a civilian-employee drug testing program at the Department of Transportation for a year. All employees in safety or security-related positions, myself included, are subject to the same standard. We know that random testing works. The Coast Guard began random testing five years ago, and the percentage of those testing positive dropped from 10.3 percent when the program began in 1983 to 2.9 percent last year.

Drug testing is but one element of the Reagan-Bush Administration's long-term effort to use our full legal authority to attack the supply and demand sides of the drug problem. Earlier this year, we began enforcing a "zero tolerance" policy toward drug abuse. For the Coast Guard, which is part of my Department, zero tolerance means that simple possession of any measurable quantity of drugs within our territorial lands or waters may result in confiscation of the vessel where illegal substances are found. Vessels will also be seized outside our waters when an intent to either introduce the illegal substance into the United States, or export it, can be shown. Through the end of September, the Coast Guard made 61 arrests for possession of personal quantities of illegal drugs and seized a total of 114 vessels. During the same period, the Coast Guard participated in seizures of 438,000 pounds of marijuana; 32,000 pounds of cocaine; and 86,000 pounds of hashish. These seizures involved drugs with a total street value in excess of \$2.2 billion. The seizures would have been far higher had Congress not cut the President's budget request for 1988 by \$72 million. That very short-sighted action forced a reduction in patrols of more than 50 percent. Although the President and I promptly asked for congressional approval to transfer funds to the Coast Guard from other accounts, it took Congress six months to take that simple action.

Under the zero tolerance policy, the men and women of the Coast Guard are no longer expected to "look the other way" when they find illegal narcotics on board a vessel. In a sense, all we are doing with zero tolerance is enforcing existing law. But we are also doing something much more important. We are recognizing that enforcement of our laws against drug use is essential if we are going to reduce the market for the dealers and smugglers. We are saying to well-to-do suburbanites, who often buy drugs from dealers in inner-city neighborhoods where our school children now play "Hustler," that they may no longer use those drugs with impunity on their boats.

The American Civil Liberties Union and other opponents of tough drug law enforcement complain that confiscation of property is too much punishment for the crime of possessing minor amounts of drugs. But punishment must be sufficient to

deter wrongdoing. It is unlikely that many people would risk their \$100,000 boat for the sake of smoking \$20-worth of marijuana. We know from reports from the field that zero tolerance is in fact deterring drug use.

On the state and local level, law enforcement officials have become increasingly intolerant of drug use, and have found tough, innovative ways to discourage it. In Delaware, for example, motorists stopped by state police for traffic violations on Interstate 95 are frequently searched. If drugs are found, the suspect's cash and/or his car may be seized. The cars are either converted for undercover police use or sold at auction, with the proceeds going toward the purchase of other police vehicles.

Last May, Tampa Mayor Sandy Freedman initiated "Operation Crackdown." Enlisting the help of volunteer demolition crews, in just four days they razed 54 abandoned houses suspected of being havens for crack dealers. All drugs and drug paraphernalia were confiscated and burned.

And First Lady Nancy Reagan's "Just Say No" campaign is having a positive impact on millions of young people, with tangible results. Recent polls have shown that drug use among young people is dropping off. For instance, since 1980, there has been a steady decline in the percentage of high school seniors using marijuana and hashish; and for the past three years, cocaine use among high school seniors has also been decreasing. A different study found that the biggest increase in anti-drug attitudes is found among college students. These findings are extremely encouraging.

I think everyone here knows there is no glory in the drug culture. We have got to educate our young people and rehabilitate those who seek help. But there can be no compromise in punishing drug users as well as drug dealers. If the penalties are great enough, more young people will never smoke that first joint or buy that first vial of crack. That alone may be worth the effort.

The federal government cannot solve this problem by itself. Ridding our society of illegal drugs will require a coordinated, determined effort by people at all levels of government, leaders in private industry, and by those who act as role models for millions of Americans. This is much more than a series of cases against individual pushers and users. It is about preserving for our people an uncorrupted environment in which to raise their families, safe neighborhoods where kids can play baseball instead of "Hustler" and where their parents may go about their daily business undisturbed by crime. Abraham Lincoln said of slavery, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." So too with the drug problem. Partisan squabbling only gives the drug pushers an advantage. But if we stand together against drugs, and if we are willing to sustain our efforts to enforce laws against use as well as dealing, we can make real progress in our efforts to control this menace to our people.





