



# REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

★ RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ★ BAPTIST PRINCIPLES  
★ PUBLIC AFFAIRS

A bulletin published by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, Washington, D. C.

Vol. 19, No. 1

Jan.-Feb., 1964

## Will President Ask Aid To Church Schools?

By W. Barry Garrett  
Baptist Press Staff Writer

Washington — Rumblings that President Johnson will recommend to Congress some form of federal aid to parochial schools continue to be heard around the Nation's Capital.

However, a White House aide told Baptist Press that newspaper stories to that effect "are full of hot air" because "we have not yet decided what we are going to recommend to Congress." He did say, however, that the discussions are now underway and that the Administration hopes to deliver its education-poverty message to Congress sometime in February.

The Washington Post reported that meetings "held without fanfare" have included the National Catholic Educational Association, the National Education Association and the

U. S. Office of Education. The White House aide said that "nothing is known around the White House about any such meetings."

This does not mean, however, that discussions did not take place between persons within each of these groups and that an informal meeting of minds may not have been achieved.

In the absence of formal proposals by President Johnson it cannot be reported precisely at the time of this writing whether or not and in what ways parochial schools may be considered in education-poverty programs. On the other hand, many of the signs of the times can be discerned, the political facts of life can be considered, and efforts can be made to put the jig-saw puzzle together.

President Johnson's Budget Message to Congress contained a section on "Education" and another on "Health, Labor and Welfare." These two sections contain many areas of overlapping and frequently "education" is found under the category of "welfare" to persons. It has been comparatively easy to pass welfare legislation and difficult to pass education aid. Consequently the provision for medical and dental schools passed last year was considered a public health measure. Mental health and mental retardation programs will be similarly considered, rather than as education.

Now, President Johnson has come up with a massive attack on "poverty." It is to be expected that measures to provide certain types of education.

(See, CHURCH SCHOOLS, page 6)

## President Outlines Education Goals In Budget Message

(The following is the "Education" portion of President Johnson's Budget Message to Congress delivered on January 22. It is anticipated that he will deliver his "education-poverty" message sometime in February, spelling out the specifics of the outline below.)

Education is essential to preserving our democratic society and advancing our national economy. Every individual should have the opportunity to develop his abilities to the fullest, particularly in an age of increasing technology and rapidly growing demand for the highly

trained. This can be achieved only through concerted and cooperative efforts by private individuals and organizations and by all levels of government. The Federal Government

can best play its part through programs designed to meet selected, critical needs and to stimulate improvements throughout our educational system.

The 1965 budget provides for an increase of \$339 million in expenditures for education programs. Most of this increase is for measures recommended last year which were recently enacted and for pending measures on which the Congress has not yet completed consideration. Other increases are provided for expanding existing programs, mainly those of

(See, EDUCATION GOALS, page 5)

### DON'T MISS THESE!

Read C. Emanuel Carlson's analysis of "The Growing Edge of Church-State Relations in Education" beginning on page 2. Also a summary of the new Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is found on page 7.

s snag,  
d other  
te work  
rich the  
hey are  
cal dia-  
r some  
"prose-  
coun-

Bishop  
icle 25  
Spain  
schools  
an law  
t with

Spain  
exist—  
Span-  
law to

tion is  
an ex-  
'public  
s com-  
-priest  
arsive"  
" may

Capital

# Growing Edge Of Church-State Relations In Education

By C. Emanuel Carlson

"The first session of the 88th Congress will have the greatest record in the field of education in the history of the nation." Such was Rep. Carl Albert's enthusiasm as he viewed the higher education bill which became law in December of 1963.

In attaching his signature to the bill President Johnson congratulated both the House and the Senate and said, "This Congress is well on its way to doing more for education than any since the Land Grant College Act that was passed 100 years ago." Logan Wilson, president of the American Council of Education, spoke of it as "a landmark in the history of American education."

The basis for this enthusiastic appraisal is chiefly a law (P. L. No. 88-204) which will distribute an initial \$1.2 billion as grants and loans to public and private institutions for the construction of academic facilities for teaching science, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, and for libraries. It will be noted that these categories are broad enough to include any and all of the accredited schools that may wish to establish their eligibility.

