

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

APRIL 1965



U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

HEW Affects Everyone In Nation

In one way or another, directly or indirectly, the work of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare touches the daily life of nearly every man, woman and child in the nation. The mere list of agencies, functions, programs and services of HEW would fill more space than is available for this brief article.

There are 10 major divisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under these a large number of bureaus carry out a wide variety of services.

Public Health Service

This agency is dedicated to safeguarding the nation's health. It assists the states in the control of epidemics, the sanitation of milk and water supplies, and the control of communicable diseases. It is responsible for foreign and interstate quarantine, medical and hospital care for certain beneficiaries, the licensing of serums, vaccines and other biological products. It administers the federal programs for the construction of hospitals and related facilities, and of sewerage-treatment works. Many other services are provided by this agency.

Welfare Administration

The Welfare Administration is concerned with research, training, financial assistance, and social service programs to promote the welfare of children, the aging, families and individuals. It handles many U. S. responsibilities in international welfare work.



Anthony J. Celebrezze
Secretary of HEW

Office of Education

Congress established the Office of Education in 1867. Its major functions include research, dissemination of information, and the promotion of education throughout the country. The office provides a wide range of services, both advisory and consultative, to state and local school officials, to the administrative and professional staffs of colleges, universities and libraries, to educational and general organizations, to representatives of foreign countries, and to students of education. This office administers much of the educational legislation passed by Congress.

Food and Drug Administration

The Food and Drug Administration safeguards the public by enforcing federal laws designed to assure the purity, safety, and truthful labeling of foods, drugs, and cosmetics moving in interstate commerce or imported into the country. Food and drug inspectors are constantly on the alert to make sure that no injurious items reach customers. By enforcing federal laws on impure or mislabeled articles, the Food and Drug Administration protects ethical producers.

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration cooperates with the states in preparing for and restoring to useful employment disabled men and women who have job handicaps resulting from illness, accident, or other causes. The handicapping condition may be either physical or mental. The states operate the programs, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration establishes standards for state operations, gives technical assistance to the states, and certifies federal grants to the states.

Four Other Divisions

Four institutions complete the agencies of HEW. St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D. C. is the government hospital for mental illness. Howard University in Washington, D. C., originally for Negro students, now serves all races and creeds. The American Printing House for the Blind, Louisville, Ky., receives substantial support from the federal government. Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C., is the only institution in the world offering advanced education for deaf students.

The above 10 divisions include the following and many more: Bureau of Medical Services, Bureau of State Services, National Institutes of Health, National Library of Medicine, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Bureau of Family Services, Children's Bureau, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, Bureau of Biological and Physical Sciences, Bureau of Enforcement, Bureau of Field Administration, Bureau of Program Planning and Appraisal, etc. . . .

Church-State Relations

The programs encompassed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are so comprehensive that inevitably there is overlapping with those of the churches and church agencies. The church-state problems arise from the programs of cooperation between church and governmental agencies, the use that governmental agencies make of church agencies for public purposes, and the use that church agencies make of government for religious purposes.

Both the function of government and the services offered by church agencies have expanded beyond prediction in an earlier day. New, creative, dynamic approaches to church-state relations are called for during this latter half of the twentieth century.

An adequate understanding of and approach to the church-state problems involved in this one governmental department would require the services of a staff of researchers, analysts and creative thinkers. These would have to be backed up by a staff of information officers, public relations personnel, and correlation directors.

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL—a bulletin published 10 months during the year by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, 1628—16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. A purpose of the bulletin is to set forth information and interpretation about public affairs that are relevant to Baptist principles.

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs is a denominational agency maintained by the American Baptist Convention, Baptist Federation of Canada, Baptist General Conference, National Baptist Convention, National Baptist Convention, Inc., North American Baptist General Conference, Seventh Day Baptist General Conference, and the Southern Baptist Convention.

Executive Staff of the Committee: C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director; W. Barry Garrett, associate director for information services and editor of Report From The Capital; and James M. Sapp, associate director for correlation services.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Individual subscription, \$1.50 per year; Club rate for 10 or more, \$1.00 each per year; Bulk distribution of 10 or more to a single address, \$.75 each per year. Write for further information about Club and Bulk distribution plans.