U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele.: (202) 366-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS "AMERICA'S ROAD TEAM"  
OCTOBER 18, 1988  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

I am delighted to once again address the members of the American Trucking Associations, especially on the occasion of honoring the eight professional truck drivers who make up 1988 America's Road Team.

A great deal of attention has been focused in recent months on the importance of making our highways safer. As a major force in the trucking industry, it is commendable that the ATA has made highway safety for all drivers its top priority. Your unique program, America's Road Team, has become a symbol for improving safety on our highways. You are helping spread an important message to students, civic groups and the media about safety and how to share the road with a truck, and you are helping to dispel many myths about truck safety. Public education campaigns such as this help to reassure the public about your industry's commitment to safe roadways and safe trucks.

So I salute the members of the 1988 team for your dedication and efforts in getting out the safety message. Over the last two years, America's Road Team representatives have reached millions of people through appearances in 40 states -- providing safe driving tips and answering questions about what the industry is doing to cut down on accidents and improve highway safety. We know that most traffic crashes result in large part from some type of driver error, and that's true for all sizes of vehicles. The drivers we honor today have made a real and personal contribution to highway safety -- they have not only avoided making mistakes that can result in crashes, but they have also been driving safely enough to compensate for the mistakes made by others.

The trucking industry plays an integral role in our economy. In fact, trucks carry 84 percent of the goods shipped in this country due to their speed, convenience and



cost-effectiveness. The men and women who drive them must not only deliver their cargo in a timely fashion to their destination, but in operating these large, heavy vehicles, drivers must remain fully alert and in complete control of their mental faculties.

Improving the safety of our highways and roads is a top priority of the Department of Transportation. We have come a long way in managing and improving this country's ground transportation system. For example, the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP), has made it possible for the states to increase roadside inspections from 36,000 in 1984, to over a million last year. With ATA's support, the Reagan-Bush Administration has successfully urged Congress to fund the program fully with \$60 million dollars to be spent on aid to state inspection efforts in FY 1989 alone.

We have also completed major studies of heavy truck safety within the last two years, including a comprehensive review of prospective truck braking measures. Although we believe that a new generation of anti-lock brakes may correct problems afflicting earlier anti-lock systems, we need to evaluate the results of our field tests before making any determination on regulations. National Highway Traffic Safety Administrator Diane Steed announced last Friday the beginning of a two-year fleet test program to evaluate anti-lock braking systems for heavy trucks. This will help determine whether the new truck anti-lock brake systems are effective and reliable enough for operating conditions in the U.S.

Likewise, we are awaiting the results of a study being conducted by the Federal Highway Administration to determine the practicality and cost effectiveness of biometric identifiers. I realize this is an issue of concern to ATA members and its foundation, and I want to assure you that we are committed to the development of a biometric identifier as part of the Classified Drivers License Program. We clearly understand that such an identifier could add another level of security and confidence in the authenticity of licenses. Yet, we do not want to impose such an untested, costly system on states until both we and they are confident that it will be affordable and will get results.

We have just issued final rules setting strict alcohol restrictions for all commercial drivers that will go into effect on October 27th. Ridding our roadways of drunk and drugged drivers has become one of America's most important national goals. And while the vast majority of commercial drivers are responsible and concerned about highway safety as exemplified by America's Road Team, we cannot tolerate any amount of drunk and drugged driving. From now on, a .04 blood alcohol level will be considered driving under the influence for commercial drivers, significantly tougher than the .10 standard now in force in most states.

Under this new rule, a first offense will result in a one-year license disqualification, while a second offense results in life disqualification for operation of a commercial vehicle. In addition, the new rule would require that drivers be put out of service for 24 hours if any trace of alcohol is detected when they are on duty.