## Unclear Distinctions in Education

The American nation has never achieved the same clear distinctions between public and private in higher education that we have in elementary and secondary education. Yet the new law does represent an important new development in the church-state patterns.

In October 1962, the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs sponsored a three day conference on church-state relations in higher education. Many of the issues involved were faced in that conference by church leaders and schoolmen who studied the field. The participants found the issues to be numerous and complex, but made significant progress in their analysis. This amount of deliberation was a beginning only. Among the churches and the educational institutions of the country even this amount of attention has rarely been given. The discerning of the long run effects and the making

of fundamental church policies remain a matter of urgent need.

## I. THE MAKING OF A NATIONAL POLICY

The article by Christian K. Arnold (*Saturday Review*, January 18, 1964) entitled "Higher Education: Fourth Branch of Government?" does include a question mark. However, much recent material regarding the universities would show that these schools have already outgrown their church ancestry and are now agencies of public policy. In fact, many military research projects rating "top secret" classification are now based in the universities, and countless contracts, projects, and services make these institutions vitally tied into the whole economic and political structure. The great majority of Americans undoubtedly favor the national goals that are involved in this growth. Perhaps this must also be the line of development in the liberal arts colleges?

The higher education legislation represents an overwhelming consensus that the American nation needs to provide more facilities and enlarged college opportunities for the rising tides of American youth. Post-war birthrates, the increasing technology and science, the declining unskilled labor market, the cold war, the new thrust on research and development—these and other factors brought the nation to the conclusion that the tax collecting powers of the federal government must undergird higher education in a new and larger way.

## The Effect on The Churches

Now what does this, do to the churches?

The significance of the new law lies in the enactment of a policy. The policy is simply this: the government will develop and support the colleges that exist rather than try to encourage the building of new institutions to meet the new needs. In following this policy for higher education the government has decided to ignore the differences between the public, the private, or the church in-

stitutions. The law requires that the institution be a going concern to be eligible. It is, therefore, no help in developing new schools. Politically viewed this approach is probably the only one possible because the existing institutions oppose new ones as long as the old ones lack funds.

## Shift From Liberal Arts?

Some of the future is already clearly legible. The government now offers one-third of the funds for needed building projects in the five subject fields listed above. Clearly, this one-third will commandeer the other two-thirds toward a decision to build for science, for engineering, for mathematics, for foreign languages, or libraries. The law was designed to assist in the expansion of college facilities, but it will also influence heavily the direction of this expansion regardless of whether the schools claim a public orientation or a set of church objectives.

The direction thus set for building expansion requires the same direction for student recruiting and for faculty enlargement. Many old science buildings may be converted into general classroom space. Yet, within a decade American higher education will certainly feel the shift from the emphasis on the liberal arts and the humanities, which has in the past marked the church contribution to the field, to the more functional applied sciences. It is this latter emphasis on the public manpower policy which gave the basis for the new law. A time of expansion is envisioned by the law, but it is also a shift in the emphasis.

## Shift From Church-Relatedness?

The federal government will now help with the buildings, and the \$1.2 billion is only a beginning. However, the institutions must still find the funds for operating the enlarged programs. Few schools can collect in tuition fees more than one-half the cost of instruction. This means that the expansion of facilities requires more operating money from their usual sources. The church schools

(Continued on page 3)

must therefore turn to their supporters for larger current budgets so as to enlarge their contribution to public policy and to national needs. Will church colleges be asking for more money with which to do what is less relevant to the churches? Could it be that the government's share in the construction of facilities will loosen up funds from other sources with which to operate the new facilities?

Probably not. The coming of an enlarged sector of public interest into the school's program may well do two things. First, it could dry up church and private support because the people come to feel less personally responsible. Secondly, the institution's leadership may feel increasingly that the current or operating costs are also appropriately tax-supported. Sooner or later even the "church-related" schools could easily shift in the direction of private institutions dedicated to the public and the national needs. "Church-relatedness" is likely to be a declining relationship, even below its present customary level.

