people. The omissions in this proposed reorganization plan unquestionably will deny to the citizenry the opportunity to be heard at public hearings, and before public board meetings.

Rather, it seems to me that what is necessary is an awareness at the District Building by the Commissioner and City Council that there is a Recreation Board under mandate by the Congress; that it is an integral part of the District government. The Recreation Board created by the Congress is not to be considered an organizational curiosity.

I can recall, not only in my tenure but in the tenure of the Chairman of the Board prior to my appointment, that vacancies would exist on the Board for many months. Failure to fill a vacancy of a citizen member denies the community 25 percent of its representation. And long delays in filling vacancies have been all too frequent.

We have at the present time under the Recreation Act, with administration vested in the Superintendent of Recreation, total responsibility for public recreation. We have witnessed in recent years a fragmentation of recreation service and responsibility. This fragmentation started with the introducton of the poverty program. It has accelerated substantially since then because many agencies find that they have collateral or peripheral interests and embark accordingly within their own range of choice rather than recognize that the Recreation Board, under public law, has the total responsibility for public recreation in the District of Columbia. We now have recreation activities which emanate from Commissioner Washington's office, the Board of Education, and from the Park Service. This year the Park Service has introduced an extensive program "Summer in the Parks." Recreation service, in the broadest context, is, basically and fundamentally, a responsibility of the Recreation Board. To me it seems that these agencies are overzealous. If the agencies have public funds, as they do, the community will receive the best recreation service and the greatest mileage out of the funds only when channeled through the Recreation Board. This is the only way in which an agency can successfully establish policy, administer service, and develop programs for the people of the District of Columbia. This, I might add, is a charge given the Recreation Board by congressional mandate—to render service in the city of Washington, a municipality and as the Nation's Capital.

One other matter which has not come to your attention this morning: years ago, Congress at the initiative of Senator Claiborne Pell and Congressmen Frank Thompson and William Widnall introduced on the floor an amendment to the National Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, a provision designating the Recreation Board as the State Arts Agency for the District of Columbia. The Recreation Board offers and administers a substantial program in this field of endeavor.

It is interesting to note, of a very recent date, that a cultural services program which should be administered by the Recreation Board has been introduced at the District Building under the supervision of Commissioner Washington. This is another case of fragmentation—of service duplication totally outside the agency responsible therefor. If these services are desired, if funds are available as they are, it seems to make sense, at least to me, out of my experience with the Recreation Board that such services should be offered and administered by and within the appropriate agency—the Recreation