



**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  
SPACE TECHNOLOGY, COMMERCE & COMMUNICATION CONFERENCE  
HOUSTON, TEXAS  
NOVEMBER 1, 1988**

It is a pleasure to be here today to address the second annual conference on space technology, commerce and communications. The timing of this conference couldn't be better. We get together in the afterglow of the successful launching of Discovery, a critical milestone in the restoration of our manned space program. During the Discovery's four-day mission, the five astronauts on board deployed a \$100 million Tracking and Data Replay Satellite critical to future NASA projects, conducted 11 smaller scientific and commercial experiments and tested the numerous changes made to the shuttle system since the Challenger disaster in 1986 halted the U.S. manned space program. I know we all share the joy and pride of the men and women of NASA in this achievement.

America is a nation built on the notion of the frontier -- she belongs in space and belongs in the forefront of space exploration and commerce. From our earliest history, we Americans have been a people dedicated to discovery. The United States pioneered in fields such as space-based astronomy; exploration of the planets; weather, communications and navigation satellites; remote sensing of the earth's resources from space; and materials processing and manufacturing in space. In fact, our exploration of the moon in the late '60s and early '70s will probably be viewed 500 years from now in the same light as we view the voyages of Columbus.

- more -

However, it was the 1986 Challenger tragedy that forced all of us to carefully reexamine our national space program. The question has been asked over and over: Has the United States lost its preeminence in space? I believe the answer is an emphatic "No," but the question is legitimate. It is grounded in the history of the U.S. space program.

NASA's predecessor, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA), spearheaded research and development of aviation technology. The NACA's record was stellar, and throughout its history it focused on research and development, leaving manufacturing and operation of aircraft to private industry. This arrangement made good sense: The NACA could undertake those research projects that were too expensive or for which financial returns were too far off to tempt private industry. The forces of private enterprise led to cost reductions and the production of widely accessible aircraft.

In the formative years of our space program, NASA similarly developed expendable launch vehicles (ELVs) for spacecraft and satellites. Then in the mid-1960's, the first major commercial applications of space technology -- communications satellites -- occurred, and NASA had its first commercial launch customers. Unfortunately, there was no opportunity for the emergence of a private launch industry, as there had been in aviation, because companies could not compete with NASA's heavily subsidized launchings.

Then, with its budget slashed by 75 percent between 1965 and 1975 as the Apollo and Skylab programs wound down, NASA began to aggressively seek commercial space development opportunities. By doing so, it preempted any serious attempt by the private sector to move into the commercial launch business. By the early 1980's, expendable launch vehicles were viewed as relics, and the shuttle had become our exclusive space transportation system.

The Reagan-Bush Administration has worked to strengthen our national efforts in space. One of its major achievements has been to create the conditions necessary to foster a commercial space launch industry. President Reagan issued Executive Order 12495 in 1984, giving the Department of Transportation primary responsibility for clearing away government impediments to the growth of the private sector's involvement in the space launch business, and we opened our Office of Commercial Space Transportation.

Congress also joined in our efforts by passing the Commercial Space Launch Act (CSLA) in 1984, reaffirming the Department's role. Since our office was created, the regulatory burden on launch companies has been greatly eased. Prior to its inception, companies planning a rocket launch would have had to obtain approvals from more than a dozen government agencies; now they come straight to the OCST.

In the aftermath of the Challenger tragedy, we came to understand the danger to our national security and leadership in space of reliance on a single launch system. In August 1986, President Reagan announced that the shuttle would be dedicated to research and development, military missions, and shuttle-unique payloads. This marked the end of the U.S. government's monopoly in the launch business.



Today we have a clear framework for future space endeavors. First of all, our reorganized space program will allow NASA to focus on a host of pioneering space projects, including the Pathfinder Project, the launching of the Hubble space telescope, and the manned space station.

The redefinition of U.S. space policies culminated last February, when the President issued his Directive on National Space Policy. It says that government space sectors shall purchase commercially available space goods and services to the fullest extent feasible and shall not conduct activities with potential commercial application -- except for national security or foreign policy reasons. In other words, from now on, the government will be a customer of, not a taxpayer-subsidized competitor of private companies.

