

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mayor Walsh, I want to say I am delighted I was able to stay to hear you. I think you have presented one of the most interesting and one of the most provocative statements given to us in the spirit you have given it to us. I would like to cover a couple of specific points. On page 7 where you generally suggest that we consider a revision of the title I and that we substitute the establishment of an Urban Conservation Corps, this has been great appeal to me. My question, I think, would be whether, in your experience, you feel that most urban areas would have the facilities available to make such a program possible. Now, they might be available, I recognize, in the situation you have in Syracuse. But is it a practical thing for instance to believe that in the city of Chicago that an Urban Conservation Corps would be able to find a home and be practical? I am somewhat concerned about my own city of Los Angeles where we would go outside the city, yes, but where the cost of land and the other facilities might make it impossible for the city to carry such a program out. Is it your belief that most of the urban areas would be able to carry out your suggestion effectively?

Mayor WALSH. I would put it this way, Mr. Congressman, that most cities have untold jobs, that if they had untold millions of dollars they would love to carry on. Park projects, recreational programs, different programs within the community that we never seem to have the money to do and we can't raise through taxes. I would guess that the mayor of any large city, mine included, could find excellent jobs. I think there is a difference here and what is being proposed. I think perhaps the committee had in mind the Civilian Conservation Corps of the depression days. As I look back and many of my friends were in that Civilian Conservation Corps, these were kids that had graduated from high school and could not get a job. They were not misfits in our economy. We are talking about people who are misfits in our economy, the dropout in our school. I don't think you can get a city kid and put him in the country and rehabilitate him. You can't get the city out of him. He is going to come back to the city and live. To me it is more appealing to keep that same kid in the city and give him something to do in the city where he is going to come back to live, where he is going to have to make his adjustment anyway. I think we can find—I know I can—I can find task after task after task for an Urban Conservation Corps.

Mr. LANDRUM. Will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be glad to.

Mr. LANDRUM. One of the things that we tried to do in drafting what is now part A of title I was to make it possible under this law to do something similar at least to what the mayor is suggesting. A careful study of the proposals to implement this legislation will show that we do hope to have a great many residential training centers where these youngsters, who are misfits, will spend at least half the time in one of these residential centers acquiring basic educational skills as well as basic vocational skills and then perhaps a half or maybe less than half in some of the conservation practices. Nevertheless, I am interested in the approach that the mayor is bringing to the problem and I hope that we may be able to work that out.

Now, while the gentleman has been good enough to yield to me, the bill itself specifies male participants. So does the mayor's state-