

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY  
ON  
TUITION TAX CREDITS  
AND OTHER PROPOSALS  
RELATING TO  
EDUCATIONAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

---

PREPARED FOR THE  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
BY THE STAFFS  
OF THE  
JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION  
AND THE  
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE



APRIL 7, 1978

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1978

25-697

JCS-16-78



# CONTENTS

---

	Page
Introduction .....	V
I. Summary of Comments Regarding Education Tax Benefit Proposals .....	1
A. Tax Credit Proposals.....	1
1. Credits for higher education (post-secondary) costs .....	1
a. Those favoring tax credits for higher education .....	1
b. Those opposing tax credits for higher education .....	7
2. Credits for elementary/secondary education costs .....	10
a. Those favoring tax credits for elementary/secondary education.....	10
b. Those opposing tax credits for elementary/secondary education.....	18
B. Tax Deductions Proposals.....	25
1. Those favoring tax deductions.....	25
2. Those opposing tax deductions.....	25
C. Tax Deferral Proposals.....	26
1. Those favoring tax deferral.....	26
2. Those opposing tax deferral.....	26
D. Education "Savings" Plan Proposals.....	27
1. Those favoring education "savings" plans.....	27
2. Those opposing education "savings" plans.....	27
E. Tax Treatment of Employee Education Expenses..	28
F. Constitutional Issues Regarding Education Tax..	29
II. Summary of Comments Regarding Non-tax Educational Assistance Proposals.....	34
A. Administration's Education Financial Assistance Proposals .....	34
1. Those favoring.....	34
2. Those opposing.....	36
B. Other Comments Regarding Educational Assistance Proposals.....	37



## INTRODUCTION

This pamphlet provides a summary by separate topics of the testimony on tuition tax credits and other educational aid proposals in the Ways and Means Committee hearings held on February 14-17 and 21, 1978. It also summarizes the statements submitted for the record.

The summary is divided into two main parts: (1) comments on various education tax-related proposals, and (2) comments on non-tax educational assistance proposals. Under each separate topic, the public witnesses are arranged by date of testimony.

The summary of testimony was prepared primarily by the staff of the American Law Division, Congressional Research Service: Howard Zaritsky (coordinator), David Ackerman, and William J. Spencer.



## I. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS REGARDING EDUCATION TAX BENEFIT PROPOSALS

### A. TAX CREDIT PROPOSALS

#### 1. Credits for Higher Education (Post-Secondary) Costs

##### *a. Those favoring tax credits for higher education*

*Hon. William V. Roth, U.S. Senator, Delaware (Feb. 14)*

Supports a \$250 tuition tax credit. Contends that it is needed to reduce the high cost of education for the middle-income taxpayer. Claims that it is less expensive and involves lower administrative costs than direct grants.

*Hon. Bill Frenzel, Member of Congress, Minnesota (Feb. 14)*

Proposes a refundable credit of up to \$500 per person for one-half of the tuition paid by a full or part-time student at a college or university. Believes that this is the most effective and least complicated means of providing meaningful financial aid for parents of students. Maintains that it has a lower cost and administrative burden than direct financial aid.

*American Council on Education Dr. Jack W. Peltason, President (Feb. 14)*

Approves of a refundable credit between \$250 and \$500, but cautions that it could provide unnecessary benefits to wealthy taxpayers unless it is coupled with a phase-out. Suggests coordination of the credit with the needs-analysis structure for direct financial grants, and coverage of living expenses and tuition of part-time, graduate and professional students.

*American Association of State Colleges and Universities: Dr. Arend D. Lubbers, President and President, Grand Valley State College, Allendale, Mich. (Feb. 14)*

Supports the tuition tax credit concept. Suggests, however, that (1) the credit should apply to living expenses, as well as books, fees and tuition; (2) the credit should not provide graduated benefits which could exclude or discriminate against students attending private colleges and universities; (3) graduate and professional students reduce the available credit; (6) colleges and universities should be eligible for the credit; (5) other forms of educational aid should not reduce the available credit; (6) college and universities should be discouraged from raising costs to absorb the credit; and (7) the present needs-analysis program for outright grants should be reviewed.

*American Association of Community and Junior Colleges: John E. Tirell, Vice President for Governmental Affairs (Feb. 15)*

Approves of the tuition tax credit approach, but not exclusively to other proposals. Views it as (1) a feasible means of reducing the net



cost of college for middle-income families, either by itself or in combination with an expansion of the need-based student assistance programs; (2) an investment credit for brainpower; (3) not jeopardizing the allocation of aid to low-income families; (4) less costly to administer than the need-based programs of direct aid; and (5) serving the goal of equality of opportunity for all families.

*Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities, Henry D. Paley, President (Feb. 15)*

Supports tax credit for a part of the tuition costs of students because it avoids additional intrusion of the Federal bureaucracy into the affairs of higher education, it targets aid to the middle-income families whose need is particularly great, and because it will make colleges and universities more responsive and accountable to their students since the latter receives the funds. Urges that a tuition tax credit be "tuition sensitive," suggesting a credit of 25 percent of tuition payments, up to a maximum credit of \$1,000.

*Larry L. Leslie, Professor of Higher Education, University of Arizona (Feb. 15)*

Prefers tuition tax credits to direct need-based aid because (1) they require no extensive bureaucracy; (2) they would not increase the Federal budget; (3) they would avoid the problems of default encountered in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program; (4) they are consistent with the view of higher education expenditures as an investment in human capital; (5) they avoid the precedent of making transfer payments to middle-income families; and (6) they would benefit both public and private institutions. Also, believes that educational institutions are not likely to raise tuition to offset the credit, and that the Government will gain tax receipts in the long-run because of increased earnings from college-educated individuals.

*Hon. Albert H. Quie, Member of Congress, Minnesota (Feb. 16)*

Strongly supports the tuition tax credit approach because (1) there is a compelling need which it satisfies; (2) it is simple and everyone will easily understand and accept it; (3) it is sensitive to costs, requiring the family to shoulder at least 50 percent of the burden; (4) it will provide relief for students from families with income above \$17,000, whose college attendance has dropped recently; and (5) it will reduce bureaucratic involvement.

*Associated Students of Michigan State University, Kent L. Barry, President (Feb. 16)*

Supports tuition tax credit approach because (1) it would aid the middle-income families, who are hardest hit by the rise in college costs; (2) it would encourage freedom of choice in education; (3) it would not indicate a diminution of support for lower-income families; and (4) it would not constitute an act of charity on the part of the Federal Government.