Last July I announced the Department's Commercial Launch Manifest, listing 20 scheduled payloads that private firms will launch for foreign, commercial and U.S. government customers. Of the signed contracts, 11 come from foreign governments or international organizations. These agreements will reduce the U.S. trade deficit by more than \$600 million and altogether, these 20 payloads will generate about \$900 million in launch contracts. Furthermore, gearing up for this demand, U.S. firms have invested more than \$500 million and project that these launches could generate as many as 8,000 new jobs.

The licensing process we administer from the Department includes both mission and safety review of launches by U.S. companies. In the mission reviews, we check for any reasons why we shouldn't allow a mission -- we look primarily at national security and foreign policy issues, such as technology transfer. Then we conduct the safety review, during which we look at the nuts and bolts of the proposed mission. Are the people qualified? Is the procedure sound? In short, is the public safety protected?

As ordered, the U.S. government has also begun to rely more heavily on the commercial sector for launch services. For example, General Dynamics has a contract to launch three government weather satellites, and Martin Marietta is launching INMARSAT communications satellites. I was also pleased to see NASA's announcement last week that it has contracted with Space Services Inc. here in Houston for a suborbital launch of microgravity experiments. Another area of serious activity is the development of private launch ranges. Several states, including Florida and Hawaii, are showing strong interest in establishing commercial launch sites within their borders, and we hope soon to be able to license both private and state-run launch facilities.

As we nurture the commercial launch industry, we also face several major concerns. One is the problem of insurance. Launch vendors are seeking at least partial indemnification from the government for purely private launches, arguing that insurance is unavailable at any price for the upper end of the range of possible third-party claims. Giving their case further impetus is the fact that the other countries getting into the launch business in competition with U.S. firms plan to indemnify their "commercial" activities.

Unlimited risk is clearly an impediment to the growth of the commercial space launch business. Therefore, I am pleased that in its final days Congress passed the Commercial Space Launch Act Amendments of 1988. By working closely with the key leaders in Congress, we were able to develop a legislative package which strikes

a delicate balance between facilitating the industry on the one hand and protecting the federal treasury on the other hand.

The legislation directs the Department of Transportation to set minimum insurance requirements for private launches. Those levels are not to exceed \$100 million for government property and \$500 million for third party claims. The federal government, subject to the availability of appropriations, will be responsible for third party claims above the DOT-imposed insurance requirement, up to a maximum of \$1.5 billion -- meaning there is a cap on the government's share of the risk. In addition, the bill sunsets in five years. Thus, the federal government will not allow U.S. launch companies to be put at a severe competitive disadvantage because of the limited availability of affordable insurance. Equally important, the government's risk has been capped, both as to financial exposure and the period of time we will be in the backup insurance business.

Another major issue confronting us is the aggressive marketing of launch services by the Soviet Union and China. It is vital to our national security that the United States have a viable private space launch industry. We did not break up the U.S. government's monopoly on launches to create an opportunity for other governments to dominate the commercial launch business through predatory practices.

As you know, the Administration has agreed to grant export licenses to Hughes to launch communications satellites on the Chinese Long March rocket series, provided the Chinese meet certain stringent conditions. The U.S. delegation, which included Department of Transportation representatives, returned home from China last week with an agreement ensuring that China -- and not the U.S. -- will bear liability under international law for damages caused by these launches. The Chinese also agreed to all American demands concerning protection against technology transfer. The Chinese still must provide assurances that they will not engage in predatory practices in the international marketing of their launch services.

In addition, there is a profound underlying strategic significance in the Soviet space program. Last year while the Soviet Union launched to earth orbit 95 times, the United States made it only seven times. If the United States ever allowed an habitual use of Soviet launchers for U.S.-made payloads, the Soviets' already mature launch capability would be further strengthened while our launch facilities could lie rotting on the ground. In effect, we would be paying the Soviets with our hard currency to help them build a launch capacity that could be used against our allies in wartime. The United States must develop its own strong launch capability and not become dependent, in any shape or form, on our primary adversary for access to space.

