

EDITORIALS

The Seattle Times

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER
Founded August 10, 1896

Allen J. Blithen, 1896-1915
Elmer E. Todd, 1942-1949

C. B. Blithen, 1915-1941
W. K. Blithen, 1949-1967

John A. Blithen, Chairman of the Board
W. J. Pennington, President and Publisher

James B. King, Editor and Vice President
Herb F. Robinson, Editorial Page Editor
Michael R. Fischer, Managing Editor

N-TRAIN TO BANGOR

That chugging nuclear choo-choo

WHEN the first armored train carrying nuclear warheads to the Trident submarine base at Bangor arrived in this state last December, hardly anybody made a peep about it. There was no publicity, no controversy, no demonstration.

When the second such train began making its way to Bangor from a weapons plant in Texas this month, it was followed all along its route by a network of anti-nuclear activists. Ten were arrested in Colorado. Six more were arrested when they sat on the tracks at Bangor — one when he apparently tried to throw himself under the train.

Somehow we felt better and safer about it all last December. Will we be subjected to similar sallies by publicity-seeking demonstrators every time a nuclear choo-choo comes chugging along?

The shipment of nuclear-weapons components is one government activity in which full secrecy and tight security are justified. Under an agreement with the Defense Department, only the state Utilities and Transportation Commission and Burlington Northern Railroad have advance information on the routes and schedules of such trains. That is as it should be. Those agencies can guarantee that track conditions are safe.

The demonstrators thus far have been non-violent. But who can say what acts of terrorism or martyrdom some misguided individuals might attempt in the future?

Granted, even if a weapons train were derailed or bombed, there is virtually no danger of a nuclear explosion or radiation leak. The cars are heavily armored, and guarded by an armed escort team.

But by a foolish act, overly zealous demonstrators could easily endanger themselves, the train's crew or innocent bystanders.

GOOD MAN FOR JOB

Let Ruckelshaus put EPA back to work

PRESIDENT Reagan described William Ruckelshaus as "the one man in the country better qualified than anyone else" to head the Environmental Protection Agency today. We can't think of anyone better.

Ruckelshaus has a unique combination of environmental experience, business familiarity, legal background, and reputation for personal integrity unmatched by any other potential candidate for the EPA job.

The question now is, will he be allowed to do that job without distracting, unproductive political interference — either from the White House or from Capitol Hill?

Reagan said Ruckelshaus has a "broad, flexible mandate" to set EPA policy and review agency needs. Ruckelshaus said the president "has given me the tools that I need to do the job," adding that he will report directly to the president, not to aides.

But while some members of Congress have been making a big deal about how EPA should be free of political interference, they themselves have interfered continually with the agency in recent weeks — and not without political motives of their own.

They can't have it both ways. The half-dozen or so congressional committees still "investigating" the agency are long on accusations but short on evidence. Unfortunately, they show no signs of backing off and letting the EPA get back to the difficult task of enforcing some of the most complex, ambiguous (and often unrealistic) laws and regulations ever enacted.

The Reagan administration has a right to name an EPA administrator who shares its goals of making the agency more efficient and effective, even if that sometimes means working with, not against, business and industry in protecting the nation's environment.

"I don't think it necessitates confrontation," Ruckelshaus correctly said of the EPA job. "I don't think it means shaking our fist at anybody."



LETHAL CHOKE HOLD

It should be banned by the City Council

IN slightly more than two years, two inmates have met death behind the bars of the Seattle-King County jail — victims of a controversial choke hold used by officers to control them.

That is two too many. The so-called "sleeper" neck hold has proven itself lethal. Jail guards should not be unreasonably handcuffed in dealing with violent, but unarmed, men inside a jail. But a control method that has taken two lives is neither reasonable nor necessary.

City Councilman Sam Smith has proposed an amendment to the jail contract which would prohibit use of the "sleeper" hold to restrain city prisoners. He was joined in his proposal by Council members Dolores Sibonga and Norm Rice. We would hope that the two additional votes needed for the proposals passage are readily available. The Public Safety Committee will hold a hearing on the matter April 6.

The proposal would prohibit jail guards from using on city prisoners "any neck hold that inhibits blood flow through the carotid arteries of the neck or that inhibits breathing by compression of the airway in the neck."

Smith's measure appears to have more chance of passage than a similar state-wide ban proposed last month by Sen. George Fleming, D-Seattle, though Fleming's bill also warrants support.

We believe it is possible for several guards to restrain a single violent individual behind bars without resorting to a method that has proven deadly.