*Professor C. Lowell Harriss, Columbia University (Feb. 16)*

Supports the tuition tax credit approach because (1) it is needed to recognize the different economic positions of families; (2) it recognizes the problems caused by exceptional expenses within a graduated



income tax rate structure; (3) it alleviates the hardship caused by inflation on parents who attempted to provide for educational costs by savings; and (4) it could permit discretionary use of funds otherwise tied up for educational savings.

*Independent Colleges and Universities of Indiana, Wallace B. Graves, President (Feb. 16)*

Urges adoption of a graduated tuition tax credit rather than a uniform tuition tax credit, as well as increased direct aid.

*Long Range Finance Committee, New York State Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities: Melvin A. Eggers, Chancellor and President of Syracuse University, Chairman (Feb. 16)*

Supports the tuition-sensitive tuition tax credit because (1) it provides support with a minimum of governmental interference; (2) it encourages and compensates citizens with a special burden of high social priority; (3) it is similar to the investment tax credit for purchases of capital assets; (4) it represents a substantial, positive influence even if it only covers a fraction of tuition costs and (5) it leaves the family and individuals more able to make the educational decision as they would wish, without significant economic factors. Proposes that the credit be 25 percent of tuition costs, up to a maximum of \$1,000, rather than a flat rate credit.

*Michigan Student Assembly, Jon R. Lauer, President (Feb. 16)*

Supports the tuition tax credit approach because it would aid taxpayers without increasing Federal bureaucracy, it avoids any question of invasion of privacy presently felt with respect to the required Parent Financial Statement, and it will greatly aid self-supporting students who are presently under intense financial pressure.

*United States Association of Evening Students, Ann M. Diehl, Vice President—East (Feb. 16)*

Supports tuition tax credit as an investment in the country's future, and believes that it would alleviate hardships of adult students.

*University of Delaware, Robert W. Mayer, Assistant Vice President for Student Services (Feb. 16)*

Prefers tuition tax credit to increased direct financial aid because of a history of underfunding direct aid programs and middle-income family failure to participate in direct aid programs. Also favors tuition tax credits because they have a lower administrative cost, they are simpler, and they would have an important psychological benefit for the public, similar to that of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

*Edward Blankstein, Inc. (Princeton, N.J.), Edward Blankstein, President (Feb. 17)*

Favors tuition tax credits but not to the exclusion of direct aid. Suggests that the credit should be transferrable to the educational institution by assignment, thereby avoiding the cash flow problems of lower and middle-income families, and that the credit not be considered an asset for purposes of the need-based direct aid programs.

*Joseph A. Veres, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Feb. 17)*

Favors the tax credit approach because it targets educational support to those classes in greatest need, it promotes progressivity, it assists in subsidizing education, and it offers more administrative opportunities than do other forms of aid.

*Hon. Bob Packwood, U.S. Senator, Oregon (Feb. 21)*

Proposes a tax credit because the recipient need not plead poverty in order to receive assistance and it is not complex. Indicates that 62 percent of its benefits will flow to the middle and lower middle-income families with incomes below \$20,000.

*Hon. Daniel P. Moynihan, U.S. Senator, New York (Feb. 21)*

Proposes tax credit because individuals will not be required to meet standards of need in order to receive aid for educational costs and the benefits will flow mostly to middle-income and lower-income families. Feels that individuals should not have to claim need in order to receive Federal aid, and that private schools will not injure public schools if aided with Federal funds. Also, states that because 82 percent of private school students are from families with incomes below \$30,000 a year, aid to these schools will inure to the benefit of the middle-income families and lower-income families.

*Hon. Robert C. McEwen, Member of Congress, New York (Feb. 21)*

Recommends tuition tax credit for fees, books, supplies and tuition, up to \$250 the first year, \$300 the second year, \$400 the third year, and \$500 thereafter. Favors tax credit approach because it channels funds to the middle-income families who receive no significant aid from other governmental programs, and because the funds so expended will eventually be recaptured in additional taxes on the higher incomes attributable to better educations received by the children of these taxpayers.

*Hon. Lawrence Coughlin, Member of Congress, Pennsylvania (Feb. 21)*

Proposes a refundable tuition tax credit of up to \$500 per person, for the costs of attending an accredited institution. Claims that it will (1) ease the burden of education's high cost to middle-income families; (2) have a low administrative cost and little redtape for the educational institutions and recipients; (3) result in increased taxes in later years due to higher income of recipients with better educations; and (4) encourage the arts and cultural activities.

*Hon. Jerome A. Ambro, Member of Congress, New York (Feb. 21)*

Supports a tuition tax credit equal to one-half of the expenses of a student, up to \$1,500. Indicates that 35 percent of the benefits would go to families with incomes between \$10,000 and \$15,000, and another 32 percent to families with incomes between \$15,000 and \$25,000; those persons hardest hit by escalating educational costs. Views the lower credits proposed as insufficient for most families.

*Hon. Tom Corcoran, Member of Congress, Illinois (Feb. 21)*

Proposes a \$250 tuition tax credit in the first year, increased to \$300 in the second year, \$400 in the third year, and \$500 thereafter. Believes

it will aid both students and institutions, it targets relief to the middle-income families, and it is simple and inexpensive to administer.

*Hon. Tom Railsback, Member of Congress, Illinois (Feb. 21)*

Supports tuition tax credits provided by H.R. 9332. Feels that they would relieve the middle-income families of the burden of high educational costs which threaten to exclude many Americans from the opportunities of attending college. Believes that parents of all income levels should have the freedom to choose what they believe is the best education for their children.

*Hon. Louis Frey, Jr., Member of Congress, Florida (written statement)*

Proposes a tuition tax credit of 100 percent of education expenses up to \$200, 25 percent of the expenses between \$200 and \$500, and 5 percent of the expenses up to \$1,500. Believes it to be a realistic and simple approach to easing the financial pressures on middle-income families caused by the high cost of college education, which has risen 77 percent between 1966 and 1976.

*Hon. Ron Marlenee, Member of Congress, Montana (written statement)*

Supports H.R. 10207 (introduced by Representative Frenzel) providing a tax credit equal to 50 percent of tuition paid to an institution of higher education, with a maximum of \$500 per student, because it provides equitable relief to low-income families and because it permits families to select the type of education they desire for their children.

