

implied that that was not a good way to do it. The two things which you mentioned I think could be cleared up if you could read with me the proposed amendment. You said (1) you thought that 2 years was not enough to develop such a program. And secondly, that you thought that the approach ought to be through new systems rather than just through individual technology. Now, if you will read the amendment with me, I think you will agree that we have in mind precisely what you do—the amendment will direct the Department to prepare a program for research and development and demonstration of new systems of coordinating urban transport. And then it says the program should “aim at a breakthrough within 5 years of its approval by the Congress,” and it “concerns itself with the technical, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects of the problem. In this connection, experts from such universities as Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and such aerospace companies as North American Aviation, have recently testified that a program of this sort has an excellent chance of bringing about the required breakthrough. The proposed program would ‘provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities, and foundations.’”

Now, I call your attention to the fact that we are talking about 5 years rather than 2, and that we are talking about not just isolated technology, but whole new systems, for communities of different sizes. Doesn't this convert you into an enthusiastic adherent of the Ashley-Moorhead-Reuss amendment?

Secretary WEAVER. Let me say that it removes some of my hesitancy. I think there are two problems involved here. The first one is, of course, to reconcile this amendment to what we already have under the mass transit law. And the second goes back to the fact that we will soon have a message up to the Hill on a Department of Transportation. I think it would be premature for me to make any comment on anything to do with mass transportation until the position of the administration on the whole subject has been set forth.

Mr. REUSS. As of today, you are in mass transport. And the question is, are you content in going along buying communities a new bus here and a new subway car or subway station there? Or don't you think, as representatives of the aerospace industry do, as representatives of our great universities like Massachusetts Institute of Technology do, that what is really needed in our problem of urban transport is an approach like that of the Manhattan project on atomic energy, like that of the Boston and Washington high-speed railway, like that of the space program to put a man on the moon, whereby the Federal Government acts as a coordinating influence on the whole society, with all its public and private aspects?

Secretary WEAVER. I think our differences come down to this, that I feel that there has been a great deal of overemphasis on what I call the hardware approach, on the notion that you are going to get some technological breakthrough, and get people riding on air and have them riding in a new type of thing—monorail, for example, is often mentioned—or have them riding in a tube underneath the ground, pneumatic tube, and so forth. I think that while this is a part of the picture, the economics of it, the consumer habit part of it, and all of these other factors are equally important. I would hate to see—and I