UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PRESENTATION OF

SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION NEIL GOLDSCHMIDT

BEFORE THE

FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES

NEW YORK, NEW YORK

March 10, 1980

(The following transcript was prepared from a live tape.)

Acme Reporting Company

(202) 628-4888

.....

SECRETARY GOLDSCHMIDT: It's very nice to be here.

The subject of energy is one which preoccupied me as the

Mayor of the City of Portland and one which continues to

occupy a considerable amount of my time as Secretary of

Transportation.

I think it is fair to say that nothing characterizes the life of our nation more than the notion of change. As we enter the 1980's, ours is a country in transition, a people performing a perilous high wire act, carefully moving from the set of assumptions that guided us in the past to a new set that will direct our course to the end of this century.

As committed and concerned citizens, our task is the management of that change that lies before us, the development of those new assumptions to guide us, remembering what is good and true and of real value in our past even as we change to recognize new realities in the future.

Nowhere is this transition more fundamental than in

o.

the area of energy, for energy and our use of it touches every aspect of our lives, as we have grown so painfully aware.

It is basic in our food, in our clothing, in our shelter, transportation, health care, everything that we make or do is driven by energy and it is energy that has seen the greatest, most shocking changes over the past decade.

For almost 30 years this country grew and prospered on one guiding assumption -- unlimited, cheap energy. And based on that assumption after World War II we did away with transit systems in our cities, in my own city of Portland, where we had a first-rate electrified trolley system every shred of it was ripped out and in many cases the corridors in which it operated were sold off.

entirely, or almost entirely, on the auto in this nation.

Based on that assumption, we built sprawling, low-density communities that reinforced our dependence on the auto.

We enjoyed the luxury of miles of separation between our places of work and our homes. We made the drive daily, most often alone, in gas-guzzling cars.

And in our homes and in our places of work we took
little cognizance of the energy that we used, whether in
manufacturing or production or offices or schools or
hospitals or even home heating. Why should we? After all, oil

was cheap and abundant and it always would be. So we assumed, until the 1970's when we suddenly learned that there was a new reality in the world emerging, one that would threaten our economy at home and could jeopardize our freedom in the world. Energy was scarce and energy was becoming expensive. It is that overdependence which you have heard again and again and again in the nightly news that has threatened our nation's ability to act independently in foreign affairs, on behalf of our friends, and in pursuit of our traditional and historic national interests.

Let me give you some sense of the dimension of the economic and foreign policy vulnerability that stems from our dependency on imported oil.

In 1973, this country spent \$8 billion for foreign oil. It is this fundamental change that has triggered a major shift in our nation's way of doing business. This dependence, in 1973, cost us \$8 billion. Last year it cost us \$60 billion and next year may cost us as much as \$85 to \$90 billion.

In a little more than a year, from December 1978 to

February, 1980 the average price of imported crude oil

more than doubled. The result is staggering to

calculate. But the fact is that every hour, the people of this

country are sending \$10 million to foreign countries for

oil.

3

A

5

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Or to put it another way, a way that I like to talk about it when I'm at neighborhoods coffees or parlor meetings, the cost to our people is equivalent to having each of you gather around all of your families, included grandparents, children and grandchildren whether they're old enough to write or not - having each one of them fill out a blank check on behalf of the people of the United States which is filled out to OPEC in the amount of \$325. That's \$325 for each member of the family, to be matched against the expense side of the family ledger. That includes our vacations, our retirement, our health care, our housing payments, and all the things that we expect to do with our lives on the basis of either the labor that we have already performed if we are retired, or the labor we are performing if we'd like to have a secure life for ourselves and our family.

And that is just the direct dollar drain to this country. It is costing us as well in our balance of trade, not only for oil but for automobiles from abroad that are fuel efficient, and for other products that we import because they come from countries whose economies long ago internalized the reality of scarce and costly energy.

Let me just say a word the auto industry. Last month in this country the Japanese sold more cars to Americans than Ford, Chrysler and American Motors combined. We have

Acme Reporting Company

almost 200,000 people in the automobile and related industries out of work. The automobile industry is in the process of taking 800 to 1,000 pounds of steel out of every car that comes out of a steel industry which gets its most profitable sales in many cases from the automobile industry, and from a steel industry which itself is under threat of foreign competition and today the papers is describing what it must do it order to avoid dumping of cheap steel from abroad.

So our whole economy will reverberate over the next two to five years with the adjustments that we must face. It is also, and maybe most significantly, costing us in terms of inflation and in the value of the dollar. Roughly one third of the rate of consumer inflation is directly attributable to higher oil prices, and it is costing us in jobs as well. Some economists estimated that last summer's oil price hikes took an estimated 800,000 skilled American workers off the production lines and put them in the unemployment lines.

Just as important as the economic dislocation is the threat to our independent foreign policy.