As for our space relationship with the Europeans, we have held two rounds of negotiations in our attempt to establish a level international playing field. In these negotiations, we are trying to define the extent of government subsidies on both sides, and then reach a trade agreement governing future launch business. I believe the prospects for the U.S. commercial launch industry, given its 96 percent success rate for our established rockets, are very good -- so long as it is given a fair opportunity to compete.

The advances made thus far in nurturing a private U.S. launch industry are substantial. The U.S. government owes our private launch companies a consistent, supportive policy, so they can continue to move steadily forward with confidence.



As we contemplate the future of public and private sector space programs, we should remember that 75 percent of the products on the U.S. market today did not exist at the close of World War II. Now just imagine a world in which lifesaving medicines, manufactured in space, cure diseases such as diabetes and cancer. For example, during the flight of Discovery, experiments were conducted to process materials and study effects of weightlessness on red blood cells and other organic materials, to help find cures for certain diseases. Consider the next phase of the electronics revolution, accelerated by the production of near-flawless crystals grown in micro-gravity. Think about the communications system now emerging in which messages are being received and sent by moving vehicles, on land, sea, air, anywhere in the world. And with the injection of the American entrepreneurial spirit, we will see a dramatic surge in private launch activity.

An active commercial space industry is crucial to maintaining America's leadership in space; a strong, visionary government space program is equally critical. I am confident that we now have a solid foundation for both. With the leadership of the people in this room, the 1990's can and should be the "American" decade in space.



**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  
PRESS CONFERENCE ANNOUNCING  
TRANSPORTATION EMPLOYEE FINAL DRUG TESTING RULES  
WASHINGTON, D. C.  
NOVEMBER 14, 1988**

Today I am announcing final rules to require testing for drug use of approximately four million transportation employees who have safety- or security-related responsibilities. This is an important step in not only enhancing the safety of our transportation system, but in discouraging illegal drug use. The American people demand and expect a drug-free transportation system. These new rules will take us as far as practically possible toward that goal.

The use of drugs is not a victimless crime. We all recall the January 1987 Conrail-Amtrak crash, which was caused by a Conrail engineer who had drugs in his system; 16 people died in that crash and another 178 were injured. This was not an isolated incident.

- Since January 1987, there have been 60 major rail accidents, including the Conrail-Amtrak crash, where one or more employees involved tested positive for illegal drugs, killing 33 people and injuring another 360.
- When 1,300 truck drivers at three Florida truck stops were surveyed, the respondents thought that 36 percent of all truckers sometimes drive under the influence of drugs.
- In July of this year, forty-four people were injured in a tour bus crash near Bass River, New Jersey. The driver, who tested positive for cocaine, was arrested and charged with driving under the influence as well as possession of drug paraphernalia.

- more -

- In January of this year, 9 people died in a commuter aircraft crash near Durango, Colorado; the pilot had cocaine in his blood.
- In March of 1983, a cargo jet crashed in New Jersey; both the pilot and co-pilot tested positive for marijuana.
- In a fall 1986 series of articles, the Pittsburgh Press reported interviews with emergency room staffs at area hospitals, and found 23 cases of airline flight crew drug abuse. Twelve cockpit crew members and 11 flight attendants were among those treated by the hospitals for drug use. In addition, hospital personnel said they had treated numerous cases of drug abuse by critical non-flight employees, such as mechanics. In a survey of only 17 drug treatment clinics across the country, the newspaper found that at least 69 pilots had been treated for cocaine addiction.
- Last April, all five employees responsible for operating a commuter train that crashed into another train in suburban New York tested positive for drug use. Fortunately, both trains were empty, on their way to pick up full loads of rush-hour passengers.
- The FAA has had to dismiss 13 air traffic controllers for drug use following rehabilitation efforts, and another 4 resigned their posts rather than undergo rehabilitation.