#### What of The Future?

The new law sets up the framework and establishes the channels for the flow of public money for college facilities. In the future we may expect Congress to vote more and larger appropriations for the purposes set up by this law. We may also expect the Congress to broaden the purposes for which grants are made. How soon the operating budgets of the colleges will benefit, either by grants or by a system of scholarships, cannot be predicted. Nevertheless, an important policy has become law. The nation's resources will help the existing institutions meet the nation's need for more and better higher education. The churches and their schools are now free to make their choices on programs and relationships.

### II. THE COLLEGES AND DISCRIMINATION

Those who try to discern the workings of the new law are likely to ask, does this open the door to preferential treatment or to discrimination?

Under the law each state is invited to set up a commission that represents both the public and private institutions. This commission will

have the task of surveying needs and of establishing priorities. Federal funds are available for the administrative costs involved, thereby avoiding the delays necessary to obtain state legislation and also avoiding the barriers put into the state constitutions regarding the use of public funds for private institutions. At the present time the quasi-public and quasi-private status of the state commissions seems to project an agency which is neither fish nor fowl, and yet is both. Presumably the functions of the state commissions are designed to avoid the danger of an undue or an improper participation by the federal administration, and accordingly, also to avoid charges of preferential actions.

#### The Question Not Yet Faced

The appropriateness of discrimination in the institutions built in part by public funds has not yet been faced in connection with the new education laws. Racial discrimination has been outlawed already in programs of housing where public funds are involved. That such policies must ultimately be applied also in colleges using public money seems obvious. The questions about religious discrimination, however, seem to be most relevant.

Church and civic leaders, as well as judges on Supreme Court benches, will undoubtedly be agreed that the public dollar must be accompanied by public policy. The principles of public access to public facilities will surely apply. So also the principles of non-discrimination on the basis of religion or other criteria except academic competence for the program must be effective.

Admission policies, selection of teachers, required chapel attendance, required religion courses, selective curricular offerings, and even the balance of philosophic interpretations must be subject to scrutiny from the viewpoint of the equal rights of all. Such policies are abundantly valid for public higher education, but are they valid also for church programs? Do churches still want colleges even if they must hire the properly qualified teacher regardless of whether he is Baptist, Catholic, or Moslem? Do they want colleges even though admissions and graduation policies should need to be

as purely academic as they are at a state university?

### III. THE CHURCHES SEEK A WAY TO THE FUTURE

These and many related questions can be helpful toward careful analysis of the churches' role in higher education. Many schools have long justified their programs on the basis of contributions to community needs and to the common good. Do such rationales satisfy the churches as the public funds come to undergird the effort?

What, then, can be done toward assurance that churches are proceeding deliberately toward well conceived goals in higher education? What are the goals and how can they best be reached?

#### Re-Examination of Christian Education

The initial and primary responsibility falls on the Board of Trustees. Each Board of a church-related college or university may now need to convert itself into a study seminar on the Christian witness through the college and the university. In this effort they will need to re-think, now in the modern context, the questions about making the gospel meaningful in a particular culture and in specific social situations. The expression of Christian faith through science, technology and research needs to be analyzed, but so also its relevance to philosophy, history, literature and the arts. Perhaps this is the challenge needed for a renewal of the Christian witness in the intellectual arenas.

This century has been a period of rapid social change. These changes have now come to bear on the institutions of education, at all levels. Undoubtedly the institutional patterns of the future will be different from those developed in the 19th century. Can freedom be conserved in these times of change? Can the principles of church-state relations which have made the free consciences and the free churches possible be conserved in the midst of the changes?

### IV. DOWNWARD EXTENSION OF THE POLICY

An unavoidable question for the American people and for the Con-

(Continued on next page)

gress is this: Do the same principles apply in elementary and in secondary education as in higher education? Many in higher education have argued that there is a difference between the public interest in the college programs and the public interest in the elementary or the secondary schools. So far the arguments have lacked convincing quality because of the sectarian ownership, control, and purposes current in many church colleges. There are a number of colleges that are fully as sectarian as any parochial elementary school. Perchance if these colleges become simply private institutions committed to public service the arguments will become more convincing for a distinction between the levels of education?

