

copy 1  
**FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS**

---

---

1851-1

**HEARINGS**  
BEFORE THE  
**GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**  
OF THE  
**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR**  
**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS**  
**FIRST SESSION**  
ON  
**H.R. 4970**  
AND RELATED BILLS AUTHORIZING PROGRAMS OF FED-  
ERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND AMENDING PUBLIC  
LAWS 815 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS

---

**PART 2**

---

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 21, 22, 24,  
27, 28, AND 29, 1961

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1961

The Federal Government has often made long-term low-interest rate loans. But it has always done so in order financially to aid and assist the beneficiary of the loan and to encourage some specific enterprise. It is exactly this governmental aid and assistance which the first amendment forbids where the beneficiary is a church.

The reality that Government loans to churches and church schools constitute Government aid is recognized in the laws and constitutions of many of the States. Typical is the mandate of the New York constitution (art. 11 sec. 4) that: "Neither the State nor any subdivision thereof shall use its property or credit or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection, of any school or institution of learning wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught \* \* \*"

A leading case showing that a loan of governmental funds constitutes governmental assistance is the recent case of *Leritt and Sons, Inc. v. Division Against Discrimination* (31 N.J. 514, 158 Atl. 2d 177, appeal dismissed 80 Sup. Ct. 1257). In that case the Supreme Court of New Jersey, in a unanimous decision, held that a statute which prohibited discrimination in housing accommodations which are "publicly assisted" was applicable to a building financed by means of a Federal Housing Authority loan. The grant of Government credit, the court held, constitutes assistance.

In respect to the proposal for long-term loans to parochial schools particularly appropriate is the remark of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Cooper v. Aaron* (358 U.S. 1, 17). The Constitution, the Court said, may not be "nullified openly and directly," "nor nullified indirectly \* \* \* through evasive schemes \* \* \* whether attempted ingeniously or ingenuously."

#### CONCLUSION

The demand that Federal funds be granted to parochial schools represents the most serious assault upon the wall of separation of church and state in the history of our Nation. If it succeeds, it may well mark the beginning of the end of our public school system. It most certainly would mark the beginning of the end of the American principle of religious liberty and the separation of church and state as we have known it in our country. I am certain this committee will not allow it to succeed.

Mr. THOMPSON. Our next witness is Rabbi Morris Sherer of New York City. Rabbi, do you have a prepared statement?

#### STATEMENT OF RABBI MORRIS SHERER, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Rabbi SHERER. Yes, I do.

Mr. THOMPSON. You may proceed as you wish.

Rabbi SHERER. It is rather brief, I may say. I believe that copies were distributed.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Morris Sherer. I have the privilege to represent Agudath Israel of America, a national organization of orthodox Jews with local membership chapters in communities throughout every part of the United States.

Our organization was founded 89 years ago, and our membership includes thousands of rabbis and communal leaders, amongst them the foremost Jewish scholars and religious authorities in this country.

We strongly favor Federal aid to parochial schools. We deplore that an incorrect image has been foisted upon the American public of the Jewish position on this issue, and that, as a result, a false impression has risen of the Jewish posture toward religious education.

Mr. THOMPSON. I take it you are referring to the remarks of the previous witness on behalf of the American Jewish Congress?

Rabbi **SHERER**. To the testimony of the previous witness and to the various statements that have appeared in the press, from various leaders of secular Jewish groups and reform clergymen.

When we refer to false impressions about the general Jewish attitude toward maximum religious education in parochial schools in particular I take, for example, some references and insinuations made in such a magazine as Life magazine and this relationship pains us very deeply.

Classical Judaism has, from the very inception of the Jewish people, placed religious education in sharp focus as the centrality of life itself. This awareness about the primary role of religious education is a fundamental principle in traditional Jewish law.

Thus, for example, the Talmud forbids one to reside in a community which lacks educational facilities for the children.

In order to place the primacy of education to the Jew in its proper perspective, one need but leaf through the history of our people, which is one long glorious record of enormous personal sacrifice by parents, in order to provide a maximum religious education for their offspring.

