Mr. HUGHES. No, but it reviews it and may modify it.

Mr. ERLENBORN. They may refuse to accept a particular line item or something like that.

Mr. HUGHES. Or change it.

Mr. ERLENBORN. But why are they not in on the original planning? Why do you not have this Council, as a group broadly representative of the residents of the District, in on the planning for the recreation program? Why are you concentrating this all in one man?

Mr. HUGHES. Well, I think the normal process of administration is to provide—I think the Federal Government is perhaps a parallel situation—to provide within an executive entity for the initiation of proposals and for their review, modification or investigation by a legislative or legislative-like body. This is the pattern for the preparation of the budget as it is now established in the District. Of course, the legislative body, in this case the Council, can initiate also.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mrs. Stern had her hand up before.

Mrs. Stern, you are recognized.

Mrs. STERN. At one point I sat down to find out what the budget-making process really was, and I find 45 places where the budget could be cut from the time it left the desk——

Mr. BLATNIK. How many?

Mrs. STERN. Forty-five. I am sorry I did not bring——

Mr. BLATNIK. That really is an obstacle course; is it not?

Mrs. STERN. But from the time it left the desk of the man who was requesting the item until it got back, usually cut out. I just think that this would clean up this cutting system and that you would have a more direct way of funding programs. This is, I think, the whole point of putting it under the Mayor. He may well designate the Council as his advisory board as opposed to the Board that Mr. Thomas has suggested or Mr. Segal has suggested, but the problem is money. Hopefully, this will be an effort——

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes; in addition to funding, we understand the point you make, but what Mr. Erlenborn is pointing out, and I am too, is, Do you have a broad enough representation, both laterally and in depth, of the community to do the actual planning to meet the real needs on an equitable basis regardless with the funding that will be made available? I believe that is the issue; is it not, Mr. Erlenborn?

Mr. ERLENBORN. It is, plus the fact that now you have a Recreation Board that by law must hold public hearings. It has to have its meetings at stated times and places and all meetings are open to the public and the public can participate, I presume, the public can at least act as observers of what the plans are, when they are being formulated. Now all of this authority will be given to the Mayor-Commissioner who is not required by law to hold any public hearings. None of this planning will be done with the advisory help of the public or with public scrutiny unless the Mayor wishes to do so and unless the Mayor appoints an advisory committee who by law will not be required to hold public hearings.

I just think that though the intentions are good, and it may work out in practice, we should be aware of the fact that we are removing from the public domain the power to establish the plans and programs for recreation in the District and will not be required by law to allow the public to participate or even observe this planning process. And it just is curious to me that no part of this authority is given to the