#### A Shift In The Political Factor

At the level of the political, the untimely death of the Roman Catholic president, yielding the post of Chief Executive to a Protestant, has probably hastened the day of national debate on the application of these policies at the elementary and secondary levels.

In a democracy the representative principle must be expected to work. Obviously, any man of stature will have his actions fenced in by his own convictions and his own conscience, but for most people this allows much freedom and flexibility for political policy.

The political leader must, by the nature of the process, seek to enlist his opposition. If he is a man of wealth he needs to show his concern for the poor. If he is a Roman Catholic he must convince the non-Catholics that he stands with them on basic constitutional principles. If he is a Protestant who needs Roman Catholic support he may have to show them that he is concerned about their Roman Catholic institutions and their interests and ideas. If he is a manufacturer he may well presume that the corporation owners will support him; but he may also need some labor votes.

Such adjustments often presume upon the support of those who are nearest to the candidate's own background while seeming to be more considerate of other population groups. Politics consists in the intricate process of creating align-

ments that can work together at least for immediate goals. The time seems to be ripe for beginning some new policies on public aid to the church schools at the elementary and secondary levels.

For the public leader who tries to find some consistency in his own principles the present situation presents a necessary choice. If he insists that public funds must be used for public purposes only, then he must seek the full adjustment of the higher educational institutions to public policy. On that basis he may conclude that church work in the elementary and secondary schools is not affected by the public interest in the same manner or in the same degree as in higher education. On this reasoning he might resist public grants to lower church schools, but the price of that opposition is a commitment to the public nature of higher education.

#### Argument For Church School Aid

Several lines of emphasis are already audible. The sponsors of elementary or secondary church schools are also highly committed to their work and must be expected to see their schools as being vitally related to the public need. They see their schools as being as meritorious of tax support as are the church schools at the college level. They can well argue that the foundations for mathematics, science, languages, and academic competence generally are laid before the student reaches college.

The sponsors will also contend that the parochial schools follow the curricular requirements of the state boards of education and are less sectarian in their programming than many church colleges are.

The questions about ownership and control, about the true purposes of the institution, about selective policies for pupils and teachers, about symbolic and ceremonial life in the school—these and other related questions will be brushed aside in this discussion as they have been in the higher education debate.

#### Danger To Parochial Schools

Support for giving public funds to parochial schools is also possible from many who have doubts about the future of those schools or who are already in opposition to them.

"Give the church schools public money and follow up with public control" is the simple formula in some people's minds as the only solution to an "outmoded institution." Even many of the sponsors of church ventures into general education are looking for a way out from under the impossible burdens. Church leaders do not seem apprehensive regarding the expansion of public direction into church schools as it might well come with public aid. The parochial schools, then, may also be on their way toward becoming "public-private institutions."

#### V. IDEAS: NEW AND OLD

Clearly, enough new trends are present in the financing of general education so the churches must face afresh the questions of how to give a religious education. Some have suggested, and even the Congress of the United States has taken note of the thought, that the pupils' compulsory school week should be "shared," between church education and public education. This "shared time" idea has been favorably viewed by many Protestant and Catholic leaders as a step toward the solution of the dilemma.

Basically the same principle could be arranged in higher education by means of the "affiliated" system of schools around a university campus. Closely related is the idea of "chairs" for Biblical or religious instruction.

A time of change need not be a time of loss. It can be a time of gain if people are prepared to put enough effort and commitment into the issues.

#### Florida Prayer Case

The Florida Supreme Court upheld for the second time Bible reading and prayer in public schools. The case will again be appealed to the U. S. Supreme Court.

The case first went to the Supreme Court after a state court decision in June 1962 upholding the Bible reading law. The Supreme Court returned the case instructing the state court to reconsider in the light of the Pennsylvania and Maryland Bible reading and prayer decision of 1963. This resulted in the state court's second decision upholding the law.