Another important safety issue is drug testing of key employees involved in the transportation industry. Often ignored in the debate about drug use in this country are the consequences it has for public safety -- and not just from drug-related crime. We have all seen time and again, that drugs mixed with any form of transportation is a deadly combination. The 1987 Conrail-Amtrack crash in Chase, Maryland, where a Conrail engineer under the influence of drugs, caused his train to collide with an

Amtrack passenger train, was a needless tragedy. Sixteen people were killed in that crash and 178 were injured. In trucking, a recent survey of 1300 truck drivers at three Florida truck stops yielded an average estimate that 36 percent of all truckers sometimes drive under the influence of drugs.

At the Department of Transportation, we began random drug testing of key safety and security employees, myself included, a year ago. We know that random testing discourages drug use. Five years ago, the Coast Guard began random testing, and the percentage of those testing positive has dropped from 10.3 percent when the program began in 1983 to 2.9 percent last year.

We must act immediately to identify those commercial drivers who abuse drugs and get them off the road. Thus, we are completing work on a rule that would establish a comprehensive drug testing program for interstate commercial drivers. It would require pre-employment, periodic, random, reasonable cause and post-accident drug testing in which drivers would be tested for marijuana, cocaine, opiates, PCP and amphetamines. We have also proposed drug testing rules for employees in sensitive positions in the aviation, rail, mass transit, maritime and pipeline industries. Such testing would take place under strict federal guidelines and with respect for the privacy and dignity of the individual.

On another front, maintaining logs has been truck drivers' biggest headache for decades. Federal rules have been modified to give truckers the option of using automatic on-board devices to record speed, miles driven, engine use and other items of information drivers currently enter by hand in log books. This action gives the trucking industry an opportunity to dramatically reduce the time drivers now spend filling out log books, thus making it much easier for truckers to comply with federal record-keeping requirements, and at the same time, improve the accuracy of these records, both for federal reporting and their own management use.

We at the Department of Transportation understand that the trucking industry is among the nation's most valuable assets, and while there may be myths about truck drivers and their driving records, the fact is that truckers as a group are safe drivers. It is reassuring therefore, that the American Trucking Associations and its foundation remain committed to safe roadways and safe trucks and, through America's Road Team, are able to carry this message to the motoring public.



U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele.: (202) 366-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
DETROIT ECONOMIC CLUB  
DETROIT, MICHIGAN  
OCTOBER 20, 1988

It is a real pleasure to be here in the Motor City, particularly at a time so eagerly awaited in this part of the country, the introduction of a new model year. Detroit is once again leading the world in automotive design and high-quality production. I believe the industry's optimism about another strong year in sales will turn out to be well-founded.

The automobile industry in the 1980s has in many ways paralleled more general trends throughout the economy. Just as the U.S. economy in general barely resembles that of 15 or 20 years ago, so too the auto industry has changed. Detroit is building better cars, making better use of new technologies, and doing a better job of involving its workers in management decision-making than it did back then. The industry described in Arthur Haley's "Wheels" -- a novel that cautioned people not to buy cars built on Mondays or Fridays -- is just a dusty memory.

Having said that, it is important to note that some of the troubles the industry faced in the late 1970s were brought on by misguided federal regulatory policies. The auto industry bottomed out at a time when Washington's philosophy toward regulation was mainly one of trying to prove how much the federal government could push private industry around. That was a period when the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration lost sight of its primary mission, which is supposed to be saving lives on our highways. Instead, NHTSA embarked on a campaign of Detroit-bashing that seemed more interested in tougher bumper standards, low tire pressure indicators, and CAFE standards -- or just about anything that would generate public criticism of America's auto industry, as if the industry didn't have enough problems already with double-digit inflation and sky-high interest rates.



This kind of approach to regulation ignores a fundamental idea: people make a difference. One of the last reports prepared under Joan Claybrook, the NHTSA administrator under Jimmy Carter, predicted that highway fatalities would inevitably continue to rise during the 1980s, from 51,000 in 1980 to 70,000 by 1990. Claybrook simply wrote off any possibility of reducing drunk driving or improving safety belt use, and said that more drivers, more miles traveled, smaller cars, and higher speeds would result in a highway bloodbath.