APRIL 1965—Volume 20, Number 4



Washington Observations

News — Views — Trends

March 26, 1965



PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SCHOOL AID BILL passed the House of Representatives virtually as reported out of the Education and Labor Committee. The bill provides for \$1.3 billion for help to the nation's needy school children and impacted school districts.

THE NEXT MOVE IS UP TO THE SENATE. Although hearings were conducted simultaneously with the House hearings on the education bill, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has waited for House action. Earlier education bills have passed the Senate but bogged down in the House. Prediction: the Senate will approve the House version of the school bill with minor amendments to show senatorial independence. Compromises will be easy to reach in joint conference committee.

OPPONENTS OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION fought furiously but without success to raise the church-state issue in the Administration's school bill. While this was being done the Catholic and Protestant groups were working quietly for education principles that would be constitutional and also good public policy.

THE U. S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, traditional foe of federal aid to education, in a last minute warning to its members and in a letter to every member of the House of Representatives frantically tried to inject the religious issue. It charged that the new bill would provide textbooks, etc. to private and parochial schools.

THE OTHER SIDE is seen in the House Education and Labor Committee's report on the school bill. While private school pupils are eligible for certain benefits, "no provision of the bill authorizes any grant for providing any service to a private institution." All grants, services and facilities will be under the ownership, programs and administration of public agencies. If parochial school children benefit, it will be through public agencies.

WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF CATHOLIC-PROTESTANT RELATIONS IN SPAIN? During the recent Week of Prayer for Unity in Madrid the two faiths joined for the first time in public for daily services. Priests and pastors from both led the daily services together in a Protestant church three days and in a Catholic church three days.

MSGR. MORCILLO, ARCHBISHOP OF MADRID, on the last day of the united meetings took the chair at a public meeting and led a prayer of repentance asking God for forgiveness for the wrongs done to "the separated brethren." It looks like the reforms advanced by Vatican Council II are being felt even in Spain.

CERTAIN RELIGIOUS PEOPLE HAVE BEEN KEPT OUT OF CIVIL SERVICE because of requirements to sign a statement that they would be willing to work any day of the year. Rep. Jonathan B. Bingham (D., N. Y.) has offered a bill to provide that persons who could not work on a particular day because of religious reasons be allowed to work on another day.

Basic Information Toward An Understanding of The Legislative Process

Most Americans are aware that we live under a federal form of government in which our constitution gives certain powers to the federal government. Those powers not given or implied to the federal government are reserved to the states.

There are many reasons why a President with a congressional majority may be unable to carry out his legislative program. Congress may be organized under rules and past practices which impede the passage of progressive laws. Congressmen from the President's party may fail to support his program. The President may fail to exert strong leadership. In order to do something about this failure to act when we believe it is necessary, we must have a better understanding of how Congress works.

The Legislative Process

1. A Bill is Introduced in Congress by a Congressman or a Senator.

The bill may be his own bill or he may have gotten the idea from some group or person back home or from a national group such as a labor, business organization, or religious denomination. Or, it may be a bill sponsored by the administration or the opposition.

2. Bills are Referred to Committees.

The committee studies the bill and makes recommendations to the House or Senate. Committees are extremely important, as many bills are long and involved and generally the recommendations of the committee are given very serious consideration.

3. On Most Important Bills, the Committee Which is Studying the Bill Will Hold Hearings.

Representatives of various groups or individuals who are interested usually can present their views on the legislation involved before the committee.

4. When the Hearings Are Over.

After the hearings, the committee and its staff studies all the recommendations and the bill itself and presents an agreed-upon bill to the House or Senate for consideration.

5. The Bill Goes on the Calendar in the Senate.

The bill goes on the floor of the Senate for debate in the order that it appears on

the calendar of bills kept by the clerk of the Senate.

6. The Bill Goes to the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives.

The Rules Committee acts as a traffic cop and decides when the bill can be presented for debate.