I want to start by describing something, and I suppose, as I start to talk about this, that it becomes obscured. I have asked, I asked yesterday at a community

emb-9

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

is the largest oil producing meeting, which 1 nation in the world on any given day? The answer, of course, is the United States of America. We still continue to produce, 3 along with the Saudis, fantastic amounts of oil. But our biggest single outside source of oil, most consistently, is Saudi Arabia, from whom we get 1.5 6 million barrels of oil each day. The Saudis have been basically friendly in dealing with us, but then so was Iran for more than a generation.

Now that that entire area of the world is threatened and is threatening to buckle, from the pressure of religious upheaval or the heavy hand of Soviet aggression, it is a volatile and potentially perilous situation for us, particularly given our level of dependence. Our second largest supplier is Nigeria, from whom we purchase about 1 million barrels each day. And today the Nigerians seem quite friendly to this country. A few months ago, a different government threatened to stop supplying oil unless we obeyed their foreign policy guidance.

Four nations -- Algeria, Libya, Iran and Iraq -have supplied us with about 2.3 million barrels of oil each day. But that amount, over one-fourth of the total amount, has been called by one energy expert "hostile oil," because of those nations' view of this country.

Very soon, the Congress will have completed action

Acme Reporting Company

12021 628 4888

24

25

the first in our nation's history. It is well worth remembering that the first energy policy in our nation's history should have been adopted in 1973 after the oil embargo, but the Administration then in power managed to run John Sawhill, then the Federal energy conservation expert, out of the government, and we announced victory over the problem of foreign oil dependence. The fact remains that since that time one-third to one-half and we are now, in this year, not in 1973 or 1974 or 1975, but in 1980, finally passing a national comprehensive energy policy.

We are already pricing energy at its real cost, an important step in sending the correct signals to the market-place so it can operate. And I want to pause here for a minute. For all of those of you who have, with real feeling, complained about the price of gasoline at the pump, please understand that the change in that price at the pump is what is changing the American auto fleet. It is that price change that is calling for changes in regulations affecting the American trucking industry. All of these pricing changes are causing us to shift from foreign oil to coal and away from dependence on the Persian Gulf. So our problem then is a serious one. We have allowed our addiction to jeopardize the basic

and economic political heritage of this country, and we have created a situation in which the transition we must undergo is very painful.

We are going to have to go through this transition before we arrive at the new energy destination where we can reclaim control over our own choices. It is a transition which I am convinced we not only can make but which we are already making. And under the President's leadership, we are embarking on a program to enrich our productive capacity to find and create more energy domestically and — as our highest priority — conserve it.

I think the country has the resources and the will, the determination and the discipline, to remedy this dependence. And I'd like to describe for you briefly this morning why I think that evidence is clear. Between November of 1978 and November of 1979, oil use in the United States dropped eight percent. It is a very encouraging sign, and when matched up against the rest of the industrial countries in the world, and admittedly some of them are farther along in the progression of transition, still it is an encouraging sign. The average car in the United States is being driven 15 miles per week less and at the same time is becoming increasingly energy-efficient, up to 21 miles per gallon this year from 12 miles per gallon average in 1974. By 1985 the fleet on the roads in the United States, as an average,

Acme Reporting Company

will get 27.5 miles per gallon. The decision about where to go beyond 1985 is out ahead of us.

Last year, 12 percent of all American families
fully insulated their homes, and United States industry has
cut energy use per unit of production by 16 percent since
1974. So the message is that we are making the energy
transition, but the question that remains, and this is the
major point I wish to make to you today, is what are we
making it to? We know that some of the key assumptions in
the past were faulty. But what about the assumptions for the
future and what about the values that ought to guide them,
and what is this vision of America as an outcome that ought
to direct us in our decision?

Let me share with you my vision of this country i the last two decades of this century.

I see an America at peace at home and in the wor yet vigilant in defense of our permanent commitment to freedom. And it is from this premise of personal liberty in this land that we must proceed.

I see an America tempered by this energy test emerging from it more productive at work and more conser in habits, an America that reaffirms our old and lastin values of hard work, of community, of equal rights and opportunity. An America that promotes competition, inn and efficiency in the operation of its economy, making

À

decisions today that will guarantee full participation in an international economy of the future. An America where people of all ages and background and communities of all sizes are encouraged to offer their best, understanding that we all have a contribution to make if this country is to flourish. The key to achieving this vision or another, even more ambitious one, if you may conceive it, is the development of a national conservation effort. Today, in spite of the improvements that we have made, we still waste nearly half of the energy we use.

It is mind-boggling to imagine that we literally could do without the oil we import if we stopped wasting what

we currently use. We still see roughly 1.4
million barrels of gasoline burned each day by commuters
driving back and forth to work alone.

Our
national purpose demands that we go on the attack against
waste and inefficiency.