None of Ms. Claybrook's doomsday predictions have come true, of course. Overall, highway fatalities dropped from more than 51,000 in 1980 to just over 46,000 last year. In fact, the fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled dropped from 3.3 in 1980 to 2.4 last year, a 25 percent decline, to the lowest rate ever. If the fatality rate had remained the same as in 1980, an additional 86,000 Americans would have lost their lives.

One reason for the substantial drop in highway fatalities is that the Department of Transportation has extended the safety effort to the driver side of the formula -- instead of focusing on idiot lights, we've gone after just plain idiots. For example, we launched an aggressive campaign against drunk driving. Rather than mandating expensive, red-tape laden programs out of Washington, we found ways to encourage states, communities, businesses and citizens groups to join in getting drunks off the road. America has been mobilized against drunk driving. Not only have virtually all of the states toughened their drunk driving laws, but every state and the District of Columbia have raised their drinking ages to 21. The results have been dramatic: Drunk driving fatalities have fallen 14 percent since 1982, and the percentage of teenage fatalities is down more than one-third.

Our efforts to promote seatbelt use have been similarly successful. Thirty-two states and the District of Columbia have mandatory seatbelt laws on the books. We've gone from practically no safety belt use -- just 12 percent in the early 1980s -- to 43 percent today. This increased seatbelt use has saved an estimated 11,000 lives since 1984. Much credit is due to the active participation of the auto industry in this effort, particularly its support of Traffic Safety Now, an organization that has been tirelessly promoting seatbelt use and pursuing seatbelt laws in all 50 states. More energy has been devoted to seatbelt use also in part because Secretary Elizabeth Dole settled the long and often bitter debate over passive restraints. Her decision in 1984 provided a phase-in to give Detroit the lead-time it needed to develop new systems; helped give consumers new options for different systems, such as airbags and automatic belts and it provided an extra incentive for safety belt laws. And we all know that safety belts are perhaps the best way to save lives. I'm particularly pleased to see the industry's commitment to standard installation of rear-seat lap/shoulder belts in virtually all new cars by next year.

The Reagan-Bush Administration approach to auto safety is not accidental. It stems from a single guiding principle of our entire regulatory approach, and that is we trust individuals to make good judgments wherever safety permits. We carefully consider the regulatory impacts on individuals and businesses and weigh those against predicted benefits. Where appropriate, we have sought to lift the heavy yoke of economic regulation.

One example of this is our recent action to lower the 1989 Corporate Average Fuel Economy standard to 26.5 miles per gallon. Ford estimated that CAFE-induced sales restrictions had already cost America approximately 15,000 jobs. General

Motors predicted that if the standard were left at 27.5 miles per gallon, 170,000 workers at GM and its suppliers could lose their jobs over the next two years. The UAW also weighed in, expressing concern about how excessive CAFE standards provide a perverse incentive to export American jobs. Those dire predictions certainly were a factor in our decision. But we also looked at the reason for the CAFE law in the first place -- production of much higher mileage cars, compared to the 1970s. Indeed, automakers have met that goal; the total new-car fleet now exceeds the 27.5 mpg goal set by Congress in 1975. But that doesn't mean that each and every manufacturer can meet that target, especially in the case of domestic automakers. After all, they are full-line manufacturers, while some foreign companies specialize in small cars and therefore can easily meet a higher CAFE.

Consumers have demonstrated, however, that they still want large, family-size cars available to them, and they are not always willing to sacrifice performance for mileage either. It is unrealistic and unreasonable for Washington to expect that Detroit can somehow change consumer tastes to meet CAFE's arbitrary legal standard.

The basic problem is obviously with the CAFE law itself. The CAFE statute was well-intentioned, but it is clear that this is an ineffective, job-threatening law that ought to be repealed. Indeed, the Department of Transportation asked Congress to repeal CAFE more than a year ago, and I hope that the next Congress will face up to this issue.

While Congress has not yet repealed CAFE, I am delighted to report that it has finally agreed to give you some CAFE relief as an incentive to design and build vehicles powered by alternative fuels. I encourage you to take advantage of this new law -- you can help to clean the air, give consumers the better performance they are demanding, and create a whole new market for American energy sources.

