

Secretary WEAVER. We have no objection to the objectives of any of these amendments. We do question sometimes whether or not they would be the best method of achieving a result.

One of the things that has struck me in the mass transit field is the fact that the real problem here is not the great, exciting breakthroughs which are going to come or even a new system which is going to revitalize the way everybody moves, as important as they may be over the long run. But the real problem is, as it is in housing construction, and as it is in urban development, and urban renewal, to get these various new technological components, of which we have a large number, into a system so that will work and get some consumer acceptance of them.

Let me illustrate. We have a demonstration project in California which involves a new type of mass transit system with the Bay Area Rapid Transit Authority. And here the problem was not one of getting a better electric motor, a better type of wheel, a better type of suspension, or a system of automation, but of putting all these together. And the first thing we discovered was that lo and behold, what nobody had contemplated, you had to get a different size of track, a wider one or narrower one, I don't know which.

So putting the components together and trying them out and seeing if they can be integrated is where I think the big need is.

Secondly, assuming that you want to do what is proposed here, which is basic research—and I have no objection to it—then I would say that the 2-year limit as I recall that you have on is too tight. It is going to be a much longer term affair. I think the priorities ought to be in putting it together rather than the great breakthroughs, but I am perfectly willing to have both if we can get them.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Do I understand that you would be willing to accept this proposed amendment, is that correct, sir?

Secretary WEAVER. I would say that we don't have any objection to this proposed amendment as to its purpose and use. If there is a question between this amendment and the type of amendment that would do the system approach, we would say the system approach should have higher priority. We would not want this to knock out the other.

Mr. BARRETT. The time of the gentleman has expired.

I think the Secretary can answer the questions on the other two amendments this afternoon, Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Stephens?

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Secretary, we have with us two acts, the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 and the Urban Development Act of this year. I don't understand why you want two separate acts. It seems to me that when you talk about new cities and urban renewal that the only difference is whether you are going to call it a Latin name or an English name. I would like to have you explain why you feel it is necessary to put these in two different acts.

Secretary WEAVER. If the question involves the combination of the provisions of these two programs in a single act we would have no objection to that. I think this developed out of the exigencies of the situation rather than for any philosophical consideration.

Mr. STEPHENS. I wanted to be sure that I understood that, because I feel like for several years we have rejected the proposals for demon-