7. When the Bill Passes One of the Houses of Congress, it is Then Sent to the Other House for Approval.

If the bill passes the second House without any changes, it is sent to the President for his signature.

8. If the Senate and House Pass Different Versions of a Bill.

The two separate bills are sent to a joint Conference Committee made up of Senators and Representatives. They seek to reconcile differences involved. Then the compromise bill is sent back to the House and Senate, where it is generally passed by both Houses.

9. If the President Signs the Bill, it Becomes a Law.

If the President vetoes the bill, it is sent back to the House and the Senate. It takes a two-thirds vote of both Houses to pass a bill over the President's veto.

Congressional Committees Citizens Need to Know

Senate, Interior And Insular Affairs

Henry Jackson (D Wash.), Ch.

DEMOCRATS: Clinton P. Anderson (N. M.), Alan Bible (Nev.), Frank Church (Idaho), Ernest Gruening (Alaska), Frank E. Moss (Utah), Quentin N. Burdick (N. D.), Carl Hayden (Ariz.), George McGovern (S. D.), Gaylord A. Nelson (Wis.), Lee Metcalf (Mon.).

REPUBLICANS: Thomas H. Kuchel (Calif.), Gordon Allott (Colo.), Len B. Jordan (Idaho), Milward L. Simpson (Wyo.), Paul J. Fannin (Ariz.).

Senate, Judiciary

James O. Eastland (D Miss.), Ch.

DEMOCRATS: Olin D. Johnston (S. C.), John L. McClellan (Ark.), Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (N. C.), Thomas J. Dodd (Conn.), Philip A. Hart (Mich.), Edward V. Long (Mo.), Edward M. Kennedy (Mass.), Birch Bayh (Ind.), Quentin N. Burdick (N. D.), Joseph D. Tydings (Md.).

REPUBLICANS: Everett McKinley Dirksen (Ill.), Roman L. Hruska (Neb.), Hiram L. Fong (Hawaii), Hugh Scott (Pa.), Jacob K. Javits (N. Y.).

Senate, Labor and Public Welfare

Lister Hill (D Ala.), Ch.

DEMOCRATS: Pat McNamara (Mich.), Wayne Morse (Ore.), Ralph M. Yarborough (Tex.), Joseph S. Clark (Pa.), Jennings Ran-

dolph (W. Va.), Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (N. J.), Claiborne Pell (R. I.), Edward M. Kennedy (Mass.), Gaylord Nelson (Wis.), Robert F. Kennedy (N. Y.).

REPUBLICANS: Jacob K. Javits (N. Y.), Winston L. Prouty (Vt.), Peter H. Dominick (Colo.), George Murphy (Calif.), Paul J. Fannin (Ariz.).

Senate, Rules And Administration

B. Everett Jordan (D N. C.), Ch.

DEMOCRATS: Carl Hayden (Ariz.), Howard W. Cannon (Nev.), Claiborne Pell (R. I.), Joseph S. Clark (Pa.), Robert C. Byrd (W. Va.).

REPUBLICANS: Carl Curtis (Neb.), John Sherman Cooper (Ky.), Hugh Scott (Pa.).

House, Education And Labor

Adam Clayton Powell (D N. Y.), Ch.

DEMOCRATS: Carl D. Perkins (Ky.), Edith Green (Ore.), James Roosevelt (Calif.), Frank Thompson, Jr. (N. J.), Elmer J. Holland (Pa.), John H. Dent (Pa.), Roman C. Pucinski (Ill.), Dominick V. Daniels (N. J.), John Brademas (Ind.), James G. O'Hara (Mich.), Ralph J. Scott (N. C.), Hugh L. Carey (N. Y.), Augustus F. Hawkins (Calif.), Carlton R. Sikes (Md.), Sam M. Gibbons (Fla.), William D. Ford (Mich.), William D. Hathaway (Maine), Patsy T. Mink (Hawaii), James H. Scheuer (N. Y.), Lloyd Meeds (Wash.).