## EDUCATION GOALS

(Continued from page 1)

the National Science Foundation, and for a substantially enlarged program to aid individuals who require special education and related services, particularly as part of the attack on poverty.

The new obligational authority recommended for fiscal 1965 totals \$3.1 billion, an increase of \$1.2 over 1964.

### Proposed Education Legislation

The budget includes new obligational authority of \$718 million and estimated expenditures of \$118 million in 1965 for education programs recommended last year which are still pending, and for an enlargement of the proposed aid for elementary and secondary education. These proposals would authorize Federal support for—

- Strengthening of our elementary and secondary school system through grants for teachers' salary increases and urgently needed classroom construction;

- An enlarged program providing project grants for education as a major weapon to support broad community action programs to combat poverty and to provide special educational and related services for certain groups of children—the handicapped, the illiterate, the culturally disadvantaged, slow learners, children of migrant agricultural workers, and the gifted and talented as well;

- Expansion of the National Defense Education Act fellowship program to help meet the need for highly trained professional personnel, particularly college teachers and scientists;

- Work-study and student loan insurance programs to help assure that needy students are not denied a college education;

- Programs to train new teachers and specialists required for our schools;

- Upgrading and supplementing the training of our present teachers;

- Special assistance to ease desegregation of public schools;

- Construction of public libraries and expansion of public library services in urban as well as rural areas;

- Basic adult education; and

- University extension services.

### Assistance for Elementary and Secondary Education

Expenditures for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and for defense education programs which support science, mathematics, foreign language instruction, and guidance and counselling programs are estimated at \$471 million in fiscal year 1965. The increase of \$45 million over 1964 for schools in federally impacted areas reflect an increase of 100,000 students whose parents work or reside on Federal properties, and a 5 per cent increase in the cost of instruction. As an aid to consideration of the future of this program, a thorough study will be made of the impact of Federal activities on the fiscal and economic resources of local communities.

### Assistance for Higher Education

A new program to assist in construction of classrooms, libraries and laboratories for graduate and undergraduate schools, public junior colleges, and technical institutes was authorized in Public Law 88-204, approved December 16, 1963. The budget includes a proposed supplemental appropriation to initiate this program in 1964. About \$570 million in grants and loans will be committed in 1965, with expenditures estimated at \$38 million.

New obligational authority of \$300 million will be available for college housing loans in 1965, the same as in 1964. Estimated expenditures in each of these years reflect anticipated sales to private lenders of \$50 million in Government loans previously made. Repayments on outstanding loans and increased private participation in new loans during 1965 will further reduce net expenditures by \$15 million in 1965 to an estimated \$208 million.

Under the National Defense Education Act, the number of student loans is expected to increase by 45 per cent between 1963 and 1965, when an estimated 314,000 loans will be made.

### Assistance to Science Education and Basic Research

The National Science Foundation continues to perform a vital role in support of science education and fundamental research. In keeping with proposals made a year ago as part of the Administration's education program, substantial increases are again recommended in the scope of the programs of the Foundation to develop additional academic institutions of scientific excellence and to strengthen science education.

The need for highly trained manpower for engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences—to which these programs would contribute significantly—was underscored by the President's Science Advisory Committee last year. Over 10,000 fellowships will be granted in 1965, an increase of nearly 80 per cent over 1964. Increases are also provided in 1965 for the support of basic research, including funds to proceed with major procurement of Project Mohole. Total new obligational authority for the Foundation will rise from \$353 million in 1964 to \$488 million in 1965.

### Other Aid to Education

Expenditures for vocational education programs are estimated to increase by \$54 million in 1965 to carry out the provisions of Public Law 88-210, approved December 18, 1963. The act authorizes grants to States for vocational education and construction of facilities, and provides Federal support for projects which will meet the vocational needs of youths with special handicaps to learning. The budget includes a supplemental appropriation of \$60 million in 1964 to initiate programs under the new act, and a further increase of \$89 million is recommended for 1965.

Expenditures are also estimated to increase in 1965 for (1) expanded research supported by the Office of Education to improve course materials, teaching methods, and knowledge about the processes of education; (2) increased construction of educational television facilities; and (3) expanded training of teachers for the handicapped, as authorized in Public Law 88-164.