Preserving jobs and encouraging job-creating economic growth, are, after all, the primary reasons for economic deregulation. I believe the significant progress of the Reagan-Bush Administration in this area is one of the primary reasons we are in the midst of an unprecedented economic boom. Since the current economic expansion began a record-breaking 71 months ago, more than 18 million new jobs have been created. To put it in perspective, that is about equal to the combined populations of New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia, Detroit and Atlanta. These are good jobs, too; more than 90 percent of these new jobs are full-time, and more than 70 percent of them pay in excess of \$20,000 per year. More Americans have jobs than ever before, about 117 million as of last month. The national unemployment rate has been cut in half since this expansion began.

New businesses and plant openings have played an important part in this expansion, from Mrs. Fields' cookies to General Motors' giant Saturn project. There were 684,000 new business incorporations last year alone, a 28 percent increase over 1980.

And as a result of the tax reforms of 1981 and 1986, American families are taking home more of what they have earned. A family of four with an income of \$34,000 now pays 19 percent less in income taxes than in 1986; and more people at the lower end of the economic ladder are exempted from federal income taxes altogether, giving them a much better chance of climbing out of the poverty trap.

Despite the benefits to millions of working Americans, and despite the evidence that lower tax rates do generate more revenues for the government, some continue their insistence that tax increases are necessary. Fortune magazine proclaimed recently on its cover: "Everybody knows that for the deficit to come down, taxes must go up." Well, I certainly do not "know" that and, I suspect, neither do the millions of Americans who have been paying the government less and bringing home more for their families.

The problem with the deficit is not that Americans are under-taxed, it's that Congress -- which ultimately controls government spending -- is spending too much. Since 1980, annual tax revenues have increased by \$396 billion; yet, Congress is now spending an additional \$475 billion per year. Each year in this Administration, Congress has appropriated more than President Reagan has asked for in his budget. While Gramm-Rudman-Hollings has helped, we still need fundamental reform of the budget process, including the line-item veto.

Now I've seen in some recent corporate annual reports words to the effect that there is "economic uncertainty" in this country. I really do not understand where that comes from, given the record of stable, non-inflationary growth during the last six years. Let me make a prediction: if we continue on a path of low tax rates and keeping the government out of the way of private commerce wherever safety considerations permit, economic growth will continue until this expansion has touched each and every American. The automotive industry makes up the single largest segment of our economy, and as such, its performance is a strong indicator for the nation's economy generally.

Andrew Malcolm aptly summarized the essence of America's love affair with the automobile. "[A driver] is a king on a vinyl bucket-seat throne," he once wrote, "changing direction with the turn of a wheel, changing the climate with the flick of a button, changing the music with the switch of a dial." It's more than the love of good design. The automobile is an emblem of American individualism, and the automobile industry is a continuing symbol of the strength of our economy. Those who wrote you off underestimated the drive and entrepreneurial spirit of American business. I expect you will continue to lead the way in building cars that satisfy that American love for efficient, enjoyable, personal transportation.





U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele.: (202) 366-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
HINE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL DRUG AWARENESS DAY  
OCTOBER 25, 1988  
WASHINGTON

The Coast Guard is trying to stop the flow of drugs into this country, because we care about you. The flashy life-style and easy money of the dealers might look good to some of you at first. But that leads to one of two things: jail time or death. It's that simple. Just last month, I read about 11-year-old Enoch Thomas, who was shot point-blank in the head when a drug deal went bad. Young Enoch, it seems, had been working as a crack runner and lookout since he was nine. In his last drug deal, he lost his packet of crack vials somewhere along the way. His bosses killed him for his error and left him lying in a clear plastic bag just two blocks from his home. That's not just an isolated incident. The D.C. police department says that drugs are the main reason why the murder rate here has gone up more than two-thirds this year.

I don't need to tell you all the terrible things that drugs can do to you. You know that they can mess up your body, you know that they can drain your mind so that you can wind up living from fix to fix, and you know that drugs can make you become violent and hurt friends and family. The head of another federal department said it best: "Drugs aren't bad because they're illegal; they're illegal because they're bad." I think you would agree with that.