SENSITIVE AREAS

Laughable power grab seen as serious business

Herb Robinson/Editorial-page editor

A PAIR of bills in the 1983 Legislature, seeking to place some of the most sensitive areas in government under a couple of politically appointed czars, are so outlandish as to be laughable. But a lot of people involved in such areas as local law enforcement aren't laughing.



They worry that Senate Bills 4159 and 4203 may be regarded as so ridiculous by most lawmakers that they could slip through while nobody was looking.

The measures were introduced late last month by Sen. Frank Warnke, D-Auburn, who proclaims their purpose to be cost-saving and greater efficiency.

How so? SB 4159 would phase out the Liquor Control Board and the Gambling, Lottery, Horse Racing and Boxing Commissions, and combine administration of those areas under a new agency called grandly the Department of State Enterprises.

Even worse are SB 4203's provisions calling for consolidation of numerous police powers, including control of certain local law-enforcement functions, under an ominously titled Department of Public Security.

Few if any of the officials now working in the areas affected by Warnke's sweeping proposals were consulted in advance about the bills because, as a Senate State Government Committee staffer explained with a grin, "we knew what their reaction would be."

While it's true, as Warnke points out, that some of the agencies are engaged in "promoting" their product (the Lottery Commission and Liquor Control Board, for example), it long has been recognized that their primary function is control. The abolition of the enforcement agencies in favor of single, politically appointed directors, serving at the pleasure of a governor, obviously would strip away much of the existing insulation against politicking on such ticklish matters as who gets liquor and gambling licenses, and policies governing everything from professional standards for police officers to truck-weight limits and insurance and welfare fraud.

SB 4203 even would give the state security "czar" power to police such diverse problems as fish and game-law violations and illegal billboards.

In the first place, of course, the rationale for creating regulatory commissions in especially touchy areas was that the sums of money involved are so huge and the implications for integrity in government so great that they ought to be as far removed from the political process as possible. While members of control boards and commissions are political appointees of the governor subject to Senate confirmation, the staggering of terms and the

restraints on their summary dismissal tend to give them some autonomy free of wheeling and dealing on such trouble-prone issues as political-campaign contributions.

Even with the existing system, it has been tough enough to protect against abuses, especially on such matters as gambling licenses.

General law-enforcement policies in this state up to now have been based on a time-tested tradition that the closer to local control, the better.

Vesting a wide variety of enforcement responsibilities in a single state agency is viewed by many local police officials as a step toward ultimate state control of police functions of all kinds.

The potential for such a shift already exists for many smaller communities because of inadequate funds in city and county budgets. Recognizing that danger, the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs long has maintained a "loaned executive" program. Volunteers have aided smaller police agencies in improving operations in numerous areas ranging from collection of evidence and maintenance of records to policies on deadly force and hot pursuit.

Concern for these larger issues helps explain why law-enforcement people take such a dim view of Warnke's bills. At last count, there were more than 300 boards and commissions of various kinds in state government. Why zero in on only those dealing with the most sensitive areas for consolidation of functions? Because the activities affected by the measures are where the "action" is in Olympia.

The two Senate bills represent an attempted grab for power that — laughable or not — should be regarded as serious business.



CHOOSING RUCKELSHAUS

Familiar faces of Nixon-Ford era

David S. Broder/Syndicated columnist

WASHINGTON — There is an intriguing pattern to the piecemeal reconstruction of the Reagan administration. With each additional change, the current government comes to look more and more like Nixon-Ford days reincarnated. From George Shultz to William Ruckelshaus, almost every replacement Ronald Reagan has made for a vacated major policy post has been someone who earned his reputation in the earlier Republican administrations.



Such continuity is, in a sense, unsurprising. Jimmy Carter, the previous "outsider" president, reached back for such familiar Democratic establishment figures as Joseph A. Califano and Edmund S. Muskie to help him govern.

But Reagan came to power as one who had campaigned against the "Washington buddy system" that he said characterized the GOP governments of the 1970s. Many of his enthusiasts believed he would transform the Republican Party on his way to transforming the country, by installing men and women who, like himself, were unencumbered by links to those clubby Republican administrations of the past.

It hasn't quite worked out that way. Consider the major changes that have been made. As secretary of state, the first choice

was Alexander M. Haig, whose close ties to Richard Nixon and Henry A. Kissinger were mitigated (in the eyes of true Reaganites) by his outspoken anti-communism and his military background. Now we have Shultz, the ultimate team player, who filled almost as many top jobs in the Nixon-Ford years as Elliot Richardson. He is a Republican establishment man — and, worse, has been known to consort with Democrats and labor leaders.