REPUBLICANS: William H. Ayres (Ohio), Robert P. Griffin (Mich.), Albert M. Quie (Minn.), Charles E. Goodell (N. Y.), John M. Ashbrook (Ohio), Dave Martin (Neb.), Alphonso Bell (Calif.), Paul Findley (Ill.), Ogden R. Reid (N. Y.), Glenn Andrews (Ala.).

House, Judiciary

Emanuel Celler (D N. Y.), Ch.

DEMOCRATS: Michael A. Feighan (Ohio), Frank Chelf (Ky.), Edwin Willis (La.), Peter W. Rodino (N. J.), Byron G. Rogers (Colo.), Harold D. Donohue (Mass.), Jack Brooks (Tex.), William M. Tuck (Va.), Robert T. Ashmore (S. C.), John Dowdy (Tex.), Basil L. Whitener (N. C.), Herman Toll (Pa.), Robert W. Kastenmeier (Wis.), Jacob H. Gilbert (N. Y.), James C. Corman (Calif.), William L. St. Onge (Conn.), George F. Sennet, Jr. (Ariz.), Don Edwards (Calif.), William L. Hungate (Mo.), Herbert Tenser (N. Y.), John Conyers, Jr. (Mich.), George W. Grider (Tenn.), Andrew Jacobs, Jr. (Ind.).

REPUBLICANS: William M. McCulloch (Ohio), Richard H. Poff (Va.), William C. Cramer (Fla.), Arch A. Moore, Jr. (W. Va.), John V. Lindsay (N. Y.), William T. Cahill (N. J.), Clark MacGregor (Minn.), Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (Md.), Carleton J. King (N. Y.), Edward Hutchinson (Mich.), Robert McClory (Ill.).

House, Rules

Howard W. Smith (D Va.), Ch.

DEMOCRATS: William M. Colmer (Miss.), Ray J. Madden (Ind.), James F. Delaney (N. Y.), James W. Trimble (Ark.), Richard Bolling (Mo.), Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.), B. F. Sisk (Calif.), John Young (Tex.), Claude Pepper (Fla.).

REPUBLICANS: Clarence J. Brown (Ohio), H. Allen Smith (Calif.), John B. Anderson (Ill.), Dave Martin (Neb.), James H. Quillen (Tenn.).

The Outlook For 'Prayer Amendments' In The 89th Congress

By W. Barry Garrett, Associate Director

Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, Washington, D. C.

Now that a year has elapsed since the supreme effort to initiate a prayer amendment to the U. S. Constitution, what is the picture?

It would be a mistake to say that the movement is dead, for there are those who continue to agitate for legislation for prayers and devotions in the public schools. It would be more correct to say that the possibility of the 89th Congress doing anything on this issue is very remote.

New Year Brings New Situation

Look at this severe contrast. By the time the 88th Congress ended last year there were 115 Congressmen who had introduced 151 resolutions, plus 11 Senators. This year only 24 Congressmen and 1 Senator have taken the trouble to offer resolutions.

While Rep. Joel T. Brophy (D., Va.) has filed a discharge petition similar to the one pushed by Rep. Frank Becker (R., N.Y.) last year, it is not expected to make any headway.

Last year almost daily in the Congressional Record Congressmen held forth against the Supreme Court decisions on prayer and Bible reading in public schools. This year there is a noticeable silence on the subject.

Last year wave after wave of mail from certain sectors of the public hit the desks of Congressmen. This year only a trickle has been received.

Last year some politicians so misread the American public mind that the Republican party included a prayer plank in its platform. This year many of those politicians are enjoying the quiet of private life, retired from public office by the people.

Why The Change Took Place

Several factors enter into the changing picture from last year. Perhaps the most significant factor was the hearings in the House Judiciary Committee. Chairman Emanuel Celler (D., N.Y.) delayed the hearings as long as he possibly could. Finally he was forced by the Becker amendment advocates by the use of a discharge petition.

The discharge petition is a method of forcing legislation out of committee to the floor of the House. Such a petition called for 218 signatures. Becker came within 48 of the required number.