Our history books are replete with thousands of examples of the Jew's readiness to sacrifice of his very self in order to provide a traditional education for his children. Under the most trying circumstances, in eras when the Jews were the victim of pogrom, pillage, and persecution, he allowed no obstacle to stand in the path of educating the young.

In our own times, even in Nazi ghettos, underground methods were devised whereby the knowledge of their faith could be transmitted to the few surviving children.

I mention these facts in order to clear up the misconception which is prevalent amongst the American public, stemming from statements by certain secularist Jewish leaders and reform clergy. In our own beloved country, American citizens of the orthodox Jewish faith have built a network of 251 elementary and secondary parochial schools, under extremely difficult financial circumstances.

These Jewish parochial schools, known as Yeshivos, exist in 91 communities in 26 States.

Their annual maintenance budget is approximately \$10 million each year, and their building and plant expansion programs are estimated at \$10 million per annum.

Because these Jewish parochial schools labor under the pall of constant financial crises, they cannot afford a proper public relations program, so that the public should be aware of their huge contribution to American society, as well as the important role that their graduates play in the broad spectrum of the sciences, professions, and government.

It is our view that to deny these taxpaying American citizens of the orthodox Jewish faith the benefit of their taxes in order to help defray the large expense of maintaining the Jewish parochial school system for their children—and I refer, may I add, to the secular programs of the parochial schools, we are not asking for funds for the religious programs of the parochial schools—is a discrimination which is not in accordance with basic American ideals.

The Jewish parent who sends his child to a parochial school has to make many sacrifices to meet the cost of educating his children, very

often at the price of denying himself and his family some of their own vital needs.

These parents should not be unduly penalized for practicing the exercise of their free choice, implicit in the American way of life, to educate their children in accordance with their religious conscience.

The Jewish all-day schools, laboring under the heavy brunt of huge budgets for the secular as well as the religious programs they conduct, are suffering from severe financial hardships that impair their operation and restrict their expansion.

This is indeed unfortunate, because in our pluralistic American society, religious education is an integral part of our entire educational plant.

We, therefore, respectfully request that Federal aid to parochial schools be included in any Government program of school support.

In our view, this bears no relationship to the principle of separation of church and state, as this type of government support which we are asking for the secular programs, I repeat, of the parochial schools, will merely return to the taxpayer the full benefit of his taxes to which he is justly entitled, without compelling him to endure a system of double taxation.

This so-called wall of separation is not as impregnable as some maintain, as witness the 1958 National Defense Education Act, which in 1960 alone granted approximately \$1,700,000 to religious and private schools for improving science, mathematics, and foreign language facilities.

May I add, Mr. Chairman, that the memorandum distributed yesterday to Congress by the administration's attorneys against Federal aid to parochial schools, which appeared in this morning's newspapers, in our opinion, conversely tends to prove that there is no clearcut black and white thinking on this issue of constitutionality.

The brief is so full of loopholes and draws so many hazy distinctions between legal and illegal aid, that it actually serves to add weight to our contention that die-hard opposition to Federal aid to the secular programs of parochial schools is filled with inconsistencies.

We respectfully recommend that this situation be remedied through a practical method, whether in the form of tax deduction to parents for their tuition, long term loans to schools, or direct subsidies to the secular programs of the parochial schools.

Gentlemen, we felt it necessary to present this view to you this morning, so that in making a judgment you will be aware of the view of the board masses of American citizens dedicated to orthodox Judaism, who are those most vitally concerned, through personal commitment, to the issues of Federal aid to parochial schools. Thank you.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank you very much, Rabbi. I have just a question or two.

It is obvious, notwithstanding the brief which was prepared and sent to Senator Morse and those of us on this side yesterday, that there remains an argument with respect to the law involved.

Is your position one of asking that loans, for instance, be included in the present bill, or would you be as satisfied to have the matter considered in separate legislation?