The path to success is not lined with easy money and ducking your responsibilities to your fellow citizens. It's lined with work, hard work. That means

a lot of hours studying, and when the time comes, doing the best you can do at every job.

I have great confidence in all of you to make the right decisions about drugs, because I have heard from your teachers and from Ms. Whitfield about all the hard work you have put into forming a united student-parent-teacher front at Hine against drug use. All of us are here to help you make good decisions in your lives. Even your teachers, believe it or not, are on your side. And so are the rest of us.

I'm especially proud that you have taken the initiative to form the first Washington chapter of PRIDE as part of your effort to keep drugs away from your neighborhood; this is a terrific way to involve the whole community. This chapter, which is being formed in honor of First Lady Nancy Reagan, is being co-sponsored by the Department of Transportation and by the Capitol Hill Association of Merchants and Professionals. They are your neighbors, and good neighbors at that, because they care about you.



U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele.: (202) 366-4570

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
STROM THURMOND INSTITUTE  
CLEMSON, SOUTH CAROLINA  
OCTOBER 27, 1988

The election is not quite a fortnight away, and we are hearing more and more about the national drug problem. Some of it has rightly been dismissed as merely election-year rhetoric. However, this issue is far too grave to be treated as a political football. I would like to lay out some facts about the drug problem, and what my Department is doing to combat it.

The distortion of values wrought upon our society by illegal drugs is deeply disturbing. For example, elementary school children in Washington this past summer could be found playing a game called "Hustler." The object of the game is to successfully complete fake drug deals, using play money, pebbles for crack, pencil shavings for marijuana, and ground up chalk for cocaine. A city recreation Department counselor told The Washington Post: "They do everything the way they've seen it -- with the runners, the lookouts, the users, the jumpout squads, everybody." What is most foreboding is that the special police anti-drug jumpout squads are the bad guys in the game.

These kids are not just playing a game -- they are rehearsing what all too often becomes real-life. In the neighborhoods where "Hustler" is played, drug dealers -- often only teenagers themselves -- enjoy a perverse, misbegotten celebrity. It is the drug dealers who drive the fancy cars and carry big rolls of cash, while those who toil at honest jobs struggle to make ends meet.

Young people in our most distressed neighborhoods are drawn by the easy money, and often die for their misdirected ambition. Just last month, I read about 11-year-old Enoch Thomas, who was shot point-blank in the head when a drug deal went bad. Young Enoch, it seems, had been working in New Orleans as a crack runner and lookout since the age of nine. In his last drug deal, he lost his shipment somewhere along the way. His bosses executed him and left him in a clear plastic bag two blocks from his home. Drug-related crimes of this sort are on the rise in virtually every major city.

- more -



One factor certainly contributing to this upside-down value system is that some highly visible role models for these kids are drug users, and when caught using drugs seldom suffer any serious consequences. In recent weeks, the National Football League has suspended 18 players for drug use. Many of these players are back on the playing field after 30-day suspensions; if caught again, some of them will be barred from the NFL for life. But this is a threat of dubious deterrent force, since after one year they may reapply for the right to play. Other professional leagues have similarly lax drug policies.

Handing out veritable slaps-on-the-wrist for drug use sends the wrong message to America's young people. These 30-day suspensions tell them, "Don't worry about using drugs. Nothing will happen to you. Laugh it off." The gruesome reality is that drug use causes people to lose their jobs, their families, and sometimes their lives. Just two weeks ago, Dave Croudip of the Atlanta Falcons died of an apparent cocaine overdose. The NFL and other sports organizations can no longer duck their responsibility to their athletes and to the American people.

The policy for athletes should be straightforward. If you are using drugs and come forward to enter rehabilitation, fine, the leagues will be there to help. But if you use drugs and get caught, you're out, permanently. No 30-day suspension with pay, no coming back for reinstatement next year.

The demand for drugs, partly fueled -- intentionally or not -- by celebrity users, has sometimes surrealistic effects on society. For example, West Virginia's leading cash crop for 1987 was marijuana, with an estimated value in excess of \$800 million. The same is said to be true in a number of other states, including California. In comparison, West Virginia's leading legal cash crop for 1987 was hay, valued at approximately \$58 million.

