

Dr. MARLAND. I believe the Council has assumed the ongoing existence of the Teacher Corps and has accepted it as a promising new development in our whole governmental structure, and would endorse it. It does not look for alternatives.

Mr. QUIE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. How many such individuals do we need?

Dr. MARLAND. I tried to answer that this afternoon with Mr. Gibbons by projecting percentages, as nearly as I could, using Pittsburgh as the base. Whereas we have 5,000 total professional people in Pittsburgh, I would say we could use up to 1,000 such people just in Pittsburgh. We project that around the country and it could mean as many as 20 or 25 percent of our total faculties, I suppose, when we include rural areas and other deprived neighborhoods. This is an ideal.

You ask how many we can use. I think in reality we have to figure how many we can use in relation to the number we can adequately train in our training institutions and absorb. Our rate that we think we can absorb effectively in Pittsburgh is about 50 a year.

Mr. QUIE. Do you think it would be preferable if all the training were to be done by the Teacher Corps?

Dr. MARLAND. I somehow detect a feeling in the committee, and if I could understand it, it would help me to answer the questions better, that there seems to be a more finite attachment of training to the Teacher Corps and making a different kind of person in more ways than I perceive it.

This is specialized training in something that we are only now becoming sophisticated enough to know what his task is. I don't look at it as something so different. We have been training specialized people for a long time in education, art teachers, music teachers, teachers of the deaf, teachers of the gifted, and so on. This is just another category only on an intensive, heavily supported basis to fill a void of specialized people.

I think your question implies that there are other ways to do this, but this is the best way I know of so far. That is to concentrate the university and a practical school system, to team them up, and say, "Train these people. Here is the dough." That is because they have a job to do that is different, a job that requires specialized training, a job that has attracted to it very unique people who don't want to just be an ordinary teacher of history or third grade. They want to be a teacher of the poor. To this degree, it is special, it is different. But I don't see it as exalting them in any way.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to go back and give you my feelings on what bothers me. We had the same thing occur a long time ago when we realized that we had very few guidance counselors and there was a desperate need for them. Then we changed the law to provide that they would be working in the lower grades. We accomplished substantial improvement with the Federal help and willingness in the bipartisan support to provide that help.

I think that same feeling is for Federal assistance and training of people who can especially reach culturally and socially deprived. But we didn't set up a guidance counseling corps.