During the seven weeks of hearings significant changes took place, both in the Congress and in the public mind. The Congressmen discovered that it is no simple matter to write a constitutional amendment relating to religion that will not lessen the guarantees of the First Amendment. They bogged down in their own inability to improve on the present safeguards to religious liberty.

Position of Nation's Clergy

Also during the hearings the Congressmen discovered that the major denominations and the leading clergymen of the nation are strongly opposed to any change in the First Amendment. They were stunned when they discovered that most of these even favored the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Of equal significance was the shift in public opinion. As the facts of the Court's decisions became better understood and as the perils of tampering with the Bill of Rights were realized the Congressmen's mail changed complexion. The hitherto unheard-from sector of the public began to make its views known. The nation was not ready to be rushed into a change in the Constitution that would affect its basic freedom.

When the hearings concluded, it was up to the Judiciary Committee to decide what to do. Although in executive sessions of committees any member has the right to bring up any matter, not one member ever asked for further consideration of the "prayer amendment." Congress adjourned with no action, which in itself was most significant action to kill the proposals.

Results of 1964 Elections

Another factor in the deflation of the "prayer amendment" movement this year is the absence of a crusading leader. Congressman Becker did not run for re-election. No Congressman has risen yet to take his place for this cause.

The results of the 1964 national election also have had telling effects on the "prayer amendment" movement. The fact that the nation rejected overwhelmingly the Republican candidate for President and the platform that called for legislation on prayer made it clear that the people are not ready to have the government enter into their religious lives.

Add to this the fact that many Republicans and conservative Democrats who had campaigned for such legislation were not re-elected and you have in Congress a situation unlike that of last year.

Position of Supreme Court

The Supreme Court itself contributed to the deflation of the sails of the crusaders. In spite of the facts of the cases involved, it was widely proclaimed that the Supreme Court was on its way to remove "In God We Trust" from the nation's currency, to take "under God" out of the pledge of allegiance, to do away with the chaplaincy, and to run God out of the nation.

In November 1964 the Supreme Court allayed the fears of many when it refused to rule that "under God" in the pledge of allegiance is a violation of the Constitution.

This action of the Supreme Court could have been predicted on the basis of Justice Brennan's earlier words in the Maryland and Pennsylvania Bible reading cases. He said: "The reference to divinity in the revised pledge of allegiance, for example, may merely recognize the historical fact that our nation was believed to have been founded 'under God'. Thus reciting the pledge may be no more of a religious exercise than the reading aloud of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, which contains an allusion to the same historical fact."

Likewise, the Supreme Court in the New York Regents' Prayer case clearly stated: "There is of course nothing in the decision reached here that is inconsistent with the fact that school children and others are officially encouraged to express love for our country by reciting historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence which contains references to the Deity or by singing officially espoused anthems which include the composer's professions of faith in a Supreme Being, or with the fact that there are many manifestations in our public life of belief in God. . . ."

Efforts Toward Solutions

It has become evident that a constitutional amendment is not the way to face the problem of religion in the public schools. Many communities and both church and public agencies have entered into a search for solutions that are in harmony with the Constitution, religious liberty.

(See THE OUTLOOK, page 7)

Recent Developments In Church-State Affairs

Clergymen and Legislation

WASHINGTON—Church and state are deeply involved in the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965.

As a result of the civil rights incidents in Alabama clergymen of the three major faiths have reacted strongly. They have organized and participated in civil rights rallies throughout the nation. Prayer meetings have been conducted in churches. Chartered planes and other means of transportation have taken many ministers to Alabama to participate in marches, memorial services, and the struggle for voting rights.

Four thousand ministers and laymen converged on Washington. Special services were held in the Lutheran Church of the Reformation. A delegation of 16 called on President Johnson to urge civil rights action. Many of the others swarmed over Capitol Hill to ask Congressmen to support stronger voting legislation.

This is a clear instance of the moral and religious forces of the nation getting so aroused over social conditions that they are moved to petition for action by government.