*Hon. Charles Thone, Member of Congress, Nebraska (written statement)*

Supports tuition tax credits as a means of relieving the immense burden imposed on middle-income families seeking to send their children to college. Believes that there will be national economic benefits from having more college educated citizens.

*Hon. Herbert E. Harris II, Member of Congress, Virginia (written statement)*

Supports H.R. 6748, which would provide a tuition tax credit for a portion of the costs of post-secondary education, because the high cost of such education is precluding many middle-income families from sending their children to college. Indicates that in the past five years the cost of post-secondary education has risen 51.5 percent for public colleges and universities, and 49.6 percent for private institutions, and that a family with a one-year old child, living in Virginia, can expect to pay \$11,450 a year for the college education of that child. Also, notes that attendance of middle-income family children in college has declined 22 percent during the early 1970's.

*Hon. Guy Vander Jagt, Member of Congress, Michigan (written statement)*

Supports H.R. 10316, providing a refundable tuition tax credit, because it will ease the financial strains on lower and middle-income families created by the high cost of education, and because it will preserve the desired diversity and social vitality of an educational selection.



*Hon. Austin J. Murphy, Member of Congress, Pennsylvania (written statement)*

Supports tuition tax credit proposals (Delaney and Frenzel) because they would provide relief for middle-income families from the increasing costs of higher education and because they are administratively simple. Indicates that the average cost of a 4-year private college is about \$5,000 a year, and that state schools cost about \$3,000 a year, representing an increase of about 55.6 percent over the past 5 years. Also notes that nonpublic schools reduce the costs for public schools by about \$4.7 to \$10 billion a year in operating expenses, and preclude the necessity of public schools adding \$3.2 to \$3.9 billion in capital costs.

*College Republican National Committee, John Brady, Chairman (written statement)*

Supports tuition tax credits because (1) they represent the best answer to spiraling educational costs, in light of the small portion of such costs covered by present Federal educational grants; (2) they can be distributed with greater simplicity than can outright grants; and (3) students are allowed to determine how the money will be spent.

Suggests that the credit be made refundable, that an earnings limit be placed on eligibility in order to hold down the cost of the credit, that students should support at least a portion of their own educational costs, and that the credit not overly favor state-supported schools.

*Association of American Publishers (written statement)*

Urges passage of a tuition tax credit because it would provide needed relief to middle-income families, who may pay up to a third of their after-tax income for tuition for their children, and because it would both offset a present decrease in enrollment among young persons dependent upon their parents for financial support and be consistent with present Federal measures such as the Education Amendments of 1974.

*Georgetown University Undergraduate Student Body, Warren Lutz (written statement)*

Supports tuition tax credits as an equitable system for relief of low- and middle-income families from the high cost of college education. Recommends that the credit be refundable and that there be a phase-out as family income exceeds \$25,000.

*National University Extension Association, Lloyd H. Davis, Executive Director (written statement)*

Supports tuition tax credits because they are very much needed to assist middle-income families of college age children.

*Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Parrish, Potomac, Maryland (written statement)*

Supports tuition tax credits because of the burden of the high cost of college education on middle-income families.

### ***b. Those opposing tax credits for higher education***

*Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Hon. Joseph A. Califano, Secretary (Feb. 14)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because (1) they aid all families without regard to need; (2) they do not deal with the liquidity dilemma faced by many middle-income families; (3) they are expensive and will make other educational funds scarce; and (4) they fragment educational policies and increase regulations and paperwork.

*Department of the Treasury: Hon. Donald C. Lubick, Acting Assistant Secretary of Tax Policy (Feb. 14)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because (1) their benefits are not based either on need or expenses incurred by the students (2) they would operate to the disadvantage of private institutions; (3) they would complicate current educational policies; and (4) they would set a floor on the costs of higher education, since institutions charging less than the credit would raise their costs to absorb the difference.

*Americans United for Separation of Church and State: Andrew Leigh Gunn, Executive Director, and Edd Doerr, Educational Relations Director (Feb. 14)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because they would favor private colleges over public schools, since tuition is higher at private schools. Indicates that public opinion is opposed to increased public aid to nonpublic schools, as represented in three most recent referenda on the subject. Also objects to providing any relief for the costs of private vocational schools since this would lead to a proliferation of unscrupulous and incompetent schools. Urges that any proposals adopted be modified to eliminate inclusion of religious elementary and secondary schools and pervasively sectarian colleges.

*Coalition of Independent College and University Students: Lawrence S. Zaglaniczny, National Director (Feb. 15)*

Objects to tax credits for college costs because a flat-rate credit would significantly favor public schools over private institutions and impair the latter's ability to attract students by creating a "free tuition" at public schools, and because most of the benefits would go to the parents of children at public schools, rather than independent institutions, though the need is greater in the latter class of families. Urges that any credit adopted be both need and tuition sensitive, suggesting a refundable credit of 25 percent of tuition and fees paid by families with incomes up to \$25,000, and that the credit be reduced by 1 percent for each additional \$1,000 of family income up to \$45,000, and that all families with incomes above \$45,000 receive a credit of 5 percent of the school costs.

*Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty, Florence Flast, Chairperson (Feb. 15)*

Opposes tuition tax credits for the cost of higher education because, while college costs have increased more than 50 percent since 1970, Federal aid to college students has increased 340 percent over the same period, and college enrollments have continued to increase. Contends that a tuition tax credit would not substantially help the poor who are in the greatest need of such relief.

*Great Lakes Colleges Association, Jon W. Fuller, President (Feb. 15)*

Objects to tuition tax credits because they do not relate the level of assistance to the need of the recipient, and suggests that any credit adopted should be allowed for only one-half of the tuition and fees in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's annual income, up to a maximum credit of \$500 per year.

*Johns Hopkins University, Steven Muller, President (Feb. 15)*

Opposes a flat-rate tuition tax credit because it would disproportionately benefit students in public schools over those in private institutions, exacerbating the difficulty private schools already have in attracting students, and because it would benefit children of higher income families (incomes above \$30,000 a year). Believes that a credit would, in the long run, constrict support for existing aid programs which are beneficial to those in lower-income brackets, and urges that any credit adopted be both cost and need sensitive, applying only to expenses above a designated threshold amount and not available above a certain income ceiling. Also urges that any credit should take into account the parental income and also tuition costs.