## House Committee May Hear Prayer Argument

Washington — Hearings on proposed constitutional amendments on public school prayers and Bible readings may be held this year by the House Judiciary Committee. Rep. Emanuel Celler (R., N. Y.) is chairman of the committee.

Many religious leaders and denominational groups agreed with the Supreme Court's decisions against required religious exercises in public schools. However, members of Congress continue to receive a flood of mail asking for something to be done to overturn the decision of the Court.

As a result of this pressure 110 members of Congress (96 in the House, 14 in the Senate) have introduced 132 measures proposing constitutional amendments on religion in the public schools. The most aggressive Congressman for an amendment is Rep. Frank Becker (R., N. Y.), who has initiated a discharge petition to force the matter out of the hands of the House Judiciary Committee and bring it directly to the floor of the House. He has succeeded in getting 125 of the needed 218 signatures for the discharge.

Several civic, patriotic, political and religious groups throughout the nation have been organized to campaign for a prayer and Bible reading amendment. These groups are becoming more militant while the supporters of the Supreme Court decision are remaining relatively quiet.

In an effort to satisfy his fellow Congressmen Rep. Celler has ordered a Judiciary Committee staff study on the amendment proposals. The study will include legal questions plus historic and legal background material. It is in the final stages of preparation.

The staff study will not be a public document for the time being, but will serve as a guide for the 85 members of the House Judiciary Committee. The Committee may, however, decide later to make the document public.

The Judiciary Committee staff has indicated that some time after the study is completed Chairman Celler will call for hearings on the various proposals. The staff refused to predict how soon or when these hearings might be held.

On July 26 and August 2, 1962 the Senate Judiciary Committee, Sen. James O. Eastland (D., Miss.) chairman, conducted hearings on similar proposals to amend the Constitution to offset the effect of the Supreme Court decision in the New York Regents' prayer case. Although only a few witnesses were heard, all who wished to submit testimony in writing were allowed to do so. At present the Senate seems to be content to let the House take initiative on the prayer amendments.

In spite of the widespread agitation over religion in the schools Washington observers do not anticipate that Congress will be confronted directly on the amendment issue this year. Many Congressmen want the matter considered in a less emotional context and after further clarification of questionable points by the Supreme Court itself.

In an analysis of the drive for a school prayer constitutional amendment Roy H. Millenson of the American Jewish Committee pointed out a number of factors related to the movement. First, he said, "the issue serves as a convenient vehicle for attacks upon the Supreme Court with its obvious implications in the battle for civil rights, the campaign for the so-called 'states rights constitutional amendments' and as a source of propaganda fuel for the radical right."

Secondly, Millenson continued, "many Protestant and Catholic leaders with an enlightened view on religious practices in the public schools find themselves at odds with large numbers of their constituents who have been quite vocal in disavowing the official church positions and statements which followed the Engel, Schempp and Murray decisions."

Thirdly, "the present agitation for religious practices in the public schools by Catholics and Protestants presents a marked contrast to the Jewish position in support of the Supreme Court dicta. Professional anti-Semites are already taking advantage of this contrast and expanding upon it to their own ends. . . ."

Fourthly, "encouragement is given to flouting of the Supreme Court de-

(Continued on page 7)

## CHURCH SCHOOLS (Continued from page 1)

cational benefits for poverty and disaster areas will be included in whatever programs are recommended. It is almost certain that such programs will seek to aid state, local and private educational agencies of various sorts.

An illustration of the way this might work is a remedial reading program paid for by the federal government. Contracts could be worked out with either public or private agencies for such classes and they could be publicly administered even though the facilities of a private school were used.

Another political fact of life is that the church-state picture in the nation changed overnight with the death of President Kennedy. C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, has spelled out this factor. He says, "The untimely death of the Roman Catholic president, yielding the post of Chief Executive to a Protestant, has probably hastened the day of national debate on the ways and means of aiding the church-related elementary and secondary schools."

