makes a significant contribution to recreation resources available to the District citizen. Moreover, figures are not readily available to indicate for these cities the magnitude of existing problems or the scale of the capital development programs devoted to recreation facilities.

In sum, I think the recreation problems of the District—as of any city—will need to be evaluated in its own terms, and decisions respecting allocation of available resources to recreation will have to be made in the light of overall local needs and priorities.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Deputy Director.

NATIONAL RECREATION & PARK ASSOCIATION

FROM THE PARK AND RECREATION YEARBOOK 1965—EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1965

Cities [1]	Population	Program budget	Per capita expenditure
1. Cincinnati, Ohio	500,000	$1,307,850	$2.61
2. Cleveland, Ohio (Board of Education)	858,000	2,691,993	3.13
3. Milwaukee, Wis. (Board of Education)	765,000	2,713,837	3.58
4. Philadelphia, Pa	2,200,000	11,384,680	5.15
5. New Orleans, La	900,000	900,000	1.00
6. Columbus, Ohio	750,000	3,208,100	4.27
7. Pasadena, Calif	200,000	429,345	2.12
8. Jersey City, N.J	276,101	1,350,000	4.87
9. Providence, R.I	191,000	742,368	3.88
District of Columbia	800,000	[2] 3,309,000	4.14

[1] Major cities of 200,000 and up with separate recreation departments.
[2] 1965 actual.

Mr. SEGAL. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might just comment on this point and give some rationalization or reason for the recommendation that the present budget needs to be at least tripled in light of the urgent needs that have developed and have existed in the District.

One case in point is that we found in our investigation that the best equipped recreation center in the city was the Chevy Chase Community Center. Now, that building has been condemned, so to speak, and to rebuild it is going to cost $920,000—at least $920,000. Our contention is that this type of recreation center is needed in all the areas of the city, especially the poverty and low-income areas, and if you were to build, for example, just seven of these centers, it would take up the entire budget, the entire present budget that the Recreation Department has. And when you add to it the need for upgrading and improving the facilities, the need for having a more imaginative and more innovated program, you could see why we recommend this figure.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any questions, Mr. Reuss?

Mr. REUSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To me, this is clearly an excellent reorganization plan. I am glad it is before us. When the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967, the basic reorganization, was before us last year, there were some 432 separate functions that were transferred under that plan. Had you subdivided them into 432 reorganization plans, which happily you did not do, you could have immobilized the Congress for years to come.

I note that there was a great deal that was not accomplished by Reorganization Plan No. 3. Some of the things that should have been done are now being done under Reorganization Plans 3 and 4 of 1968, but I notice that there are all kinds of functions still left lying around in the District of Columbia which are not under the Mayor-Commis-