There are between 5 and 6 million cocaine users in this country, and 18 million marijuana users. These people have made the United States a leader in an area in which all of us would like to take last place: We import more illegal drugs than any country in the world. The only way to permanently stamp out the drug menace in this country is to relentlessly attack both drug-buyers and drug-sellers, using every legal means at our disposal.

Unfortunately, Washington has not always demonstrated serious concern about the drug problem. In fact, Jimmy Carter eliminated the White House Drug Abuse Policy Office. The Reagan-Bush Administration was the first to make the fight against drug abuse a national priority. Back in 1982, President Reagan set up the South Florida Task Force and asked Vice President Bush to head it. Hundreds of additional drug agents, along with extra judges and prosecutors, were sent to Florida -- the trans-shipment point for more than 80 percent of the cocaine that enters this country. More Coast Guard cutters were deployed, and the other military services provided surveillance assistance for the first time. This constituted an all-out mobilization of available forces, and the result was record drug seizures. Major crime in South Florida dropped nearly 20 percent during the first year of task force operation.

In 1984, when the "Comprehensive Crime Control Act" was passed, more than \$44 million in drug-related assets were seized; by last year that figure had risen to more than \$500 million. Since 1981, the federal anti-drug law enforcement budget has tripled; since 1979, federal drug convictions have doubled and prison sentences are 40 percent longer. In 1983, the National Narcotics Border Interdiction System,

an inter-agency working group, was formed to combat drug smuggling. Since then, annual cocaine seizures have increased twenty-fold. Last year, federal agents seized 113,500 pounds of cocaine, 722 pounds of heroin, and an estimated 3.2 million pounds of marijuana.

Earlier this year, we began enforcing a "zero tolerance" policy toward drug abuse. For the Coast Guard, which is part of my Department, zero tolerance means that simple possession of any measurable quantity of drugs within our territorial lands or waters may result in confiscation of the vessel where illegal substances are found. Vessels will also be seized outside our waters when an intent to either introduce the illegal substance into the United States, or export it, can be shown. From the beginning of this year through the end of September, the Coast Guard seized a total of 114 vessels for drug violations and made 61 arrests for possession of personal quantities of illegal drugs. During the same period, the Coast Guard participated in seizures of 438,000 pounds of marijuana; 32,000 pounds of cocaine; and 86,000 pounds of hashish. These seizures involved drugs with a total street value in excess of \$2.2 billion. The seizures would have been far higher had Congress not cut the President's budget request for 1988 by \$72 million. That very short-sighted action forced a reduction in law enforcement patrols of more than 50 percent. Although the President and I promptly asked for congressional approval to transfer funds to the Coast Guard from other accounts, it took Congress six months to take that simple action.

Under the zero tolerance policy, the men and women of the Coast Guard are no longer expected to "look the other way" when they find illegal narcotics on board a vessel. In a sense, all we are doing with zero tolerance is enforcing existing law. But we are also doing something much more important. We are recognizing that enforcement of our laws against drug use is essential if we are going to reduce the market for the dealers and smugglers. We are saying to well-to-do suburbanites, who often buy drugs from dealers in inner-city neighborhoods where our school children now play "Hustler," that they may no longer use those drugs with impunity on their boats.

The American Civil Liberties Union and other opponents of tough drug law enforcement complain that confiscation of property is too much punishment for the crime of possessing minor amounts of drugs. But punishment must be sufficient to deter wrongdoing. It is unlikely that many people would risk their \$100,000 boat for the sake of smoking \$20-worth of marijuana. We know from reports from the field that zero tolerance is in fact deterring drug use.

On the state and local level, law enforcement officials have become increasingly intolerant of drug use, and have found tough, innovative ways to discourage it. In Delaware, for example, motorists stopped by state police for traffic violations on Interstate 95 are frequently searched. If drugs are found, the suspect's cash and/or his car may be seized. The cars are either converted for undercover police use or sold at auction, with the proceeds going toward the purchase of other police vehicles.

Last May, Tampa Mayor Sandy Freedman initiated "Operation Crackdown." Enlisting the help of volunteer demolition crews, in just four days they razed 54 abandoned houses suspected of being havens for crack dealers. All drugs and drug paraphernalia were confiscated and burned.