The first choice for secretary of health and human services was former Sen. Richard Schweiker of Pennsylvania, who burned his bridges to the Eastern establishment in 1976 to become Reagan's designated choice for vice president. To replace him, we have Margaret Heckler of Massachusetts, an establishment favorite who tied with two other House Republicans in voting most often against Reagan's positions in 1982.

As secretary of transportation, the first choice was Drew Lewis, who abandoned his ties to the Ford wing of the party to organize Pennsylvania for Reagan in 1980, when that was hardly the popular thing to do. To replace him, we have Elizabeth Hanford Dole, who was a White House official under Nixon, was appointed to the Federal Trade Commission by him, and whose husband, Sen. Bob Dole of Kansas, was Gerald Ford's running mate in 1976 and Reagan's opponent for the 1980 nomination.

Finally, and most recently, we had the resignation as head of the Environmental Protection Agency of Anne M. Burford, an early and enthusiastic Reagan backer from Colorado. As his choice to succeed her, Reagan reached out to Ruckelshaus, the man Nixon picked to set up the EPA, the man who worked with Richardson at the Justice Department and was fired for disobeying Nixon and Haig during the Watergate mess.

In almost every one of these switches, the movement has been eastward and leftward —

not very far left, to be sure, but into the heart of that pragmatic Republican center the early Reaganites so despised.

You can see the same pattern in other changes. When Murray Weidenbaum, of Washington University in St. Louis, left his post as chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, he was replaced by Harvard's Martin Feldstein. When the Hoover Institution's Martin Anderson left as domestic-policy coordinator on the White House staff, he was succeeded by yet another alumnus of the Nixon-Ford White House, Edwin L. Harper.

In fact, it is hard to think of a case where a departing Reagan policy official has been succeeded by anyone further right on the political spectrum.

I'm not sure what the explanation is for this. Some of my conservative friends see it as evidence of the "conspiracy" by White House chief of staff Jim Baker and "the Bush network" to infiltrate their moderate allies into Reagan's government.

Others, less conspiratorial in outlook, see these simply as unrelated steps to buttress the operations of the Reagan administration and put politically attractive people into place before the re-election campaign.

Still others suspect that it shows Reagan has abandoned any notion of revolutionizing government and is content with anyone who will help him mind the store and avoid scandal until he is ready to retire.

I can't say which — if any — of these theories is right. All I know is that the pattern has been consistent, and the changing character of the Reagan administration's leadership is there for anyone to see.

A few more resignations, a few more explosions, and they will be sending out for Don Rumsfeld, Mel Laird, and — who knows? — utility infielder Richardson.

(Copyright, Washington Post Co.)

Poor Herschel, poor Lefty

Theo Lippman Jr./Baltimore Sun

BALTIMORE — Penn State football coach Joe Paterno, who made points with the intelligentsia last month by advocating that colleges require football players to have IQs higher than their jersey numbers and to go to class, now has blown it with them. He called on Congress to pass the so-called Herschel Walker Act, which forbids college football players to "turn pro," as it laughingly is called, before they have played four years with Alma Mater.

Actually, a statute alone is not enough to bring that about. Lawyers on Sen. Arlen

Specter's staff will urge him to withdraw his Herschel Walker bill and substitute this:

AMENDMENT XXVII
Section I
The thirteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

Section II
Slavery and indentured servitude are illegal, except for college football players.

To its credit, the National Collegiate Athletic Association opposed Specter's bill. The NCAA points out that college basketball players can drop out of college for the pros, and this hasn't hurt the college game. In fact, never has so much attention been paid to college basketball.

Especially around here, where Maryland's Coach Lefty Driesell is on the front pages every day. Lefty is said to have pressured a female student to drop charges of sexual assault that she made against one of his stars. I don't know if he did that, but if he did, he almost surely will be fired. If he is, you can bet he and his supporters will say the punishment was too

severe. But in fact, he would be getting off lightly.

The young woman in question filed her complaint in the university disciplinary system. Had she filed it with the Prince Georges County state's attorney, and had Lefty made such a call, he could have drawn a \$10,000 fine and three years behind bars.

I hear a lot of rumors about this case. The latest is that since the basketball star was black and the female student white, Lefty is going to plead that he is really a civil-rights activist. Sounds strange, but his lawyer is Edward Bennett Williams, who once defended Jimmy Hoffa before an all-black jury by having Joe Louis come in and shake Jimmy's hand — so don't rule it out.

Even if Driesell is as bad as he sounds, he would not have been in the trouble he's in if it weren't for that nickname. Nobody trusts a lefty. (This country is in the shape it's in because two of the past three presidents are left-handed.) He should've called himself Baldy. Everybody trusts, respects and loves baldheaded men.

(Copyright, Baltimore Sun; distributed by Independent Press Service)