State Aid to Church Colleges

ANNAPOLIS, Md.—A Maryland circuit court judge ruled that direct grants of state aid to four Maryland church-related colleges are valid under the state and federal constitutions. The case will be taken to the Maryland Court of Appeals and then to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The point at issue in the case was state appropriations to two Protestant and two Catholic colleges for construction of science buildings, dormitories, dining halls and class room buildings. The judge ruled that since these buildings serve a purely secular purpose and since the original legislative intent was not to advance or to inhibit religion the grants are constitutional.

This case promises to be one of the landmark cases in church-state relations, because some provisions of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and other federal aids to church colleges are at stake.

Texas to Re-study Position

WACO, Tex.—The Texas Baptist executive board meeting at Baylor University here voted to ask a committee to re-study the convention's policy on church-state separation. A 15-member committee has been

appointed to study the convention's statement.

In 1961 following a two-year study by a special committee the Executive Board of the Baptist General Convention of Texas approved 10 recommendations establishing policy positions in the field of church-state relations.

The board opposed direct tax aid to church agencies as well as loans from the government by religious organizations. Concerning loans and grants to college students the board saw no church-state violation.

Texas Baptists approved continued cooperation between their institutions and the government in the field of research on a contract basis. They, however, forbade their institutions to accept real or personal surplus government property, except through competitive bidding or payment of a reasonable market value.

In other actions the Texans approved a policy of caution in urban renewal programs, acceptance of special postal rates under present conditions, acceptance of tax-exemptions, and acceptance of "vendor-pay" for treatment of old-age pensioners and others as not violating separation of church and state.

The Texas board said that the military chaplaincy does not violate the principle of separation of church and state.

Conscientious Objectors Win

WASHINGTON—Freedom of conscience won further support in a U. S. Supreme Court decision that gave a broad interpretation of the draft law provision for exemption from military service.

The draft law exempts from combatant training and service persons who oppose participation in war because of their religious training and belief. The Court decision extended the concept of religious objection beyond that of orthodox belief in God.

In a unanimous opinion for the Court, Justice Tom C. Clark said that a test of belief "in relation to a Supreme Being" is whether a "belief that is sincere and meaningful occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by the orthodox belief in God of one who clearly qualifies for the exemption."

Applying this test the Court ruled that the beliefs of three men involved in the cases before it entitled them to exemption.

The three objectors were Daniel Andrew Seeger and Arno Sascha Jacobson of New York City, and Forest Britt Peter of Hayward, Calif. None of these men are atheists, but their concept of "supreme reality" is not the orthodox belief in God.

Propose Sunday Elections

Sen. Everett Dirksen (R., Ill.) has introduced a bill in the United States Senate "to provide for the conduct of national elections on the first Sunday in November."

There is no serious move in Congress at this time to make a change in the date of the national elections. In fact, it is the feeling on Capitol Hill that most Congressmen will probably steer away from such a proposal for fear of reactions from the church people in their constituencies.

This is not the first time such a proposal has been made in Congress, but the others were received with such protests that many Congressmen are unwilling to risk unpopularity by supporting Sunday elections.

The proposal does, however, point up a serious need in the nation—how to get more of the electorate to the polls on election days. An alternate proposal has been made that election day be set aside as a national holiday in which all citizens will be free to participate in the election.

To Study Higher Education

The Southern Baptist Convention Education Commission will undertake a two-year study of Christian higher education during which two national conferences, one in 1966 and another in 1967, will be held.

Of major interest in the studies will be the problems involved in the participation by Baptist colleges in the programs of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

The higher education study is an outgrowth of an earlier committee appointed by the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention to study the effects of federal aid to education on Baptist colleges and universities.

The new study will not be confined to church-state relations in higher education. The denomination's philosophy of education and the many common problems of the colleges in the various states will come under consideration.

Enrollment at the two national conferences will not exceed 275 each. The conferences will divide into 10 or 12 study groups with each considering a basic question pertaining to Christian higher education.

One of the projects for the 1966-67 study

will be the writing of a "white paper" on Baptist higher education. This could become "a manifesto on which the next half-century of progress can be based," according to the announcement.