There is no evidence that the transportation industry is any different from the rest of society when it comes to drugs. The vast majority of employees never have and probably never will use drugs. But the potentially disastrous consequences that can stem from even a single employee making a mistake because of drug use have compelled us to issue these rules in the hope that we can eliminate all drug use by those who hold such critical jobs.

These new rules will generally require pre-employment, post-accident, periodic, reasonable cause, and random drug testing for employees in sensitive safety- and security-related positions throughout the transportation industry. Such testing must screen for marijuana, cocaine, opiates, amphetamines, and PCP. Each of these separate rules allow for phase-in periods, including up to two years for certain small businesses; in general, however, most larger companies will be required to have their drug-testing programs in place within one year.

The rules will apply to some 3 million truck drivers, 538,000 key personnel in aviation, 90,000 railroad employees, 195,500 mass transit employees, 120,000 seamen, and 116,500 pipeline employees. We are very sensitive to the rights of these employees, and I want to emphasize that testing will be conducted in accordance with strict federal guidelines and with respect for individual privacy. In order to ensure the accuracy of test results, we are requiring confirmation tests for samples that screen positive, as well as strict procedural guidelines to assure the authenticity of each sample.

We know that drug testing works, and random testing is particularly effective. 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 have had a drug testing program at the Department of Transportation for more than a year. All employees in sensitive security- or safety-related positions are subject to the same standard, myself included. Since testing



began in September 1987, 6,688 random drug tests have been conducted; 49 of those tested positive for illegal drug use, including 33 air traffic controllers. Of the 49 cases, 31 tested positive for marijuana, 16 for cocaine, and 2 were combinations of marijuana or cocaine with amphetamines.

This rulemaking process has been particularly complex and sensitive. I want to thank all of those who provided comments for the docket or who testified at the 21 hearings held. I want to especially thank Senators Danforth and Hollings, as well as the leaders of Safe Travel America, for their unyielding efforts and support for meaningful drug testing in the transportation industry.

As I said at the outset, the American people rightfully expect a drug-free transportation system. Drug testing is the best and only effective tool available to make sure they get it.



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  
COMMONWEALTH FOUNDATION  
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA  
NOVEMBER 15, 1988

It's a real pleasure to be among a group of dedicated free-marketeers, particularly people like yourselves who have such a strong interest in state and local policy. It is too often forgotten in Washington that public policy exists at some level other than the federal government, and all innovative policy ideas need not come from inside the Washington Beltway. There are now at least a dozen free-market policy research groups emphasizing state and local issues, representing virtually every region of the country. With Don Eberlee's leadership, you are on the cutting edge of this movement. President Reagan's policies have led to a transfer of power back to the states. With more policy and program decisions being made at the state level, organizations like the Commonwealth Foundation can provide the kind of thorough research and thoughtful advocacy for conservative ideas on the state level that the Heritage Foundation, Cato Institute and the American Enterprise Institute provide on the national level.

Any discussion of the growing importance of state and local policy -- particularly from a free-market perspective -- must necessarily begin with the recognition that we might not be here discussing market-oriented policies and federalism were it not for the strong leadership of Ronald Reagan over the last eight years. He brought to the presidency a thoughtful appreciation of the need for a division of labor between the national government and the states, and he turned that into reality with initiatives to re-institute true federalism as envisioned by the Founding

- more -

Fathers. I think that the American people last week delivered a firm affirmation of that approach will continue under Bush.

One area where state and local governments have often been ahead of Washington is privatization. In fact, many localities were practicing privatization before the word was invented.

Last year alone, states and localities contracted out for more than \$100 billion-worth of services to private companies -- an amount roughly equal to 10 percent of the federal budget. These contracts were not limited to activities one might naturally think of contracting out, such as garbage collection. They also included such innovative programs as the following:

- The City of Scottsdale, Arizona, contracts with the Rural Metro Corporation for fire protection services.
- The City of San Diego, California, has a privately operated ambulance service.
- One Tennessee county has a privately operated jail.

These are far from being isolated examples. Privatization, whether it involves asset sales, contracting out, or introducing other competitive management practices to government programs, is widespread and involves many diverse services.