Rabbi **SHERER**. While we take no position as to the bill, itself, because that is in the province of legislators, which we are not, we feel however, that any bill which would grant Federal aid to children should in all justice include those children who also go through the studies of secular subjects, but whose parents give them several hours more teaching a day.

So that as a matter of justice we feel that any Federal aid should include parochial schools.

Mr. **THOMPSON**. With regard to myself, I have examined with reasonable care, although I have not studied it as carefully as I am going to, the brief which was sent up yesterday. I do not, however, feel that parochial schools should be included at all in a bill calling for aid to public education.

I think that the two things are quite different. I will not argue with you the discrimination, as to whether it exists, or not. It depends on one's point of view. I think, although personally I am not averse to the idea.

I think that if this thing is to be handled at all, it is obviously inflammatory; as we all know, it should be the subject of separate legislation.

For, if it has merit, it can stand just as well on its own as part of something else.

Again, my view is that it is not properly a part of a public education bill.

There is being devised on the Senate side, as a matter of fact, there was introduced and withdrawn probably for technical changes, a bill by Senator Clark of Pennsylvania, the nature of which I understand is that it would be a long-term, low-interest-rate loan program for parochial schools in a bill designed very carefully to make such a thing possible if it is constitutional to the extent of its constitutionality, the device being the use of the language of the first amendment to the Constitution and saying—I am paraphrasing, and not precisely—in effect that there shall be loans in accordance with the title to the extent that they do not promote the establishment of a religion.

The legislation, as I understand it, is designed to make possible a test before the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject.

Now, we can all read cases and study them and one lawyer who is just as good as the next one might have a different conclusion on the basis of what his view of those cases is.

We have to take into consideration, also, the fact that the Supreme Court is made up of human beings who interpret things in different ways on different occasions.

Mr. **Booley** said sometimes they follow the election returns.

I think that if such legislation is designed that the advocates in the form of loans to parochial schools would do very well to abandon the insistence, not only that they tell us that they want something, but the method by which, and you are not included among these, the method by which it shall be done.

Because, when they do that, they are undertaking really to tell us how to do our job. They are telling a committee composed of 31 members and, incidentally, you now many of us have been through this for a number of years. We have a huge record this year and we are going to have thousands of pages more to review. Most of us have sat here during the entire time and have listened carefully.

We might well decide to try this business as part of the public bill; the committee may decide it.

If there is a majority on the committee it might be done. The committee might decide otherwise, however, and decide to take the matter up as a separate measure.

My view would be to consider it, but to consider it as a separate measure.

I do not necessarily sympathize with the insistence that it be part of a public school bill. Your position—I am very glad that you make it known this morning, because I think it is unfair to create the impression that any one group, ethnic or religious group, or even racial, is unanimous in its thinking on this subject.

I happen to be a Catholic. I know that my bill indicates that more people of my faith oppose the higher hierarchy on this than support them. Their letters are mostly with respect to the inclusion in a public bill.

A great many have written and said, "Let us consider this, but consider it separately." Fifteen percent of the Nation's youngsters go to parochial schools of various denominations. Eighty-five percent do not.

I think if it is unfair to discriminate against the 15 percent, as is claimed, then it would be even more unfair percentagewise at least, to discriminate against the 85 percent.

I am one who believes that the inclusion of this proposition in the public bill would defeat it and, therefore, the 100 percent would get nothing.

But I think we have a superb chance if we keep them separate of doing something for the 85 percent and then considering the 15 percent and I think there is a good chance that that would succeed because if there is enough support to keep a loan title in the major bill, then it follows that there must be enough support to pass that on its own.

The tactics, I think, should be determined and the judgments with respect to the bill should be left to the Members of the House of Representatives.

I appreciate your indication that you would be willing to leave that to our judgment.

Rabbi SHERER. Yes.

May I say in closing, sir, that although we would prefer that any bill for Federal aid to children not exclude parochial school children because we would consider it an injustice—

Mr. THOMPSON. By exclusion, are you referring to the means by which the allocation is made?

Rabbi SHERER. I am not referring to the means, but even the general exclusion of aid to parochial school children we would consider an injustice.

