

Mrs. DWYER. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Would you care to comment on the city demonstration bill which is before us at the present time?

Mr. BRAMAN. Yes, I would.

The demonstration bill, of course, is a very intriguing and challenging approach. We, in Seattle, have been looking at it. We are going to continue to attempt to develop some kind of proposal should the program become one in which applications are actually going to be received.

I have misgivings, however, on this bill, and on this program, because, at this moment, if you will excuse me, I would just like to express a little, I guess you might call it, philosophy.

As I stated earlier, we have been most impressed and encouraged by the apparent interest at the Federal level in our problems, whether it is in transportation, urban renewal, in the development of open space or a better city to live in, in general. I am sure it has all been done with full sincerity. But as we spend a great deal of time on these programs, and we spend our own and some Federal money, and we work closely with the field people in the department that administer these things, generally HUD at the present time, and then we find there is little or no funding back of the proposals that we are working on, this is a little disconcerting.

While I recognize the obvious advantages to those cities that might be selected, I would be hopeful if the program goes ahead, that we can present a good enough case that Seattle will be selected.

Recognizing that certain cities are selected, the cost of this program will probably be, if implemented, such that will clean out the funds that I think could be better utilized to keep on track and going according to some kind of schedule on which a great deal of work has already been done, and I refer to such things as mass transportation programs and urban renewal programs. We have a couple of real good urban renewal programs in Seattle. They are dead in their tracks at the moment. We do not know why but we think it is probably because of lack of money. I would much rather see the funds utilized to carry forward the programs that are already tried out and found to be workable. They can, and are being improved by experience. Perhaps, this is just a personal philosophy, but this is the way I see it.

Mrs. DWYER. But you prefer that we start with 5—5 or 7—demonstrations rather than go to a program of 70 cities which would cost a great deal more than \$2 billion? Because it is a new program and we ought to start small, so to speak, and with three or five or seven demonstration cities?

Mr. BRAMAN. I wish I could answer more authoritatively, and incidentally, I am not as authoritative as that, and it is a rather broad question. I will have to admit that I am not firm enough in my own mind as to whether I understand fully what is intended under the demonstration city program.

If what we are thinking of is trying to take a city and correct virtually all of its urban ills at one time, so we come up with a city almost perfect, then I think we are way out in the dream world somewhere. But, on the other hand, using Seattle as an example, we have solved our water pollution problems with the metro program—which, inci-