In brief, the reason for such an observation is that the Roman Catholic candidate needed strong Protestant support to win the election. Hence, it would be normal for a rigid stand to be taken on politics affecting separation of church and state. On the other hand, the Protestant seeking election needs strong Catholic support. It is normal for him to try to convince Roman Catholics that he is concerned for their schools and other interests.

Back to the President's Budget Message: he will seek to implement many existing programs enacted by previous administrations as well as to initiate new ones. Considerable expansion in some areas will be undertaken. Many of these programs contain a wide variety of provisions for participation by private schools or by persons connected with private schools. Although the President may favor these programs he cannot be charged with initiating them, unless he did it while he was a Senator. (BP)

# Summary Of Higher Education Facilities Act Of 1963

## Purpose

To assist the Nation's institutions of higher education to construct needed classrooms, laboratories, and libraries in order to accommodate mounting student enrollments and to meet demands for skilled technicians and for advanced graduate education.

## Title I—Grants for Construction of (Primarily Undergraduate) Academic Facilities

Matching grants are authorized for construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic facilities, with 22 percent (\$50.6 million), of the funds reserved for facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutes. This program is authorized for 5 years with appropriations of \$230 million annually authorized for the first 3 years.

Construction is limited (except in the case of public community colleges and public technical institutes) to structures, or portions thereof, especially designed for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages, or engineering, or for use as a library.

An annual amount of \$179.4 million is allotted to the States as follows: One-half on the basis of the State's relative high school enrollment and one-half on its relative college and university enrollment.

An annual amount of \$50.6 million for public community colleges and public technical institutes is allotted among the States on the basis of relative numbers of high school graduates and State allotment formulas which are based on per capita income.

State commissions, broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education including junior colleges and technical institutes, will administer State plans which determine priorities for construction projects. Only projects which, alone or with other projects, substantially expand an institution's student enrollment capacity, or in the case of a new institution of higher education result in creating ur-

gently needed enrollment capacity, will be eligible for grants.

The Federal share of a project for an institution of higher education other than a public community college or public technical institute may not exceed one-third of its development cost, while the Federal share of a project for a public community college or public technical institute shall be 40 percent of its development cost.

Matching grants for construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic facilities at private junior colleges and private technical institutes are available from the \$179.4 million annual authorization.

## Title II—Grants for Construction of Graduate Academic Facilities

Matching construction grants are authorized for the establishment or improvement of graduate schools or of cooperative graduate centers created by two or more higher education institutions. For this program, appropriations of \$25 million are authorized for the first year and \$60 million for each of the succeeding 2 years.

Matching grants are authorized to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education and to co-operate graduate center boards. There is no State allotment formula for this title, but institutions in one State may receive not more than 12½ percent of the total amount appropriated for any one year. In determining whether to approve applications for grants, the Commissioner must seek the advice of an Advisory Committee and must consider the extent to which the project would promote a wider distribution of graduate facilities. The Federal share of the cost of each project is limited to one-third of the development cost. The bill establishes an Advisory Committee to advise the Commissioner of operations of this program and action on applications for grants.

## Title III—Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities

Loans to higher education institutions are authorized for 5 years for the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of academic facilities,

with \$120 million authorized for each of the first 3 years.

No more than 12½ percent of the total funds may be used for loans to institutions in any one State in any one year.

The loans will bear an interest rate determined by the Commissioner, which cannot be less than one-quarter of 1 percent above the average annual interest rate on all Federal obligations. Currently this rate is 3½ percent. The maximum period for repayment of a loan is 50 years.

An institution applying for a loan will have to show that not less than one-fourth of the development cost of the project will be financed from non-Federal sources and that it cannot borrow from other sources on equally favorable terms.

## Exclusions

Excluded from the bill are:

1. Any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is charged to the public.
2. Any gymnasium or other facility specially designed for athletic or recreational activities, other than a course in physical education.
3. Any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship.
4. Any facility used or to be used primarily for any part of the program of a school or department of divinity.
5. Any facility used or to be used by a school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health.

