two things: One was to improve the total transportation system in the country, and we made it very clear that this definitely included urban transportation. The second was to create a focal point for relating transportation to the environment in which it operates.

Now, 70 percent of our people live in cities in this country today, in metropolitan areas. They are the ones who constitute the major part of that environment.

As to the question of allocation of resources within the Department, this is something that Sam Hughes ought to be discusing instead of me; but the fact of the matter is, if you will recall how the Department was established, the Office of Secretary contains functional elements. It does not have any champions for airways, highways, waterways, or anything else. We are set up to try to deal with the total transportation system.

I can tell you that I have spent more time on urban transportation than on any single thing since I have become the head of the Department.

Mr. HUGHES. Two points, Mr. Rosenthal. First of all, the improvement of transportation, as I see it, is improvement in terms of its capacity to serve people. It should be a servant and not a master. It seems to me that goal was both implicit and explicit in the establishment of the Department.

Secondly, with respect to the question of choice here, mass transit versus highways versus other options, the Secretary, as he has pointed out, has structured the Department in a fashion which enables him to make these choices on as objective a basis as we people can make them.

It seems to me the choices are almost inevitably going to be better within the transportation field if mass transit is one of the competitors in the picture within the Department of Transportation.

Certainly the choice-making process is not improved by having mass transit off in left field. Rather, the fact that it is a component part of the Department and thereby impresses itself on the Secretary's consideration and to an extent certainly on congressional consideration as one of the alternative means of moving people from here to there within the city—that objective is much more assured by the plan than under present arrangements.

Mr. BOYD. If you will not hold it against me, I will point out that urban mass transportation is not altogether rail transportation. There is a lot of mass transportation moving on the highway system. It seems to me that there is some intelligence in trying to get the concept of dealing with urban mass transportation in the same place you have the concept of designing and building the highway.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. In some areas, for example, Long Island, N.Y., you could build highways forever and in vain—you know the Long Island Expressway was outmoded the day the concrete dried. We can't build any more highways. We have to develop a new type of transportation. More highways in and around that type of a city won't do any good.

Mr. BOYD. That is quite right, and that is why the city or the urban complex must be the one to decide what its requirements are. New York City doesn't go very far west of the Hudson River. There are an awful lot of cities in this country who do need highways and who do want highways. New York doesn't want them, can't use them. That is fine.

What we are trying to do is to deal with the proper set of require-