

A lot of people flee to the suburbs because there are no schools in the city to which they want to send their children. But there are other problems. In an inquiry which the Regional Planning Association of New York made of suburbanites in the New York region, they asked the suburbanites what things would keep them from moving into the central city. One of the chief ones, interestingly enough, was sheer dirt, for people in the New York region. Dirt ranked above the problems of schools. Another was physical safety, which also ranked above schools. So perhaps the answer to your question is yes, central cities are worth saving because there are no alternatives. But we have put our money on the wrong horses so far.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. As a matter of fact, if you are going to put additional parks in cities, additional recreational areas, one of your second big problems is to police them, is it not?

Mr. FITCH. I would say the problem is the whole supporting structure—not only the policeman, but the recreation director and the activities programs and so forth. You cannot turn mobs of kids loose in parks or other recreation facilities with no guidance or organization.

But let me suggest the absence of recreation facilities creates so many of the problems. For example, the youth gangs of New York City fight over their “turf.” What does this mean? It means that turf is scarce.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Finally, might I say on this problem of dirt, while I agree that the cities are dirty, and surprisingly, right around the Capitol in Washington it is exceedingly dirty, you could dust three times a day and at 6 o'clock it is still dirty. But I would like to say that the way suburbia is being built up, it is going to be dirty, too. The factories are moving with the people.

Mr. FITCH. Well, I would suggest that in part the dirt is an air pollution problem. It certainly is in New York. I think everything we now know about urban environment, both from the amenity and the health point of view, suggests that this is one problem we are going to have to clean up to make the city livable.

Second, I would suggest that a lot of foreign cities, Moscow, for example, where things are as neat as a pin, have solved this problem of dirt in cities. They have shown that it is not actually necessary to be as dirty as we are.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Well, would it not be cheaper to move the poor out into smaller communities?

Mr. FITCH. Well, I think as a long-run consideration, yes. I would suggest that both political and social considerations dictate that the poor are going to have to be upgraded to middle-class basis before they will either want to move en masse or they will be acceptable en masse.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Would it not be cheaper and more reasonable, anyhow, if the Federal Government just took over the expenditures of educating and the expenses of welfare, rather than to do anything else? Take care of this problem, remove this burden completely?

Mr. FITCH. Well, I would certainly go along with the Federal Government's assuming the cost of welfare and the special costs of education. I would point out one thing that bothers me. It is epitomized by the fact that in New York City we doubled the expenditure