Nevertheless, although we would prefer there being some reservations, some aid made for the parochial school children, we would not assume to dictate to Congress the methods and the means of providing this aid to the parochial schools.

In our statement this morning we wanted to present to you our view that in all fairness the secular programs of the parochial school system should be subsidized.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, sir, very much.

Mr. Garland?

Mr. GARLAND. No questions.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. No questions.

Mr. THOMPSON. Our colleague, Mr. Edmondson, of Oklahoma, is here.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ED EDMONDSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN  
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to state for the record that I wholeheartedly support the legislation before the committee, which has the endorsement of the President of the United States.

I have recently caused a survey to be made of the school districts in the congressional district which I represent.

I find that there is a very real need for this program, both in terms of construction and in terms of aid to teachers' salaries.

I think there is also general agreement among the school people in that area that there has never been an instance in any Federal program in education in which there has been any control of any kind that would be something to be concerned about in legislation of this kind.

I would like permission, if I could, to file a statement in support of the points which I have just made.

Mr. THOMPSON. By unanimous consent, you have that right.

I might say, Mr. Edmondson, that I think you will not mind my referring to a conversation that we had regarding this elsewhere in which you did express your support but expressed the hope that, for the benefit of some of the impacted areas in your State, we consider raising the amounts of moneys as provided in the original legislation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your making note of that. There is serious concern in several of the districts of Oklahoma, and also in areas where there is a large percentage of Indian population, about the impact of this legislation if it should phase out our Public Law 815 and 874 programs.

I certainly appreciate your mentioning that. I appreciate your concern with it at the time we discussed it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The following was submitted for the record:)

**SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF HON. HARLAN HAGEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN  
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

With respect to my basic statement on H.R. 4970, I would like to invite the committee's attention to the problems of two school districts within my congressional district in relation to such legislation.

The first of these is the China Lake Elementary School District which is most certainly unique. This district came into being with the provision of buildings by the Navy in order to serve the children of civilian and military personnel employed and living on the naval ordnance test station. According to my information the students at the various elementary schools operated by this district total approximately 2,228 in the A category and 8 in the B category, with no other pupils. The district has no real property tax base and is in a position to raise only approximately \$1,000 in local taxes which are derived

# PUBLIC SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

---

---

1450-1

HEARINGS  
BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON  
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 8, S. 57, S. 293, S. 433, S. 723, S. 991, S. 1021, S. 1078, and  
S. 1109

BILLS TO PROVIDE FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO  
EDUCATION

---

PART 2

MARCH 14, 15, AND 20, 1961

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1961



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,  
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1961.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: This morning Rabbi Morris Sherer, executive vice president of Agudath Israel of America, testified before the Committee on Education and Labor in the House in favor of Federal aid to private schools.

I shall appreciate it very much if you will make Rabbi Sherer's testimony a part of the Senate hearings of your committee on this subject.

With kind regards, I am  
Sincerely,

JOHN.

STATEMENT BY RABBI MORRIS SHERER, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF AGUDATH ISRAEL OF AMERICA

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have the privilege to represent Agudath Israel of America, a national organization of orthodox Jews with local membership chapters in communities throughout every part of the United States. Our organization was founded 30 years ago, and our membership includes thousands of rabbis and communal leaders, amongst them the foremost Jewish scholars and religious authorities in this country.

We strongly favor Federal aid to parochial schools. We deplore that an incorrect image has been foisted upon the American public of the Jewish position on this issue, and that, as a result, a false impression has arisen of the Jewish posture toward religious education.

Classical Judaism has, from the very inception of the Jewish people, placed religious education in sharp focus as the centrality of life itself. This awareness about the primary role of religious education is a fundamental principle in traditional Jewish law. Thus, for example, the Talmud forbids one to reside in a community which lacks educational facilities for the children.

