

This, to me, is clearly and specifically an education program, not an Office of Economic Opportunity program. It is very hard to separate them and tell where one begins and the other ends. It would puzzle me as to why grades 1, 2, and 3 aren't fundamental to the total spirit of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I.

It happens that we in Pittsburgh have had the Headstart program in the public schools 11 months a year for 3-year-olds and 4-year-olds, moving on into the conventional kindergarten. Three- and 4-year-old classes average about 12 to 15 children present each day. This is a splendid learning environment, children coming into a loving, constructive, and helpful situation for about 2 hours a day for 2 years.

Then to put them into a 40-pupil kindergarten with the tensions and pressures of a schoolhouse where very limited facilities are at hand for them, the class size, the environment for learning suddenly changing, we can't be surprised if they begin to lose some of the advantages they gained in the small and intimate situation, and so on, through grades 1, 2, and 3.

I urge favorable attention to what is now called Followthrough, but I would urge that it be part of education.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Let me ask another question with respect to recommendation No. 5 of your January 1967 report, in which you express concern about the apparent difficulty in disseminating the results of the local experience of title I programs around the country.

Wouldn't title IV, the research title, offer some opportunity for doing a more effective job in that? It apparently hasn't been very effective in that respect.

Dr. MARLAND. I think it will. I think you will also get some effect on that through title V, with the State departments of education making themselves felt. Again, I think we are talking about a function of time.

The regional laboratories are hardly in business now, and I think that it is too early to expect this dissemination to have flowed vigorously from that. I think it will.

Mr. KIRST. Congressman, if I may respond to that, I think one of the findings our consultants come back with is that dissemination is especially effective if it is person to person.

If some of these school people from other areas of the country could move about and actually see projects that are very good, it would have, we think, maybe more impact than dissemination of printed literature which talks in generalities but does not provide a consultant who comes in and analyzes the specific local situation.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I noticed in your general observations, Mr. Marland, if I am not incorrect, you address yourself to two principal problems: One is the problem of producing more teachers with special capabilities for teaching the disadvantaged, and we have been discussing that, Mrs. Green's observations, my observations, and your observations.

The other problem, major problem, that you address yourself to is the importance of money for facilities. Is it possible for us really to make any significant headway—and on this one point, I think Mrs. Green and I are in full agreement; that the Teacher Corps program, whatever it is, is modest—will we make significant headway in these two problems without full funding of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act?