

as, prior to this reorganization plan, it looked to HUD as the unified single source of responsibility. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BOYD. Yes, sir; I think so. I think it is also a two-way street. I would expect HUD to manifest a concern.

Mr. REUSS. May I ask Mr. Hughes and Mr. Wood whether they agree or if there is anything that they disagree with in this colloquy?

Mr. HUGHES. I certainly have no difficulty with your formulation of the proposition, Mr. Reuss, and I would only add to it that we in the Bureau of the Budget have a responsibility here to keep the two portions of the executive branch in step with one another.

Mr. WOOD. I would simply add, Mr. Reuss, not only my concurrence with these general agreements, my belief that any future Secretary or Under Secretary of HUD who found DOT not performing in its judgment effectively in terms of its part of these responsibilities would have the same obligation as Secretary Boyd outlined to assure that a genesis team developed, and then on the basis of the February 19 document—we understand we do have the responsibility of the impact studies—we will take them seriously.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Secretary Boyd, there was one response that you gave to Mr. Reuss that perplexes me somewhat. You said that your Department would be responsible for developing the hardware and the scientific and technological advances for urban mass transit or transportation, and you would rely on HUD for developing the social need criteria, et cetera. Why is it that HUD or some agencies within the Federal Government can't deliver to you the requirements of urban transportation needs? They tell us these are the things that need to be developed; then, you go out and develop the hardware rather than developing the hardware and impressing those on the needs of the city.

Mr. BOYD. I don't look at this as pressing anything on the cities.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Impressing was the word.

Mr. BOYD. Impressing. First of all, I want to get back to what I think is basic, Mr. Rosenthal, and that is the cities are different. Manhattan can't use the same kind of transportation system that Kansas City is using. I believe that, I may be wrong, but just by way of example. Certainly, if any city can come up and say these are our requirements, then, we can try to tailor something to their requirements. I doubt seriously that any city today is in a position to say "these are our requirements," because they don't know what is within the realm of technical feasibility. It is more than a matter of technical feasibility. I take it that our society can build anything. As Mr. Reuss said, we developed the atomic bomb and we have been able to put a man in space. I think, given the resources, we can build anything.

The question really is going to get down to how much money is going to be made available to build a system and will that comport with what the city says it wants.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Which comes first, developing a system to meet those needs or independently developing a system and then finding out which cities can use it?

Mr. BOYD. I don't think there is anything independent about it, Mr. Rosenthal, nothing. I was purely and simply using a manner of speech when I said we would have to find out what the technical possibilities