*National Council of Jewish Women, Ray Tucker, Co-Chairman of the Workgroup on Constitutional Rights of the National Affairs Committee (Feb. 15)*

Opposes a tuition tax credit as inequitable, because it makes no distinction between the wealthy and those in need. Asserts that there is no adequate way to preclude colleges and universities from raising tuition by the amount of the credit.

*Preserve Our Public Schools, Carol Holt, Executive Secretary (Feb. 15)*

Opposes tax credits for higher education because Government has no need or reason to finance alternatives to its own system of public colleges and universities. Argues that private colleges would probably increase tuition to absorb the credit and that aid to private institutions would deprive public colleges and universities of badly needed revenues.

*Taxation with Representation, Thomas J. Reese, Legislative Director (Feb. 15)*

Opposes tax credit concept for higher educational expenses because the relative burden of college costs is less today than ten years ago, noting that the median income has increased 89 percent while the cost of college has risen only 75 percent in that period. Indicates that middle-income families, with incomes between \$10,000 and \$20,000, already receive about 36 percent of the Federal relief while representing only 33 percent of all students.



Opposes a nonrefundable \$250 credit because 54 percent of the benefits would go to taxpayers with incomes above \$20,000, though income tax rates would have to be increased for all taxpayers to pay for it. Also notes that colleges could raise tuition to absorb the credit, that private institutions would be disadvantaged because the relative cost of attending a public institution would be even lower, and because it would add further complexity to the financing of education.

*National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, Dallas Martin, Executive Secretary (Feb. 16)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because they would reduce a family's ability to qualify for need-based relief, the parent may be benefitted without benefitting the student, and other Federal relief may be reduced.

*National Student Lobby, Joel Packer, Legislative Director (Feb. 16)*

Opposes tuition tax credits as inefficient, regressive and ineffective because institutions will raise tuition to absorb the credit. Also, fears that the credit approach will fragment educational policy administration.

*Hon. Abner J. Mikva, Member of Congress, Illinois (Feb. 17)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because (1) they would be inconsistent with the public desire for reform and simplification of the tax code; (2) they would be inequitable because they would apply only to those parents whose children attend college; (3) they would provide the greatest benefits to those with higher incomes; (4) they would threaten an erosion of local taxpayer support for public education; and (5) they would add to an already too large Federal budget deficit.

*Education Policy Research Center, Dr. Joseph Froomkin, Director (Feb. 17)*

Opposes a \$250 tuition tax credit because of its high cost (\$1.7 billion); it is hidden in the tax laws rather than directly bestowed; and because 29 percent of its benefits will be distributed to persons with family incomes above \$25,000 a year. Believes that colleges will raise tuition to absorb the credit.

*Pennsylvania State University Undergraduate Student Government, Bonnie L. Northrop, Federal Liaison (Feb. 17)*

Opposes tuition tax credit because it cannot be geared adequately to benefit the middle-income families most in need of relief, and because tuition would, in time, be raised to absorb the credit.

*William E. Titus, Esquire, Greenlawn, New York (written statement)*

Oppose tuition tax credits as unconstitutional and, where there is no phase-out of the credit as family income increases, unfair to those who paid their own way over the years.



## 2. Credits for Elementary/Secondary Education Costs

### *a. Those favoring tax credits for elementary/secondary education*

*Hon. Bill Frenzel, Member of Congress, Minnesota (Feb. 14)*

Supports refundable tuition tax credit of one-half of the tuition paid to an elementary or secondary school, up to \$500 per person. Contends that it is the most effective and least complicated way to provide financial relief from the growing cost of education, and because the overall cost of the tax credit is less than that of other non-tax proposals, particularly the Administration's education aid proposal. Notes that the credit is no less need-based than the Administration's proposal which would grant \$250 to all students with family income below \$25,000, and that the tax credit will not increase fragmentation of educational programs.

*Christians for Better Government, Robert E. Baldwin, Executive Director (Feb. 14)*

Supports proposed tuition tax credits because the present cost of religious education impairs the free exercise of religion, since Christians must pay taxes to support public schools even if they do not use them. Suggests removal of the requirement that tuition is only creditable if paid to accredited schools, since States may disaccredit religious schools and thereby interfere with free exercise of religion.

*Citizens for Educational Freedom, Edward F. Spiers, Executive Director (Feb. 14)*

Supports H.R. 9332 and similar tuition tax credit bills because they are simple, nonbureaucratic, and effective in reducing the high cost of education.

*Federation of Catholic Teachers, Local 2092 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO: Harold J. T. Isenberg, President (Feb. 14)*

Supports a refundable tuition tax credit such as that provided in H.R. 9332, because parents need Federal assistance if they are to be able to exercise their constitutional right to select education for their children in the face of inflation, taxes and rising costs, and because public schools should not be allowed to have an educational monopoly. Contends that Catholic schools in New York provide a better education than public schools, at a lower per-pupil cost, and that tuition tax credits will not result in substantial increases in tuition charges.

*National Association of Catholic School Teachers, James V. Bellavia, Executive Committee Chairman (Feb. 14)*

Supports H.R. 9332, providing a credit of one-half of schools costs up to a maximum of \$500 per dependent per year, because it would

support parochial schools which provide an important educational service to students of diverse economic backgrounds, especially in urban areas. Notes that 47 percent of Catholic elementary schools and 54 percent of Catholic secondary schools are in urban areas, and another 26 percent of all Catholic schools are located in major city suburbs, and that 36 percent of the school closings were in urban areas.

*Parents Rights, Martin L. Duggan, St. Louis, Missouri (Feb. 14)*

Supports tuition tax credits because they are a fair and necessary means of providing financial aid to parents of school children.

*Professor Walter Williams, Temple University (Feb. 14)*

Supports the tuition tax credit because (1) it is equitable; (2) it will increase the nation's productivity because of better education of children; (3) it will increase religious freedom by reducing the penalty paid by parents who finance both public and private education for their children; (4) it will ease the burden of overcrowding in public schools; and (5) it will increase opportunities for minority students and the desegregation of elementary and secondary schools.

*Council for American Private Education, Robert L. Lanbron, Executive Director (Feb. 15)*

Supports tuition tax credits because they will give parents a viable choice of education for their children; they would not fuel tuition increases; and church schools provide useful competition to public schools, particularly in the areas of values taught. Argues that any incidental benefit of the credit to churches in no way establishes religion, and that equity requires parents to be helped to exercise their right to control their children's education.