Vatican Council, Religious Liberty

Religious liberty is expected to be the first item on the agenda for the fourth session of Vatican Council II which convenes September 14, according to reliable sources at the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Some skeptics have predicted that the declaration on religious liberty will never reach the floor of the Council for a vote. However, competent authorities in the Catholic Church say that the rules of procedure of the Council require that it be further discussed and voted upon.

The declaration of religious liberty was approved by the Council as a document for discussion at the last session. This means that it must be returned to the floor for debate and vote.

Since the third session adjourned last November the declaration on religious liberty has been rewritten. This will be the fifth draft of the statement. Those who are acquainted with the instrument report that each revision has been an improvement over the earlier versions.

Several courses are open for the Council on the declaration on religious liberty. It can reject the document. It can approve a weak and watered down statement. It can accept the new document. It can order an even stronger statement to be written. Only one thing can be certain at the present time. The Council must take some definite action on the declaration.

Capital Or Capitol?

Occasionally the "Report From The Capital" gets an inquiry asking why "Capitol" is spelled with an "a" instead of an "o."

The dictionary is the authority on this point. The seat of government such as a city, is "capital." Thus, Washington, D. C. is the "Capital" of the United States.

On the other hand, the building in which a legislature meets is called a "capitol." Hence, the edifice at Washington in which the Congress holds its sessions is the United States "Capitol."

Since the "Report From The Capital" covers more than the events in Congress, it is a report from an agency located in the "capital" city of the nation.

The Outlook for 'Prayer Amendments'

(Continued from page 5)

erty and faithfulness to the national heritage.

The American Association of School Administrators published in 1964 a report of its Commission on Religion in the Public Schools. This 64-page book seeks guidelines for constructive policies by which public school administrators could develop public policies and practices. It does not claim to have the final answers to all the problems involved, but it does seek ways to incorporate knowledge of religion into the educational processes of the nation.

Some schools have made provision for the use of facilities by students who wish to do so to participate in religious services before or after school hours.

Some communities have offered devotional periods in a church near the schools for 10 or 15 minutes before the school day begins. Both student participation and cooperation from the several local clergymen have been enlisted.

Other organizations have provided book covers with a prayer printed on them for

the private devotion of the pupils. Other devotional materials have been placed in the hands of pupils for their own private meditation.

Some school districts have considered the possibility of setting aside a minute of silence for whatever meditation or praying the pupils care to do for themselves.

Some communities have enlisted local radio stations for a brief devotional and Bible reading period in which families can participate around the breakfast table as they prepare for the coming day.

Yet other communities have developed courses in appreciation of the religious heritage of western civilization and in a study of religion along the lines suggested by the Supreme Court itself. The Court said:

"One's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities."

Three Ways To Receive "Report From The Capital"

By individual subscription. Your own personal copy subscribed for by you and mailed to you at your own expense. \$1.50 per year.

By club subscription. A group subscription by ten or more persons subscribed and paid at the same time. Each member of the club subscription receives his or her own copy mailed to each person's address. \$1.00 per year each.

By bulk subscription. Ten or more copies subscribed for at the same time all mailed to one address. Excellent for distribution by a church leader to his co-workers or by a pastor to leaders of his congregation. \$0.75 per year each.

(Clip and mail this coupon)

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

1628—16th St., N. W.

Washington, D. C. 20009

☐ Please enter my subscription for year(s) and send to the address below.

☐ Please send "Report From The Capital" to the attached list of names and addresses. This is a club subscription, and the name listed below is the treasurer of the club.

☐ Please send copies of "Report From The Capital" each month to the address listed below. This is a bulk subscription as described above.

Enclosed please find \$ for the above order

Name

Mailing Address

City State Zip Number

Congress Considers New Voting Rights Law

"Every citizen must have an equal right to vote," declared President Lyndon B. Johnson in his address to the joint session of Congress on March 15.

The President said that this is the clear meaning of the Constitution of the United States. He dedicated his full powers to the accomplishment of this end.

Johnson pointed out that last year by the time the Civil Rights Act of 1964 passed through the legislative process and reached his desk for signature the heart of the voting provision had been eliminated.

