

ing the categorical aid here to mean aid to the various subject disciplines.

We favor the retention of categorical aid largely on the basis of the experience that the schools have had with it. We are impressed with how much it has achieved for teachers of mathematics and science over the past decade and in the field of the humanities also the foreign languages, where Mr. Brademas was a great supporter of aid in that direction.

In these subjects it has had almost a decade to operate, that is since 1958 and the passage of the first NDEA legislation.

In the case of English, aid to the subject matter discipline has just begun to make its impact. The provision that included English within the NDEA came only about 3 years ago and up to the present NDEA institutes have reached only approximately 1,500 teachers of English and reading, which is a very small proportion indeed of the tremendous numbers we have.

It has, however, resulted in a very fruitful collaboration between the teachers of English in the colleges and universities, the so-called subject-matter people, and the schoolteachers. The NDEA institutes were, I think, a liberal education for both sides in many, many instances.

So far as the title III provisions are concerned, first of all, there has been a tremendous increase in the number of subject matter supervisors in State departments of education. This has occurred all the way up the line.

I believe when the NDEA was first begun there were only four foreign language supervisors in any of the State departments of education. I believe now all but one or two States have them. When NDEA first began from the point of view of the English field there were only 10 supervisors of English in State departments of education.

Now all 50 States are covered; there are 74 supervisors in all.

These serve, I should like to make the point, these serve as a valuable link in communications between the schools and the State department. The State department has its channels of communications so that national associations can use them as a communications link and, on the other hand, they serve also as a link between the State departments of education and hence the schools and the U.S. Office of Education.

We also see a danger and something of an irony in the proposal to cut matching funds in title III to reduce support for the purchase of equipment.

Certainly as far as the teaching of English is concerned, recordings, tapes, films, overhead projectors, all manner of materials have a potential that I think we are just beginning to realize and the evidence from the operation of title III so far, on the whole, has been that money has been wisely used, primarily because it was money that matched local funds.

Another point here, that is that classrooms and school libraries are still woefully short on what might be considered an adequate supply of books and throughout the country title III has been used very wisely for the building up of school libraries.