## PRAYER ARGUMENT

(Continued from page 6)

cision by the public schools themselves. . .

Finally, "there is concern in some quarters that widespread public sensitivity to this religious issue could affect the pending proposals for Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. The effect of the spillover of the school prayer issue on aid to public and parochial schools cannot yet be accurately gauged, but observers here sense its presence." (BP)

## Colleges Plan Study On Education Policy

Washington — Fifty Baptist college educators voted to request a special study on the effect of federal aid to higher education on Baptist education in America.

(The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, enacted by the first session of the 88th Congress and signed by President Johnson, provides \$1.2 billion for the nation's colleges both public and private. The act provides both grants and loans for academic facilities.)

The action was taken at the close of a fellowship meeting of American Baptist and Southern Baptist college representatives at the Mayflower Hotel here. They were in Washington to attend a meeting of the Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities, with which many of the Baptist schools are affiliated.

This was the second joint meeting of the American and Southern Baptist educators. The other took place in Cleveland two or three years ago. The purpose of the meetings is for fellowship and discussion of mutual problems and issues in higher education.

Rabun L. Brantley is executive secretary of the Southern Baptist Education Commission. Robert Evan Davis is director of the Division of Christian Higher Education for the American Baptist Convention.

R. Orin Cornett, director of the Division of Higher Education of the United States Office of Education, addressed the Baptist educators. The Office of Education has conducted similar orientation seminars in other parts of the nation to help college administrators understand the new college aid bill.

The decision to ask for a study on the effects of the new program of

federal aid to colleges came after remarks by Weimer K. Hicks, president of Kalamazoo (Mich.) College, which serves an American Baptist constituency. J. Ollie Edmunds, president of Stetson University at DeLand, Fla., a Southern Baptist school, made the proposal for the study.

Hicks told the group that Kalamazoo had never accepted a dime of aid for any purpose from the federal government. But now the college board has voted to make application for federal funds. The reason that the school shifted its position, explained Hicks, is simple. "Our decision was based on the reasoning that if you can't beat them, join them," he said.

Edmunds said that Stetson University would probably be the only private school in Florida that is not making application for federal grants. However, he said, "We are going to move rapidly at Stetson to get loans" from the government. He did not indicate what the future policy of the school might be toward federal grants.

In calling for the special study Edmunds said that the findings should be made available to pastors and leading laymen in the states. "An impartial, factual study might give us opportunity to say some things collectively that we would hesitate to say individually," he said.

The Florida college president said that this study should be done by the educators themselves. He said that the conferences sponsored by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs were not representative of the views of the educators. He felt that the educators were able to express only a minority view in these conferences. (In 1962 the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs conducted a conference on church-state problems in higher education. Baptist leaders in the nation were invited, including the college presidents. Many of them were present and participated in the conference.)

"I would hate for us to stand by and see a great procession for education move by and then for us to say that we won the battle for a principle (separation of church and

state) but lost it for education," Edmunds said.

The request for the study of federal funds and Baptist education was referred to the Southern Baptist Education Commission and the Division of Christian Higher Education of the American Baptist Convention. Indications were that the study would be undertaken immediately.

Cornett expressed the opinion that a substantial amount of the federal funds would go to private colleges. He reported that one state at least was considering dividing its allotment 60 per cent to private and 40 per cent to public schools. The reason, he explained, is that this would save the state the problem of building more public colleges in certain areas.

During the meeting the view was expressed that the pattern of policy on Baptist schools and federal funds would be uneven and changing. Some state Baptist bodies may allow their colleges to accept federal funds while others may refuse. It was pointed out that American Baptist colleges would be freer in this respect because most of them are independent and loosely related to the denomination. Most Southern Baptist colleges are owned directly by the Baptist state conventions. (BP)

Bulk Rate  
U. S. Postage  
PAID  
Washington, D. C.  
Permit No. 41853

### REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

Published 10 months during the year  
by Baptist Joint Committee on  
Public Affairs

Washington, D. C., 20009

Subscription—\$1.00 per year

C. Emanuel Carlson, exec. director  
W. Barry Garrett, assoc. dir., editor