Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Harvey?

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Mayor, let me ask you first of all whether you think the Demonstration Cities Act should be confined to the major cities in America, where some of the greatest unrest and difficulties have been encountered.

Mr. CURRIGAN. I would say definitely "No." In fact, I think—I think this would be a very serious mistake, if this were to become a law, and then it were to be implemented by just your so-called major cities. This does not mean that I think the problems of your major cities, your highly populated cities, are not serious—they are. But I think proportionately your communities, regardless of whether they have 50,000 people or 10 million—the problems are just as acute to those people on their home base, whether they be in New York or Denver. And personally I would say it would be a very serious mistake if this only for your so-called major cities.

Mr. HARVEY. Do you think that the act should fix proportional amounts for the large, medium, and smaller cities?

Mr. CURRIGAN. My own frank opinion—I have never really shall we say, supported in principle and philosophy—earmarking. I would be hopeful that the administration would be flexible enough, and use objective discretion so that the programs would not be utilized out of proportion favoring one section of the country over another, which I think would be wrong, or favoring one population segment over another. But I would be hopeful, again, that the administrators of the program would have enough integrity and enough objectivity so that discretion could be flexible, and the job could be done without establishing rigid financial allocations.

Mr. HARVEY. Let me follow that up with this third question. Do you think that there should be some limitation in the act placed upon the amount that any one city or any one State could receive?

Mr. CURRIGAN. Well, if I am consistent with my previous answer, I have to to say the same answer and principle here. I realize——

Mr. HARVEY. Your answer would be yes or no?

Mr. CURRIGAN. No limitation.

Mr. HARVEY. You believe that no limitation should be placed?

Mr. CURRIGAN. Right.

Mr. HARVEY. I take it then to be consistent your answer would be that there should be no limitation geographically.

Mr. CURRIGAN. That is right.

Mr. HARVEY. In other words, it would not matter whether the one city in a State or a dozen cities in the same State all received the money?

Mr. CURRIGAN. This is true.

Now, here again, hindsight and foresight might be a little different. If it were administered in a way that it was out of proportion, whether it be by cities or class of cities, then I would wish I had not said what I did, but I just cannot help but believe that good administration would dictate otherwise.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Mayor, several of the other mayors who have appeared here have expressed a fear or apprehension that one of the results of this program would be to divert funds from other urban renewal programs.