Drug use is not a victimless crime. Innocent people are frequently caught in the drug-culture cross fire. Some of you may recall the January 1987 Conrail-Amtrak crash in Chase, Maryland, where a Conrail engineer under the influence of drugs rolled through several warning signals and collided with an Amtrak passenger train, killing 16 people and injuring another 178. Since January 1987, there have been 59 major rail accidents in which one or more key employees tested positive for illegal drug use. And there is ample evidence of drug use in other transportation industries as well.

Drug use is just as much a social ill for transportation as it is for society-at-large. Thus, I have proposed mandatory drug testing rules for key personnel throughout the transportation industry. We are now in the process of finalizing these rules, which require pre-employment, periodic, random, post-accident, and reasonable cause testing for employees in safety and security-related positions at all of the nations air carriers and at other commercial aviation operations, as well as the trucking, rail, pipeline, shipping, and mass transportation industries.

The purpose of random drug testing is two-fold. First and foremost, we want to identify drug users and remove them from jobs where they pose a threat to others. Secondly, we know that the war on drugs cannot be won by simply throwing drug dealers in jail; we have to make it clear that illegal drug use is unacceptable, and that there will be immediate consequences for those who choose this reckless form of so-called recreation.

We have had a civilian-employee drug testing program at the Department of Transportation for a year. All employees in safety or security-related positions, myself included, are subject to the same standard. We know that random testing works. The Coast Guard began random testing five years ago, and the percentage of those testing positive dropped from 10.3 percent when the program began in 1983 to 2.9 percent last year.

We are seeing significant progress on other aspects of the drug problem, as well. First Lady Nancy Reagan's "Just Say No" campaign is having a positive impact on millions of schoolchildren, with tangible results. Recent polls have shown that drug use among young people is dropping off. For instance, since 1980, there has been a steady decline in the percentage of high school seniors using marijuana and hashish; and for the past three years, cocaine use among high school seniors has also been decreasing. A different study found that the biggest increase in anti-drug attitudes is found among college students, the same group that led the shift toward pro-drug attitudes in the 1960s. We have clearly come a long way since the time when drug use was glorified in songs like "Lucy in the Sky with Diamonds."

Yet, there are those who still say we cannot win this fight against the world's druglords, and therefore we should just throw up our hands and legalize drugs. That, they say, would open the drug trade to free market forces, reducing the price of narcotics, and therefore reducing the incentive to commit crimes to finance drug purchases. Proponents of legalization claim that the societal benefit of reduced crime outweighs the damage that would be done by more widespread drug abuse. I was shocked to see Mrs. Kitty Dukakis quoted in the San Diego newspaper last May urging consideration of legalization. Her husband told the Baltimore Sun last November, "I've never used drugs, but I certainly understand why some people try it."



What the legalization pushers fail to mention is that as a result we could wind up with something like 50 million cocaine users and 10 million addicts of various other drugs. One might as well advocate Russian Roulette as a harmless party game. The best counter-argument I have heard comes from DEA Chief Jack Lawn: "Drugs aren't bad because they're illegal; they're illegal because they're bad."

I think everyone here knows there is no glory in the drug culture. We have got to educate our young people and rehabilitate those who seek help. But there can be no compromise in punishing drug users as well as drug dealers. If the penalties are great enough, more young people will never smoke that first joint or buy that first vial of crack. That alone may be worth the effort.

The federal government cannot solve this problem by itself. Ridding our society of illegal drugs will require a coordinated, determined effort by people at all levels of government, leaders in private industry, and by those who act as role models for millions of Americans. This is much more than a series of cases against individual pushers and users. It is about preserving for our people an uncorrupted environment in which to raise their families, safe neighborhoods where kids can play baseball instead of "Hustler" and where their parents may go about their daily business undisturbed by crime. Abraham Lincoln said of an earlier blight upon our society, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." So too with the drug problem. Partisan squabbling only gives the drug pushers an advantage. But if we stand together against drugs, and if we are willing to sustain our efforts to enforce laws against use as well as dealing, we can make real progress in our efforts to control this menace to our people.