Mr. THOMAS. The Board has the responsibility to submit the budgetary request.

Mr. BLATNIK. Directly to the Congress?

Mr. THOMAS. No; it goes by way of the Budget Bureau and then to the Congress by way of the city Budget Office. The Bureau of the Budget and the City Council also have a say-so in its ultimate form, because the Mayor's office and the City Council can eliminate budgetary items from the recommendations. So that the Board's budget, by the time it is ultimately approved, is unrecognizable as far as the original requests are concerned after it runs the gauntlet of the City Council, the Bureau of the Budget, and the proper Appropriations Subcommittees of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Hughes, would you have any comment to make? I am particularly interested in why the budget is so greatly inadequate.

Mr. HUGHES. I think, first, Mr. Chairman, on the procedure under the plan, the recreation budget would become a part of the budget of the District of Columbia and would follow the same channels as the District of Columbia budget follows as a whole and would——

Mr. BLATNIK. Part of the total budget which is then presented to the District of Columbia Committee.

Mr. HUGHES. That would be the case under the plan. With respect to budget levels, I am not familiar in detail with who has taken what from the recreational budget of the District, but I think at least a substantial part of the problem is the fact that the Recreation Board as a separate entity and one of many separate entities competing, in a sense, for District of Columbia funds has found it difficult to make its case fully, perhaps even in the District government. I don't think the Bureau of the Budget should be exonerated from all responsibility in this. As Mr. Thomas has pointed out, the Board has had a series of hurdles, in effect, to jump in making its budget requests and missing any one of the hurdles is a fairly painful process in a budgetary sense.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Hughes, would you have any figures, or could you get them later on for the record if they are not available at this time, on the recreation budget for other cities of comparable size?

Mr. HUGHES. We will try. I don't have any with me, Mr. Chairman. We will try and provide some figures for the record.

(The following information was subsequently submitted:)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1968.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLATNIK: During the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1968, the question was raised as to how recreation expenditures in the District of Columbia compared with recreation expenditures in other large cities. The National Recreation & Park Association has supplied us with figures on program budgets of larger municipalities which have separate recreation departments. These figures, to the extent that they are actually comparable, indicate that, on a per capita basis, the budget of the District of Columbia Board of Recreation is slightly above average. The table showing this relationship is enclosed.

However, these figures do not really tell us very much, it seems to me. Most cities not only supply recreation programs of their own through a variety of municipal agencies, but very frequently county and State programs represent significant inputs into the municipal recreation package. The District is city, county, and State rolled into one. On the other hand, the National Park Service