*National Association of Independent Schools: Frederick C. Calder, Headmaster, Germantown Friends School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Feb. 15)*

Supports tuition tax credits because they (1) help maintain the rich diversity of national educational resources; (2) enable parents to exercise their constitutional right to choose the kind of education they wish for their children; (3) assist lower and middle-income families to exercise this constitutional right, in particular; (4) channel aid to taxpayers in a fashion which preserves the independence of private schools from undue Governmental regulation; (5) would not encourage resegregation, as most private schools are firmly committed to nondiscriminatory policies and have made special efforts to enroll minority students; (6) the cost of tuition would not be increased to absorb the credit because of the vested interest schools have in low tuition rates; and (7) the credit would not disturb existing incentives for effective performance by private schools.

*National Association of Private Schools for Exceptional Children: Sally Sibley, Standards and Accreditation Chairperson, and Allen Krause, Parent (Feb. 15)*

Support tuition tax credit because private schools are an important part of a pluralistic educational community. Urge clarification of the coverage of special education schools.

*New York State Federation of Catholic School Parents, William P. Gallagher, Executive Director (Feb. 15)*

Supports H.R. 9332, because it would give parents the means to exercise what has been a theoretical right to freedom of choice in education. Maintains that there is value in having diversity in educational institutions, and that private schools provide the only real alternative to public education.

*Monsignor Francis B. Schulte, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Philadelphia (Feb. 15)*

Supports tuition tax credit because of concern over the financial plight of parents who wish to choose a value-centered education for their children but are denied public help in doing so.

*Dr. Thomas Vitullo-Martin, New York, N.Y. (Feb. 15)*

Supports a refundable tuition tax credit as provided in H.R. 9332, but not H.R. 9492, because H.R. 9332 provides substantial relief for lower-income families as well as middle-income families, and because such aid is desirable as encouraging and facilitating attendance at highly cost-effective private schools.

*Hon. Albert H. Quie, Member of Congress, Minnesota (Feb. 16)*

Supports tuition tax credit approach which will benefit parents of elementary and secondary schoolchildren, as well as parents of public schoolchildren who must pay any fee related to their children's education.

*Association of Catholic Teachers, A.F.T. No. 1776, AFL-CIO: John J. Reilly, President, (Feb. 16)*

Supports tuition tax credit because it will allow citizens to exercise their constitutional right to choose their children's education and because it is needed to offset the possibility of non-public school students being forced into the public schools because of economic hardships on their families. Urges that the credit cover tuition paid for vocational and trade education.

*Association for Public Justice James W. Skillen, Director of Research (Feb. 16)*

Supports tuition tax credits because they will enable parents to select schools for their children without a penalty, and because they encourage a diversity in educational opportunities endangered by the failure of Government to support non-public education.

*Christian School Action, Robert J. Billings, President (Feb. 16)*

Supports tuition tax credits which will assist non-public schools because society requires an alternative to the nearly monopolistic position of Government schools, and private schools serve an important economic function by educating over six million students. Suggests wording of the legislation to read "accredited or approved under State law, or, parent approved, abiding by State compulsory attendance laws."

*Coalition of Parents and Teachers of the New Covenant Churches, Arnold, Maryland: Donald Parlett, President (Feb. 16)*

Supports tuition tax credits because (1) they offer parents holding deep convictions a choice against the humanism taught in Government



schools; (2) rising education costs create an economic tyranny for parents to educate their children in public schools, thus forcing parents to submit to Government education of their children for the first 12 years of schooling; (3) it will serve to maintain a variety of educational opportunities now available to the estimated 7.7 million private school students; and (4) it will not enlarge the bureaucratic structure. Requests that the statutory wording be modified to permit either State accreditation or parent approval of schools.

*Diocese of Santa Rosa, California: Rev. Dennis R. Clarke, Superintendent of Schools (Feb. 16)*

Supports the tuition tax credit as a means of assuring parents the fundamental freedom of choice over their children's education, noting that 450,000 students attend such schools in California and that, in one representative school, 80 percent of the families with children enrolled have total annual incomes under \$11,000, 90 percent are minority students, mostly black, and 60 percent are non-Catholic.

*Maryland Federation of Catholic Laity, David Larkin, Vice-President (Feb. 16)*

Supports both H.R. 9332 and H.R. 9492, because tax credits are the only meaningful way to provide economic justice to the children who attend non-public schools and their parents. Contends that a free society does not discharge its educational responsibilities solely by providing Governmental schools, but rather must also provide financial aid for those selecting private schools. Recommends that the size of the credit be reduced without any categories of beneficiaries being eliminated.

*National Forum of Catholic Parents Organizations of the Commission of National Catholic Education Association (Feb. 16)*

Supports tuition tax credits as an approach which uses the Government to insure the diversity of education that the Constitution permits and which States tend to suppress. Feels that the credit will alleviate part of the double educational tax burden of parents who choose to send their children to private schools but must contribute to the costs of public schools.

*Congress of Racial Equality, Victor Solomon, Director of Educational Affairs (Feb. 16)*

Favors tuition tax credits for schools because (1) private schools provide better instruction in basic skills and greater protection of the safety of the students with respect to inner city schools; (2) parents of inner city students should be able to select the type of schools for their children without economic hardship; (3) the credit will stimulate the public schools to improve; (4) the credit will permit black parents to exercise real community control over the schools in their neighborhoods; and (5) the refundability feature of the Frenzel-Burke bill will aid the poor and minority groups.

*Mr. and Mrs. Chandler Cowden, Washington, D.C. (Feb. 17)*

Support the tuition tax credit because it will relieve parents from part of the high cost of private elementary and secondary education for their children.

*Cuyahoga Regional Board of Catholic Education (Ohio), James Rogers, Chairman (Feb. 17)*

Supports the tuition tax credit because it will benefit religious elementary and secondary schools, which provide greater opportunities for educational advancement of minority students than do public schools.

*Lake/Geauga Regional Board of Catholic Education, Joseph Kall, Chairman (Feb. 17)*

Supports tuition tax credits because, absent such relief the continued existence of parochial elementary and secondary schools is in jeopardy.