The most important thing to remember about privatization is that it is not just some anti-government ideology, nor does it entail an abrogation of governmental responsibilities. It is instead a strategy to use the free market and its inherent strengths to meet public needs with private-sector efficiency.

In fact, outside of Washington privatization enjoys strong bipartisan support. Mayor Jan Dempsey of Auburn, Alabama, a self-described "old-hat liberal Democrat," is a strong privatization enthusiast. In 1986 Auburn became one of the first cities in the nation to contract with a private firm to build and operate its wastewater treatment plant. The city estimates that it will save some \$25 million over the next 25 years. The City of Detroit, which also has a Democrat mayor, found that it was spending \$26 for each \$15 parking fine collected; the city contracted with a private firm to collect the fines. The cost: \$2 per ticket, converting an \$11 per unit loss into a \$13 per unit profit for the city.

But saving money is not the only consideration, nor is it the only benefit. Equally important is knowing that when a private company fails to perform up to standard, you can fire it. The same cannot be said of a county garbage collection service or snow removal agency. Moreover, private companies pay taxes, while public entities are exempt.

The Transportation Department has moved aggressively to use privatization wherever feasible. Our largest undertaking in this area was the March 1987 sale of the government's 85 percent stake in Conrail. That public stock offering -- the largest initial offering in U.S. history -- netted more than \$1.6 billion for the federal government. While Conrail still stands as the federal government's largest privatization effort, we are pursuing private sector initiatives in other areas as well.



For example, the Federal Aviation Administration is contracting out to the private sector for operation of approximately 20 smaller air traffic control towers, and another 40 towers are non-federally operated -- either by state and local governments or private firms. The FAA Reauthorization Act of 1987 supports the contracting out program, and calls for expansion of contracting out as as many FAA Level One airports -- those with the least traffic -- as possible.

In the case of the Department's relatively new Office of Commercial Space, it involves the growth of an entirely new industry. The Challenger tragedy and ensuing two-year shutdown of the shuttle program, which had become the principal launch service for both private and government payloads, highlighted the necessity of fostering alternatives to NASA's subsidized domestic launch monopoly. Building on policies he had promulgated earlier, President Reagan ordered that the shuttle be used in the future only to launch payloads that for practical or national security reasons cannot be launched any other way. With the streamlined licensing and regulation made possible by having a single Office of Commercial Space -- instead of several offices scattered around the federal government -- private firms have moved rapidly to meet the strong demand for satellite launches. More than 20 planned launches have been registered with the Department for the next three years. These companies have already invested more than \$500 million to gear up for these launches, which will bring at least \$2 billion in revenues to the industry and create as many as 8,000 new jobs.

Another area where the Department has been especially active in fostering private competition is urban mass transit. This year alone, the federal government will make grants of approximately \$3.1 billion to cities for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bus and subway systems. Since 1967, nearly \$50 billion has been spent on mass transit aid; yet, fewer Americans ride public transit to work today than 10 years ago. The reason for that disparity is that in many cases riding urban mass transit means subjecting oneself to the whims of a monopoly. In too many cities, transit systems have grown unresponsive to consumer demand, and their bureaucracies have grown fat on federal aid. One symptom of this is that, on a national basis, compensation for public bus drivers and mechanics is almost half-again more than their unionized counterparts in the private sector, who are themselves highly paid. In an era of tighter federal budgets, we have had to find ways to get more out of the taxpayers' money when handing out transit grants. Privatization, particularly encouraging route competition, has been a partial solution.

For example, after the Los Angeles Regional Transportation District discontinued service on several routes, the City and the County of Los Angeles both wanted it continued. With the Urban Mass Transportation Administration providing funds for lease/purchase of capital equipment, the routes were put out for competitive bid. A private contractor is operating 40 buses on the 12 county routes for 45 percent less than it was costing the Regional Transportation Authority. On the four city routes, a private contractor is running 30 buses at nearly one-third less cost.

