

step away from the Magna Carta. I would hope we have made some progress since then. I would like to suggest that perhaps if this proposal had been initiated through the regular legislative process, rather than coming in as a reorganization plan from the administrative branch of the Government, the procedure by which it could have been done in the former way would have allowed us to make a simple amendment to incorporate the recommendations made by Mr. Thomas. As it is now, we must accept the plan as it is, as the administration prepared it, or veto it in the reverse legislative process by which the reorganization plans are presented. If accepted, we freeze into the law this idea that we have set this up with the Commissioner in control of the regulation and rulemaking authority without an advisory council provision written into the law. And I am not sure that that is altogether good. I think it may be better from the standpoint of administration, but I am not sure it is better from the standpoint of representation of the interested parties in the community.

Now, if I may, I would like to ask just one other question. Mr. Thomas suggested that this would assist in the improvement of the budget allowed for recreation in the community, and this has been the implication of this whole reorganization plan.

How will this assure the provision of more funds for recreation in the city of Washington?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Brown, when I wrote that it was with the thought that the Mayor's office, with the prestige that it carries and knowing that the Mayor's office is interested, vitally interested in recreation, that that office would, with its prestige in support of recreation budgets, carry great influence in helping to get the budget through the various processes that we touched upon earlier; and it was for that reason that I mentioned that. It was merely because of the prestige and the vantage point of the Mayor's office that I felt that rather than as now—of course, the Board does support the budget but the Board does not necessarily have the all-out support that would initiate and/or originate in the Mayor's office.

Commissioner WASHINGTON. I would like to react to that just for moment, too, Mr. Brown.

I do not think that the reorganization itself, per se, has any relevance to additional funds. I think there is a recast of the function of a department, as I see it, and as I have read the report of the Citizens Task Force which suggested that there is something inherently wrong there—I think that the recast of the functioning of the department into the whole delinquency area, the whole cultural enrichment area, the entire youth promotion area, plus the development of what we are now going into—of a programmatic budget, that is, a budget based on programs, will indeed cause this budget to go beyond what it is now. I think that the qualifying for certain programs in the delinquency area (some that HEW, for instance, sponsors) would bring additional funds in here. It is not that this has not been done. It is just that a breakdown of this program into programmatic areas seems to me to be imminent, and it seems to me that we should do it. In doing this, it puts you in a position to compete for foundation funds, as well as other Federal funds based on the recast of a recreation program that goes beyond only recreation and gets into the prevention of delinquency.