

You just can't have a hardware approach. You are the first, I am sure, to recognize that you need both hardware and sociology.

Mr. BOYD. That is quite true. But I think we should look at it in this context, Mr. Ruess. We are talking about new systems, say, new hardware systems. It is going to be extremely difficult for HUD to do a job on impact until it knows what the system characteristics are. We have to develop first of all the technical feasibility of a new system as well as the economic feasibility before HUD can say this is what it really means to the city.

Mr. REUSS. I would hope you can do them in tandem and simultaneously.

Mr. WOOD. If I can interject on the tandem point, I put a small footnote on your distinction between hardware and sociology. As a former political scientist, I would hate to be restricted just to sociology.

Mr. REUSS. Let's say the social sciences.

Mr. WOOD. Also, very possibly in the impact area you are going to have some hardware connotations. There are other hardware systems that you can see meshing. There are some software considerations that I am sure DOT would want to examine.

I think the important point is with our general mission of urban development and our general charge, as Mr. Rosenthal indicated earlier, of better community environment and better urban life, it is inconceivable that we don't be eager to work in tandem on a new system of transportation that have so much impact.

Again, our only limitations will be the limitations of our resources which, as I stated earlier, I think we have to expand.

Mr. REUSS. I think this matter can be cleared up to my satisfaction with a couple more questions and answers.

I am sure you see, Mr. Secretary, what I am driving at. I wouldn't want a situation where some years from now, and with new personnel in both Departments, Congress feels that it hasn't gotten the kind of dynamic program that it looked for and it needs then to fix responsibility, and I wouldn't want a situation where the then Secretary of Defense could say we did our best but because HUD dragged its feet in the social science aspects that we are left with it, we haven't been able to get to the moon or to split the atom. Obviously Congress set up this statute because it did want to centralize responsibilities.

I will come to my question. If a situation should develop whereby HUD is in any way lagging either in timing or in quality on its part of the total program envisaged by section 6(b), would you undertake to inform the President and the Congress, assuming that you are still in the position at that time, so that we can consider other arrangements?

Mr. BOYD. I agree with Mr. Wood that this is inconceivable, but I can certainly assure you that where I have been unhappy with my colleagues in the past I have not been unwilling to discuss the matter with the responsible people in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. REUSS. That is at least partially reassuring. Would you in this particular situation also be willing to discuss the matter with the relevant committees of Congress which I think would be the Government Operations Committee and whatever legislative committee is assigned to this? At present it is Banking and Currency.