"This time, on this issue, there must be no delay, no hesitation, no compromise with our purpose," he declared.

During the week following his address to Congress the President's voting bill was presented to Congress. The bill was worked out by Democrat and Republican leaders and will receive bipartisan support.

In the House of Representatives hearings on the bill were begun the day following its introduction. The Senate voted 67-13 to refer the bill to the Judiciary Committee with orders that it be reported back to the Senate no later than April 9. On the day it was introduced 66 Senators (46 Democrats and 20 Republicans) had their names on it as cosponsors.

This means that early indications were for quick passage of the voting bill. The threat of a filibuster is minor at the time of this writing. Even if this were to develop, the mood of the nation is such that the Senate would probably vote for cloture (end of debate).

The parts of the Constitution that apply to the proposed voting bill are as follows:

Article I, Section 4—"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

The Fifteenth Amendment: "Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous conditions of servitude."

"Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Here is a summary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It was prepared by Lewis I. Maddox, Washington, D. C.

Voting Rights Act of 1965

Section 1

Title of the Act.

Section 2

Forbids imposition of voting qualification or procedure to abridge the right to vote on account of race or color.

Section 3

Forbids denial of right to vote in federal, state, or local election because of failure to comply with any test or device in any state or subdivision in which the Attorney General determines such tests for voting existed on November 1, 1964 and less than 50 per cent of residents of voting age were registered on November 1, 1964 or actually voted in November, 1964.

"Test or device" refers to literacy tests, requirement of educational achievement or knowledge of particular subject, requirement of good moral character or the need to be vouched for by a registered voter or member of any other class. States or subdivisions may petition district court in District of Columbia alleging that they have not during preceding decade denied anyone the right to vote for reason of race or color. If the court acknowledges the truth of this allegation, the provisions of this Act shall not apply.

Section 4

Whenever the Attorney General receives 20 or

more complaints of voting discrimination in a political subdivision described under Section 3 or otherwise feels that examiners are needed to enforce the 15th Amendment, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint examiners to the subdivision to prepare and maintain lists of persons eligible to vote in federal, state, and local elections.

Section 5

Examiners shall have the power to examine applicants who have been denied the right to vote or found unqualified by a local registrar. If found to be qualified, the applicants shall be placed on list of eligible voters. This list shall be sent to the appropriate election officials at least 45 days prior to the election.

No person shall be denied right to vote for failure to pay a poll tax if he makes the payment for the current year.

Section 6

Any challenge against persons registered by examiners shall be heard and decided within seven days by a hearing officer appointed by the Civil Service Commission. Such challenges must be within 10 days after the challenged person is registered. Appeal within 15 days is permitted to U.S. Court of Appeals.

Section 7

No one shall interfere with the right of such listed persons to vote or with the vote being

counted or shall intimidate, threaten or coerce (or attempt to do so) any such person for attempting to vote.

Section 8

No state or political subdivision under Section 3 shall impose any voting qualification or procedures different than those in effect on November 1, 1964 which have the effect of denying or abridging rights guaranteed by the 15th Amendment.

Section 9

Persons found guilty of violating sections 2, 3, or 7, or of destroying or altering ballots or records or who conspire to do so shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. In case of denial of right to vote or failure to count the vote, the offended party may appeal to the examiner who will notify the U.S. Attorney for the district. The latter may obtain an order from the federal district court enjoining certification of the election results until the complainant's vote has been cast and counted.

Section 10

Listing procedures shall end in any political subdivision whenever the Attorney General notifies the Civil Service Commission that all persons listed by the examiner have been placed on the voting registration roll, and there is no longer reason to believe persons will be deprived of the right to vote on account of race or color in such subdivision.

Section 11

Only the District Court of the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to exempt a state or political subdivision from the provisions of this Act.

Section 12

Appropriation of necessary funds to carry out this Act are authorized.

Section 13

If any provision of this Act is declared invalid, the remainder of the Act shall not be affected thereby.

Bulk Rate
U. S. Postage
PAID
Washington, D. C.
Permit No. 41858