

ington when it better seemed to meet the needs of the people in the field to contact Washington directly. It was felt, however, that many services could be more effectively and more quickly rendered at the regional location than they could be rendered in Washington. If that were the case, and as people were assigned to the regional office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, they could within the limits of their authority obviate the necessity of the local people having to go to Washington every time they wanted to know something or to get something from the Office of Education.

I think it has in general worked out that way. We provide services in the region where such services seemed to be justified. But there is no requirement that a commissioner of education, for instance, has to go through the regional office in order to reach Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has there been blockage of communication in the past?

Dr. DEHART. We have had no inference of blockage, that kind of thing. In fact, it has been quite the contrary. The people in the field have taken advantage of the regional services. Yet they have consistently maintained the opportunity, the freedom, the privilege—call it what you will—of picking up the phone and calling the Commissioner of Education or any of the Bureau chiefs down there when they felt they could get an answer to a question that was beyond the authority of the regional office.

We have had no complaint from our six commissioners of education on that score. In fact, just the other day one of them told me that he had just picked up the phone and called somebody in the Commissioner's office in Washington and said, "We like this system, you are here when you can help us but we know we can get there as fast as the telephone and get our voice down there when we need them."

Mr. McCORMACK. So that this observation of yours is not an expression as to the difficulty of the past or the present but the expression of hope that the difficulty will not exist?

Dr. DEHART. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. There has been no real evidence of it but the possibility of it is mentioned from time to time. We feel strongly in the office that there should not be a blockage of free communication between the public and Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Dr. McCann, you indicated on page 4 that 15 of 68 proposals were endorsed by your office. Was that selection made only in view of the amount of money that was allotted, that is, were all 68 proposals good ones, or was that narrowed down because of the money?

Dr. McCANN. Not every proposal was totally appropriate to title I. For example, some were a little more appropriate under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. However, the majority of them were. In general, the boiling down of 68 to 15 is caused by the limit of the Massachusetts allotment.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Do you have any idea of how much additional funding would be necessary to finance all of the ones you consider worth while under title I?

Dr. McCANN. The total of approximately \$1 million will be necessary to finance all those 68 programs.