In order to place the primacy of education to the Jew in its proper perspective, one need but leaf through the history of our people, which is one long glorious record of enormous personal sacrifice by parents, in order to provide a maximum religious education for their offspring. Our history books are replete with thousands of examples of the Jew's readiness to sacrifice of his very self in order to provide a traditional education for his children. Under the most trying circumstances, in eras when the Jew was the victim of pogrom, pillage, and persecution, he allowed no obstacle to stand in the path of educating the young. In our own times, even in Nazi ghettos, underground methods were devised whereby the knowledge of their faith could be transmitted to the few surviving children.

I mention these facts in order to clear up the misconception which is prevalent amongst the American public, stemming from statements by certain secularist Jewish leaders and reform clergy. In our own beloved country, American citizens of the orthodox Jewish faith have built a network of 251 elementary and secondary parochial schools, under extremely difficult financial circumstances. These Jewish parochial schools, known as Yeshivos, exist in 91 communities in 26 States. Their annual maintenance budget is approximately \$10 million each year, and their building and plant expansion programs are estimated at \$10 million per annum. Because these Jewish parochial schools labor under the pall of constant financial crises, they cannot afford a proper public relations program so that the public should be aware of their huge contribution to American society, as well as the important role that their graduates play in the broad spectrum of the sciences, professions, and government.

It is our view that to deny these taxpaying American citizens of the orthodox Jewish faith the benefit of their taxes in order to help defray the large expense of maintaining the Jewish parochial school system for their children, is a discrimination which is not in accordance with basic American ideals. The Jewish parent who sends his child to a parochial school has to make many sacrifices to meet the cost of educating his children, very often at the price of denying for himself and his family some of their own vital needs. These parents should not be unduly penalized for practicing the exercise of their free choice, implicit in the American way of life, to educate their children in accordance with their religious conscience.

The Jewish all-day schools, laboring under the heavy brunt of huge budgets for the secular as well as the religious programs they conduct, are suffering from financial hardships that impair their operation and restrict their expansion. This is indeed unfortunate, because in our pluralistic American society, religious education is an integral part of our entire educational plant.

We, therefore, respectfully request that Federal aid to parochial schools be included in any Government program of school support. In our view this bears no relationship to the principle of "separation of church and state," as this type of Government support will merely return to the taxpayer the full benefit of his taxes to which he is justly entitled, without compelling him to endure a system of double taxation. This so-called wall of separation is not as impregnable as some maintain, as witness the 1958 National Defense Education Act, which in 1960 alone granted approximately \$1,700,000 to religious and private schools for improving science, mathematics, and foreign language facilities. And, may I add, the memorandum distributed yesterday to Congress by the administration's attorneys against Federal aid to parochial schools, conversely tends to prove that there is no clear-cut, black-and-white thinking on this issue of constitutionality. The brief is so full of loopholes, and draws so many hazy distinctions between legal and illegal aid, that it actually serves to add weight to our contention that diehard opposition to Federal aid to the secular programs of parochial schools is filled with inconsistencies.

We respectfully recommend that this situation be remedied through a practical method, whether in the form of tax deduction to parents for their tuition, long-term loans to schools, or direct subsidies to the secular programs of the parochial schools.

Gentlemen, we felt it necessary to present this view to you this morning, so that in making a judgment, you will be aware of the view of the broad masses of American citizens dedicated to orthodox Judaism, who are those most vitally concerned, through personal commitment, to the issue of Federal aid to parochial schools.

---

THE ASSEMBLY,  
STATE OF NEW YORK,  
*Albany, March 28, 1961.*

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
*Chairman, Senate Education Subcommittee,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: As a member of the Democratic Party, may I respectfully protest any program of Federal aid to education that would penalize a multitude of America's children because their parents choose to exercise their constitutional right to educate them in accordance with their beliefs.

Being aware of your forthright legislation, I know you will deliberate on my sentiments and those of countless others.

May I extend my personal good wishes for your continued health and success.