And in a project that holds great promise for reducing inner-city unemployment and poverty, UMTA provided \$100,000 in support for technical assistance for a "reverse commute" program in Philadelphia to transport workers from the inner-city, where unemployment is 8 percent, to the labor-short suburbs, where unemployment is only 3 percent. With technical assistance from the University of Pennsylvania, Accessible Services, Inc., a small private operator, has been able to

provide all the vehicles and meet all operating costs of the project. Accessible Services now makes 11 vehicle-trips per day carrying 160 people to their jobs, all without public assistance. The company, which has just begun to turn a small profit in the last six months.

I am convinced that the surface has only just been scratched in privatization. As more localities utilize privatization, and people in Washington see that privatization works, with no disruptions in service, I think it will grow at the federal level, as well. Groups like the Commonwealth Foundation are playing an essential role not only in bringing about sound budget policy, but in carrying out what amounts to a national education project on privatization.





U.S. Department of  
Transportation

# News:

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

Contact: Wendy DeMocker  
Tele.: (202) 366-0237

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY  
NATIONAL COMMISSION AGAINST DRUNK DRIVING  
ANNUAL AWARDS LUNCHEON  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
DECEMBER 6, 1988

It is a great honor to be here today and to have been chosen to receive this year's Humanitarian Award. I want to commend all of you for your efforts to reduce drunk driving, especially Jim Adduci, Chairman of the National Commission Against Drunk Driving, and Governor John Volpe, who chaired the Presidential Commission Against Drunk Driving. Their outstanding leadership has been critical in focusing the attention of the American people on this problem and getting action by both government and the private sector to address it. I am also honored to be in the company of such distinguished award winners as Governor Mike Hayden, Ralph Jackson, Nancy Sanders, Ken and Fran Nathanson, Marc Chafetz, Marvin Romanoff, Charles Hayes and Barbara Eisenhart. These are people who have made personal commitments to do whatever it takes to get drunk drivers off our roads.

Early in the Reagan Administration, President Reagan appointed the Presidential Commission Against Drunk Driving to study this problem -- setting in motion a lasting federal commitment to actively fight drunk driving. The Commission's work was vital, for example, in building support in both the Administration and Congress for the 21-year-old drinking age legislation. When its "official" work was complete, the Commission took the unique step of transforming itself into a private, nonprofit organization. Today, through hard work and dedication, the National Commission



Against Drunk Driving serves as a center for public and private organizations working to combat this enormous problem.

Today also marks the release of the Commission's Report on Youth Driving Without Impairment -- an overview of the testimony given in five public hearings sponsored in cooperation with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). These hearings -- held in Chicago, Boston, Seattle, Atlanta and Fort Worth -- provided an excellent forum for discussions between adults and young people about what is and is not working, and what new measures can be taken. With young people beginning to use alcohol on average before they turn thirteen, these hearings made it clear that we must combine prevention through education with treatment and strict law enforcement.

Improving the safety of our highways and most important -- working to eliminate drunk and drugged driving -- has been a top priority of the Department of Transportation during the Reagan years. And while drunk and drugged driving is still one of our nation's most serious problems, significant progress has been made in large part because of you and people like you all over America.

Our efforts are paying off. Overall, NHTSA estimates that of approximately 46,000 traffic fatalities in 1987, 40 percent involved drunk driving, compared to 46 percent in 1982. Overall, the fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled dropped from 3.3 in 1980 to 2.4 last year. That is a 25 percent decline, and there are tens of thousands of Americans alive today who would not be with us had the rate stayed at the 1980 level. Furthermore, the current rate is an all-time low. A significant factor in this encouraging trend is that the role of alcohol in fatal crashes declined substantially. Between 1982 and 1987, the percentage of drunk drivers involved in fatal auto crashes dropped 14 percent; teenage involvement in alcohol dropped 34 percent.

Much of the law enforcement side of the equation rightly rests with the states. Nonetheless, several very effective measures, such as the new 21-year-old minimum drinking age and other laws have been put in place with federal involvement. For example, on October 27th, we issued final rules setting strict alcohol restrictions for commercial drivers. 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-time disqualification from operating a commercial vehicle. In addition, this new rule will require that drivers be put out of service for 24 hours if any trace of alcohol is detected when they are on duty. With these rules we recognized what has been common knowledge for years: because of their sheer size, a heavy truck requires greater skill and alertness to drive safely than a car.