*National Society for Hebrew Day School—Torah Umesorah: Rabbi Bernard Goldenberg, Associate Director (Feb. 17)*

Supports refundable tuition tax credit because it will relieve the intense financial burden on the middle-income families which are now forcing many of these families to forsake freedom of choice in education. Argues that Jewish day schools are frequently the heart of a community and their loss will mean destruction of the neighborhood and community.

*Western Association of Christian Schools and Valley Christian Schools (Calif.): Thomas G. Peterson, Jr., Business Administrator for the Board of Directors, Valley Christian Schools (Feb. 17)*

Supports S. 2142 because it will bring relief to taxpayers from the burdens of educational costs without establishing an additional bureaucracy.

*Flannigan Whitfield, Austin, Texas (Feb. 17)*

Supports tuition tax credits because they will enable parents to send children to religious schools if they so choose.

*Hon. Daniel P. Moynihan, U.S. Senator, New York (Feb. 21)*

Supports tuition tax credit because it will provide needed relief from the excessive costs of education and because it will benefit all families burdened with these costs while encouraging the traditional values of pluralism and diversity.

*Hon. Bob Packwood, U.S. Senator, Oregon (Feb. 21)*

Supports tuition tax credit because it does not require the recipient to plead poverty in order to obtain Federal assistance, it is uncomplicated, and it will predominantly aid the lower and lower-middle-income families. Feels that any constitutional problems will be resolved in the courts in due course.

*Hon. Lawrence Coughlin, Member of Congress, Pennsylvania (Feb. 21)*

Supports tuition tax credits because they will relieve the burden of educational costs on lower and middle-income American families, and because, if refundable, they will also help those Americans at the poverty level. Also, believes that credits have a low administrative cost and little red-tape.

*Hon. James C. Delaney, Member of Congress, New York (Feb. 21)*

Proposes tuition tax credit of up to \$500 for educational costs as a

nondiscriminatory way of providing much needed financial assistance to parents of school age children.

*Hon. James M. Jeffords, Member of Congress, Vermont (Feb. 21)*

Proposes a refundable tuition tax credit of \$250 per dependent, decreasing to zero as the family income increases between \$30,000 and \$40,000. Indicates that revenue costs would be no more than \$1.075 billion, that benefits would be targeted to lower and middle-income families, and that the administration of the tax credit would be both simple and fair.

*Hon. Thomas A. Luken, Member of Congress, Ohio (Feb. 21)*

Supports the tuition credit proposals by Congressmen Delaney and Frenzel because they are simple to administer, avoid bureaucratic red-tape, and will ease the tax burden of those who pay for both public and private schools.

*Hon. J. Danforth Quayle, Member of Congress, Indiana (Feb. 21)*

Supports a refundable tuition tax credit for one-half of the tuition costs of an individual, up to \$500, because it is equitable, benefitting mostly poor and middle-income families, and because it will require no additional administrative burdens.

*Hon. Tom RAILSBACK, Member of Congress, Illinois (Feb. 21)*

Supports the tuition credit provided in H.R. 9332, because (1) it will halt the threatened exclusion of the poor and middle-income Americans from the opportunity of attending private educational institutions; (2) it will prevent the increased cost of public schools caused by private school closings; (3) it will encourage freedom of choice among parents; and (4) it will be constitutional.

*Hon. Ron Marlenee, Member of Congress, Montana (written statement)*

Supports the Frenzel proposal, H.R. 10207, which would permit a tax credit of 50 percent for all tuition paid, up to \$500 per student, because it is equitable, it relieves low-income families of some of the burden of educational costs, and it includes coverage of technical and vocational schools.

*Hon. Guy Vander Jagt, Member of Congress, Michigan (written statement)*

Supports H.R. 10316, providing a refundable tuition tax credit, because it will ease the financial burden on lower and middle-income families created by the high cost of education, and because it will preserve the desired diversity and social vitality of an educational selection.

*Hon. James R. Thompson, Governor, State of Illinois (written statement)*

Urges support for tax credit concept because it would both encourage pursuit of education and training, and it would help parents and students meet their share of educational costs. Also believes the Congress should examine the coordination of State and Federal educational programs.



*Joseph K. Bush, Phoenix, Arizona (written statement)*

Urges support for tuition tax credits because they will prove pluralism which may lead to improved public schools, due to increased competition.

*Joseph F. Geitzen, Scottsdale, Arizona (written statement)*

Supports Packwood-Moynihan tuition tax credit proposal.

*Andre A. Le Roux, Phoenix, Arizona (written statement)*

Supports tuition tax credit proposals.

*Robert R. Russell, Phoenix, Arizona (written statement)*

Supports tuition tax credit proposals for tuition paid to parochial schools.

*National Association of Private Schools for Exceptional Children:*

*Sally A. Sibley, Standards and Accreditation Chairperson, and Alan Krause, Parent (written statement)*

Support tuition tax credits for elementary and secondary schools because credits would provide relief for parents of handicapped children who have to use private schools because of delays in enrolling children in special public school programs or because of the inadequacy and inappropriateness of public programs for specific handicaps, and because credits would help support the pluralistic educational system. Also, suggests that some express reference be made in the legislation assuring its application to schools for handicapped children.

*E. G. West, Professor of Economics, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada (written statement)*

Supports a refundable tuition tax credit for 50 percent of tuition costs, up to \$500 per student (Packwood-Moynihan bill) because (1) it would spread benefits among all economic classes; (2) it would significantly increase the educational choices of the poor; (3) its costs, estimated at \$4.7 billion in 1980, would be undercut by reduced costs of public schools due to competition from private schools increasing their efficiency, and by the returns from increased investment in human capital formation; and (4) it would remove some of the burdens from the student loan program, already at an ebb of efficiency as evidenced by the default rate.

*Kenashans Concerned for Their Schools, Jil Wilson, President (written statement)*

Supports both H.R. 9332 and S. 2142, if the requirement of accreditation is changed to require only that the school fulfills the compulsory attendance laws of the State, if the bill is amended so that no school can be labeled a "recipient school" solely because parents receive the tax credit, if and the bill assures that private schools will be free from Government control in development of their curriculum, particularly in matters of moral or value systems and religious views supported by the parents of school students.

*Nativity B. V. M. Home and School Association, Raymond E. DeVries, Jr., President (written statement)*

Supports tuition tax credits because they (1) assist a group who have been unfairly treated in the past; (2) allow each student and his or her parents to select from among a large number of accredited educa-



tional institutions, rather than only those with low cost; (3) force all institutions receiving public funds to become cost effective, due to increased competition from private schools; and (4) aid the elderly and pensioners whose property taxes are being increased to finance public education.