Sincerely,

AILEEN B. RYAN,  
*Assemblyman, Bronx County.*

---

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE,  
*New York, N.Y., March 22, 1961.*

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
*Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed statement on Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools was filed on behalf of the American Jewish Committee today. We would welcome any comments you may have.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE LESKES,  
*Director, Legal Division.*

**NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT**  
**(TITLES III, V, VII, VIII)**

---

---

**HEARINGS**  
**BEFORE THE**  
**GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**  
**OF THE**  
**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR**  
**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS**  
**FIRST SESSION**  
**ON**  
**H.R. 6774, H.R. 4253, H.R. 7378**  
**AND RELATED BILLS TO EXTEND AND IMPROVE THE**  
**NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT, AND**  
**FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

---

**PART 2**

---

**HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 5, 6, AND 7, 1961**

---

**Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor**



**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE**  
**WASHINGTON : 1961**

STATEMENT OF RABBI MORRIS SHERER, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF AGUDATH ISRAEL OF AMERICA, TO THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, JUNE 8, 1961

I appreciate this opportunity to present to you the views of the orthodox Jews represented by Agudath Isreal of America, whose national membership includes thousands of the spiritual and lay leaders of orthodox Judaism in every part of the United States.

At the outset, we want to express our appreciation to Congressman Cleveland Bailey, chairman of the subcommittee, for his wisdom and broad vision in proposing bill H.R. 6774 to extend the National Defense Education Act. The provisions of this act are immensely important to our country, to help develop a citizenry capable of coping with the challenge which our free world faces today. Congressman Bailey is therefore performing an outstanding public service with his bill, whose impact will be felt for many years to come.

Specifically, we want to go on record in favor of the amendment to this bill, proposed by Congressman Roman Pucinski, of Illinois—H.R. 7378—to expand the benefits of the National Defense Education Act to authorize grants and broaden the scope and length of loans provided for by the act, and the proposal of Congressman Herbert Zelenko, of New York—H.R. 6489—to provide grants to private schools in the areas of science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

What we have for consideration here is not a religious issue, as is the unfortunate misconception born of irrelevant controversy. It is purely an educational issue which goes to the very roots of our American democracy.

Our Founding Fathers never intended for our children to be reared in a monolithic educational straitjacket. Our educational plant is a mosaic, with the free play of the many-faceted cultures of our people blending into the moulding of an informed, dedicated, and loyal citizenry. In this pluralistic concept lies the beauty, the greatness, and the distinctiveness of our democracy.

Since the proposed legislation spells out the areas of Federal support to specific secular subjects, and clearly does not aid any religious instruction, it should serve to remove these bills from the framework of the problems of church-state relations.

In the broad spectrum of educational institutions that make America, the Jewish all-day schools play a vital role. The number of these schools, known as yeshivos, have almost quadrupled in the last 15 years. Today, 251 Jewish parochial elementary and secondary schools, located in 91 communities in 26 States, are instilling in their students a profound understanding of individual purpose and national purpose, coupled with a deep sense of dedication and service—components that are invaluable to the development of a well-rounded citizen.

The graduates of the Jewish day schools are making important contributions to the public welfare and to the growth of our country in the sciences, professions, Government, and industry. They play a constructive role in the battle for human dignity and for spiritual values in which our free world is engaged.

Although the rapid growth of these day schools in the last decade is indicative of the determination of an ever-increasing number of Jewish citizens to provide an intensive religiously oriented education for their children, they have not been able to keep pace with the skyrocketing costs involved. The burden of constantly climbing budgets has seriously hampered their scholastic program, which in turn impedes the progress of our entire American educational system.

The proposed legislation is, therefore, most timely and constitutes a vital step in the right direction toward helping solve a major educational problem and rectifying an injustice which the private schools suffer today.

These bills will be of invaluable assistance to achieve the maximum potential capacity not only of the private schools, but of our entire national educational effort, thus benefiting our country at the most critical juncture in our history.

We felt it necessary to present this statement to this subcommittee, because a fallacious image has been created to the American public of the Jewish position on this issue. The prevailing view of the vast majority of Orthodox Jewish citizens of our land, who alone are most intimately concerned with the entire problem of the Jewish day school movement, strongly favors enactment of the proposed Federal-aid legislation being considered by this committee.