Still, there is much to be done. Drunk and drugged driving are not victimless crimes. While drug dealers and addicts are using guns as their weapons in today's urban neighborhoods, drunk and drugged drivers use the automobile as their weapon to kill or maim people on our highways.

Every 22 minutes, someone is killed by a drunk or drugged driver, averaging 66 fatalities per day. These victims are a cross-section of America: young and old, rich and poor, men and women. Take, for example, the senseless death last summer of 10-year-old Katrina Ferguson. She was killed by a drunk driver as she held her

mother's hand while waiting for a school bus outside of her northern Virginia home.

And we have not forgotten one of the worst drunk driving crashes in our history -- which left 27 people dead when an intoxicated driver collided with a school bus while driving the wrong way on a Kentucky interstate. Most of those killed in the school bus crash were teenagers. Even worse, the 34-year-old driver who caused the wreck was a previous drunk driving offender. He has been charged with 27 counts of murder and could face the death penalty.

So while there has been a measurable decline in drunk and drugged driving and a greater awareness of this deadly problem, we must continue our efforts as aggressively as possible.

One of our goals at the Department has been to continue the momentum with regard to both the visibility of this issue and tougher law enforcement that began in the early 1980's. This involves a combination of enhanced enforcement, prosecution and licensing actions; renewed media attention to the problem; greater emphasis on public information programs, community programs, promoting individual responsibilities such as designated drivers, and working with citizen activist groups. I know you share my pleasure in reading the morning papers that by a vote of 7-2, the Supreme Court let stand a decision upholding the right of the police to set up sobriety checkpoints.

Tough law enforcement, however, is only one side of the equation; drunk and drugged drivers can and should be given stiff penalties -- but we all agree it would be far better if we could convince more people not to drink or use drugs and drive in the first place.

One program that has made a difference is TEAM -- "Techniques For Effective Alcohol Management," a unique private/public sector initiative begun in 1985. TEAM has been enormously successful in building local coalitions to plan traffic safety programs, and the National Basketball Association and major league baseball have become involved in the effort. The organization has trained over 150,000 people in the United States and Canada in ways to encourage safe, responsible drinking, especially in sports arenas around the country. As a result of these efforts, all Major League Baseball and the majority of National Basketball Association facilities have instituted or revised policies addressing admissions, vending, and awareness concerning alcohol -- particularly in regard to end-of-game sales.

With the holidays upon us, we need to create this same spirit of responsibility by appointing "teams" at every Christmas party, whether at the office or at home. We should also encourage alcohol and drug-free parties for young people during the holidays modeled on "Project Graduation."

At the Department of Transportation, another successful program has been NHTSA's Corporate Outreach, which coordinates two-day "nuts and bolts" workshops for employers dealing with alcohol safety both on and off the job, and other highway safety initiatives that can be incorporated in employee programs.

Private voluntary programs, such as those of MADD, SADD, and RID remain critical to combat drunk driving. With their help, we have increased enforcement against drunk driving, instituted mandatory sentences for repeat offenders and gained greater attention and support from the media. In addition, a dozen states have

curbed "happy hours," when bars discount drinks, and insurance companies impose surcharges on policyholders convicted of drunk driving. We must keep up this momentum both in and out of the government.

But as a result of drunk and drugged driving crashes this year, people like young Katrina Ferguson are not alive to spend this holiday season with their families. As we all recognize, it is particularly important at this time of the year to redouble our efforts so that joyous occasions do not turn into tragedies.

All of us here know that the government alone cannot solve this deadly problem. In fact, we realize that we will probably never be able to completely eliminate the drunk or drugged driver from our roads. But by working together -- people helping people, in our communities, homes and schools -- we are changing society's behavior for the better, toward drinking or the use of drugs and driving. Those of you here today are the national leaders in this vital campaign. I salute you for what you have done, and for what you will be doing in the future. You do make a difference.