*John J. Ridgway, Jr., Manoa, Pennsylvania (written statement)*

Supports a tuition tax credit of up to \$500 per student for tuition paid to accredited schools, because it will relieve middle-income families of part of the high cost of education, permit their exercise of a constitutional right to free choice among educational alternatives, and because it will provide competition for public schools, creating a yardstick against which public schools will have to be measured.

*Richard E. Ruane, Rosemont, Pennsylvania (written statement)*

Favors tuition tax relief as a means of eliminating the inequity of some taxpayers having to pay to support two school systems, while others only pay to support one system, and because it will improve the public schools by introducing an element of competition.

*University of San Francisco Center for Research on Private Education, Donald A. Erickson, Director (written statement)*

Supports tuition tax credits because (1) private schools provide education for the lower-income families, indicating that in 1975, only 17.5 percent of private elementary school students came from families with incomes above \$15,000 (1967 dollars) and 34.4 percent came from families with incomes under \$7,500, and that among private secondary schools, 61.7 percent of the students came from families with incomes above \$15,000, as compared to 38.4 percent for public secondary schools; (2) the average family paying for private education for its children also pays for public schools through State and local taxes; (3) private schools are increasing their minority enrollment, with a rise from 4.8 percent in 1970-71 to 7.2 percent in 1976-77, due to intentional enrollment efforts; (4) Catholic elementary schools are often more accessible to urban, low-income families than is commonly believed; (5) the per-pupil dollar distribution is greater and more equitable in private schools, with lower-income students benefitting more and gaining more in basic skills than in public schools; (6) the achievement gap between children from high-status and low-status families is narrower in private schools than in public schools; and (7) the per-pupil cost of Catholic private schools is only 59.8 percent of that of public schools.

*Wyoming Seminary, Board of Trustees: Frank M. Henry, Chairman, Richard L. Pearsall, Secretary, and Wallace F. Stettler, President (written statement)*

Support H.R. 9492, providing a tuition tax credit, because it will enable parents to choose the type of education they desire for their children.

***b. Those opposing tax credits for elementary/secondary education***

*Department of the Treasury: Hon. Donald C. Lubick, Acting Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy (Feb. 14)*

Opposes tax credits because of their high cost, estimated at about \$4.5 billion in 1980, because they would cause a drop in public school enrollment and a charge of tuition in public schools, and because they would have an adverse effect on desegregation. Also, states that because of the absence of a phase-out provision in the credit proposals, some of the benefits would flow to higher-income families with children in elite private schools.

*Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Andrew Leigh Gunn, Executive Director and Edd Doerr, Educational Relations Director (Feb. 14)*

Oppose the tuition tax credits because they (1) would be expensive, especially since future tuition increases would bring political pressure for increasing the tax credits already estimated to cost \$4.7 to \$6 billion; (2) would be unconstitutional under *Nyquist*; (3) would cause political division along religious lines and foster sectarian division in education, leading to a decline in interfaith and community harmony; (4) would harm the cause of racial integration and worsen public school imbalances; (5) favor the more affluent segments of the population who can afford to send their children to private schools; (6) enhance the academic position of private schools *vis a vis* public schools; (7) favor large religious bodies able to assemble enough students for a private school, over small denominations; (8) encourage the religious, ethnic and class balkanization of American society because of the relative homogeneity of religious schools, leaving the public schools "wastebaskets" for poor, minority, handicapped and behavior problem children; (9) diminish freedom of religious schools; (10) lead to expenditure of public funds without public accountability; and (11) be contrary to the public will, as expressed in recent State referenda.

Urges that if the bill is adopted, it be modified to exclude religious elementary and secondary schools and pervasively sectarian colleges.

*National Education Association, John Ryor, President (Feb. 14)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because they (1) would deprive the Government of funds needed for direct financial aid; (2) would benefit only parents of 5.6 million nonpublic school children, while the parents of 43.9 million school children would receive no aid; (3) the benefits would flow to the more affluent segments of the public; (4) would fragment national educational policies; (5) would thwart national policies of desegregation; and (6) would be unconstitutional.

*Wisconsin Education Association, Paul du Vair, President (Feb. 14)*

Opposes tuition tax credit approach because (1) Federal funds ought to be expended solely on public schools; (2) other Federal education aid funds may be reduced to compensate for the cost of the credit; (3) the credit does not address itself to the particular needs of lower and lower-middle-income families but, rather, benefits the families with greater wealth; (4) it is unconstitutional; (5) public schools need the funds more seriously than do private schools; and (6) other incentives are better.

Suggests greater Federal aid to public schools, long-term low-interest loans to low and middle-income families based upon need and income, a tax rebate for those attending public colleagues in order to facilitate loan repayment, and greater eligibility for direct aid.

*Americans United for Separation of Church and State (Rochester Chapter) and New York State Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Eric M. Steel, President and Vice-President, Respectively (Feb. 15)*

Opposes S. 2142 and H.R. 9332 because (1) they are unconstitutional, regardless of their aiding more institutions than merely parochial schools; (2) they will divide society along religious lines; (3) the private schools will not be eliminated without this support; and (4) children from those few private schools which might be eliminated without this support could be accommodated in the public schools. Contends that religious dogmas should not be propagated at public expense.

*Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty, Florence Flast, Chairperson (Feb. 15)*

Opposes all tax credit bills because (1) parents have the right to choose a private or religious education for their children, but not to demand a share of public funds to subsidize private education; (2) the proposals are unconstitutional; (3) the private schools are not pluralistic but, rather, elitist; (4) private schools have continued racial segregation of urban areas; (5) private schools do not save money for the public but, rather, reduce the available support for public schools; (6) public schools are not an educational monopoly but, rather, a varied group of institutions; and (7) tax credits would be a powerful incentive to the proliferation of private and religious schools, encouraging racial, class, religious, ethnic, and economic segregation, eventually leaving public schools the home of only the poor and disadvantaged.