It is the fastest and the simplest
way that anyone knows for solving energy problems, and maybe
more than that, to preserve choice and opportunity as a
fundamental right for future generations.

We have only begun to find ways to express our conservation effort. Doubling the number of commuters using carpools and vanpools in communities that really cannot afford expensive transit systems, or to get people to locations not well servable by transit, would save 200,000 barrels of oil

per day. Reform of regulations governing trucks could save 164 million gallons of fuel per year. And let me stop there for a minute. This number is understated. It is a number that deals with trucking reform legislation. It is the law now that requires trucks to go indirectly to their ultimate point of destination, oftentimes to points that they have no desire to go, to locations where they pick up or discharge no goods. And this Administration has proposed to do away with that.

But there are additional regulations. There are the regulations on the length of trucks. Currently, the aerodynamic design capabilities of trucks lead us to believe the potential is there for us to increase fuel efficiency in trucks by 15 to 20 percent. This does not include a conversion to diesel, which has already occurred in Europe and which will occur increasingly in our fleet as the cost of fuel goes up.

The pricing of fuel today means that one tenth of a mile per gallon savings on a major national truck fleet may to represent a million dollars on the bottom line. We are nowhere near squeezing from our capital investment in our transportation system the energy conservation that is there.

Major increases in transit equipment improvements and service should mean a 50 percent increase in the number of

Acme Reporting Company

_

...

riders on transit each day by the end of the decade. Fifty percent. Nice number. What does it mean?

It means 15 million additional people every day on public transit by the year 1990. And for those of you who live in this region, that may not seem like much, but for many other communities that are literally just beginning a transit system, it is a quantum leap.

Auto fuel efficiency improvements will save half a million barrels of oil in our decade ahead.

If one fourth of all American drivers simply observed the 55 mile per hour speed limit, we would save 100,000 barrels of oil per day.

And I might add, part of our program is to make sure that they do, by paying state police agencies to be out on the highways trying to enforce the law. And of course there is more that isn't listed here, in factories, in homes, on farms and on the docks.

I sat in a Cabinet meeting one day and listened to the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States describe changes in plowing techniques and post harvest techniques that would save fuel in the agricultural sector. So our goal is a conservation strategy, a strategy that recognizes that we are dealing with scarce resources of all kinds, and not just energy.

Land is scarce, particularly if it produces crops

efficiently. Capital is scarce. You only need to look at the age of our private industrial plants and some of the government facilities to know that.

Clean air is scarce and so is water and so are some kinds of raw materials. It is all scarce and increasingly expensive.

Our economic and political future depends on this basic new assumption, and the restructuring of our old habits to reflect it. It is not that we must learn to be satisfied with doing less. I want to make that clear. I am often confronted by the question about our standard of living and what we can look forward and our children can look forward to doing in the future.

And I will say again, it is not that we must learn to be satisfied with doing less. It is rather that we must insist on getting more out of everything that we do. And it is conservation that I believe offers us the tool by which to meet this demand.

Conservation is the vehicle that can help us change our habits and institutions while reaffirming our national values and vision.

For the development of a conservation ethic is ultimately a matter of individual choice and individual decision, ultimately probably individual habit. The federal government can set policy, it can offer incentive, it can

4 5

provide education, and it can regulate. But as Mayor of Portland, I learned that the decisions that really add up are the multiple choices made by every human being in my community, made routinely each day by a single citizen, an individual company or a group, either to take the bus or to drive, either to invest in energy saving equipment or to defer, either to care or to neglect.

It is the development of those individual community strategies for conservation that should be the business of this country and of everybody in this room.

They are the strategies that taken together, will define our vision of the country as a more conserving, a leaner, more productive land. These are the strategies that will express our common interest as a people, while preserving our special distinctions in each community, and these are the strategies that will safeguard what we value most about our nation -- a promise of freedom and opportunity for each American and each generation.

And it is through conservation that we refuse to spend on things today that we do not need. Unneeded coal plants, unneeded nuclear plants, plants that charge every

consumer who pays a utility bill for a capacity that was built to substitute for waste and instead of saving it with conservation, we used up our own future.

I learned that each community is different. That an

Acme Reporting Company

4 5

energy conservation strategy for Portland, Oregon will not necessarily fit the needs in Portland, Maine as their citizens see it.

But each community can benefit from its own conservation strategy as a guide for investment, for transit and for land use planning. The community can also benefit if people who live there express, in a written document, if they can do it, the things that make a difference to them as an insurance policy for their community's health and the future.

Carl Sandburg wrote, "Rest is not a word of free people." For us today, that must be our watchword. There is much work at hand, if we are to manage successfully the process of change.

Working together, large towns and small, corporate giants and individual citizens, people who labor in the fields and labor on the docks, and people who just read and think and care, working together towards this common purpose, I am confident that we will succeed.

Thank you very much.

Acme Reporting Company