*National Association of Laity, Joseph T. Skehan, President (Feb. 15)*

Opposes tuition tax credit proposals because (1) they would provide aid in a haphazard form, undercutting existing student aid programs; (2) they would subsidize parochial schools in a fashion requiring no public accountability, and the schools could simply raise tuition to absorb the credit absent such accountability; (3) the credits are unconstitutional; (4) the credits subsidize one side of an ongoing religious struggle within the Catholic church over the nature of parochial schools; and (5) parochial schools have made no serious effort to reduce racism and serious ethnic discrimination.



*National Council of Jewish Women, Ray Tucker, Co-Chairman of the Workgroup on Constitutional Rights of the National Affairs Committee (Feb. 15)*

Opposes tuition tax credit proposal in H.R. 9332 for constitutional reasons. Also objects because the credit would siphon public revenues from the public school system, and because the cost of the credit is prohibitive in light of the pressing national needs, such as welfare, health insurance, and higher employment.

*Preserve Our Public Schools, Carol Holt, Executive Secretary (Feb. 15)*

Opposes all proposals providing aid to parents of nonpublic school-children because private schools are not publicly accountable, selecting students on their own criteria and spending their money as they see fit, and the credit would mean a reduction in the funds available for public schools. Also, feels such proposals are unconstitutional.

*Monroe Citizens for Public Education and Religious Liberty, Martha Laties, Chairman (Feb. 16)*

Opposes tax credits because (1) use of Government funds to support nonpublic schools weakens the public schools; (2) public schools, which cannot select their students, will tend to become refuges for children no private school will accept; (3) Federal funding will speed up the decline of public schools already in trouble and initiate the decline of others; and (4) funding of public schools only is demanded by the preservation of religious liberty and protection of the constitution.

*National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Ann Kahn, Secretary (Feb. 16)*

Opposes tuition tax credits and related tax measures because (1) such legislation violates the central role which the public educational system has played in the American democracy; (2) it would invariably and inevitably cut deeply into funds available for public schools; (3) it would pose a long-run financial threat to public schools on the local level through weakening the political and financial support for them among the public; and (4) it would subsidize a choice for the private school system at the expense of the public schools, forcing children out of the public schools and into private schools because of a decline in public school quality.

*National School Boards Association, Will D. Davis, President (Feb. 16)*

Opposes proposed tuition tax credits because (1) they threaten to erode the nation's public school system by draining taxpayer and Congressional support; (2) they will result in resegregating the public schools by race and economic class; (3) they will result in a disparity in accountability of those receiving Federal educational assistance; (4) they would not meet the separation of Church and State standards set forth by the Supreme Court; and (5) they would neither provide eventual tax savings nor benefit the lower-middle-income families.

*National Women's Conference of the American Ethical Union, Betty Lea Bront, President (Feb. 16)*

Opposes vigorously the use of public money for support of non-public schools because (1) it violates the principle of separation of Church and State, principally benefitting Catholic schools; (2) it would weaken the focus of the democratic society; (3) it would foster segregation practiced in parochial and private schools; (4) it would constitute a grant of Federal funds for a small, privileged class at the majority's expense; and (5) it constitutes sanction of segregated education of a 10-percent minority by a 90-percent majority of taxpayers.

*Ohio Free Schools Association, Gaston D. Cogdell, Associate Executive Director (Feb. 17)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because they constitute compulsory public support of religious organization and churches, with which the schools are affiliated. Contends that parochial schools discriminate on the basis of class, religious, ethnicity and other grounds, and believes tax credits would eventually lead to Federal control over religious schools.

*Hon. Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Member of Congress, Ohio (Feb. 21)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because (1) they would be contrary to the public desire to simplify the tax laws; (2) they would be inequitable because they would apply only to children in private schools and benefit higher-income groups more; (3) they would promote racial segregation in public schools by encouraging shift of middle and higher-income children to private schools, eroding the local taxpayer support for public schools; (4) they would be held unconstitutional as a violation of the doctrine of separation of Church and State; and (5) they would add to an already too-large Federal budget deficit.

*American Association of School Administrators (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because they will (1) drain other funds from public schools; (2) cost the average taxpayer more in lost revenues; (3) result in decreased public school enrollment, forcing curtailment of services for students in public schools; (4) be difficult to monitor and evaluate because they will be in the tax code, rather than through direct expenditures; and (5) create two segregated school systems—one white and affluent and one nonwhite and poor.

*American Atheists of Wisconsin, Al Haugen, State Director (written statement)*

Opposes Packwood-Moynihan bill and the entire tuition tax credit concept because it will lead to a breakdown in the separation of Church and State, its cost is prohibitive, and taxpayers will be required to have their taxes support a philosophy alien to them, contrary to the First Amendment of the Constitution. Favors concentration on upgrading present public schools.

*Thelma S. Kent, Kenmore, New York (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits for elementary and secondary schools because they would impair the public education system and because they would violate the principle of separation of Church and State.

*American Civil Liberties Union: John M. Swomley, Jr., Professor of Social Ethics, St. Paul School of Theology, Kansas City, Missouri (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because they induce parents to send their children to private, parochial schools at the expense of the taxpaying public, they will primarily benefit middle and upper-middle income families for whom private school is a status symbol, and they will induce churches not presently charging tuition to do so.

*American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), Walter G. Davis, Director of Education (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because (1) they will provide avenues of evasion of integration of the public schools, by subsidizing those schools with discriminatory admissions policies; (2) they will drain needed budgetary funds from an already inadequate Federal education support program, since credits are expected to cost \$4.7 billion in 1980, or 35 percent of the Federal outlays in that year for all educational institutions (and double the amount expended for the Basic Opportunity Grant Program); (3) they will provide a windfall for the wealthy, since about 25 percent of the benefits will go to 10 percent of the taxpayers, those with incomes above \$30,000, and little help will be provided for those most in need; and (4) they will neither reduce the rising cost of higher education nor promote the goals of tax equity and simplification.

*Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Syracuse Chapter: Elizabeth M. Zahora, President (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because they oblige a majority to support the private choice of a minority, reduce the incentive for improving public schools, and reduce diversity in education.

*Sue Arenz, Sheboygan, Wisconsin (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because they would fragment elementary and secondary education to the detriment of public schools, and because they would violate the principle of separation of Church and State.

*Mrs. Jean Arenz, Sheboygan, Wisconsin (written statement)*

Opposes tax credits because they violate the principle of separation of Church and State, and because the Government should support only public schools which promote friendly relations and break down prejudices.

*Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, James E. Wood, Jr., Executive Director (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because (1) the relief is only marginal but it would open the door to divisive struggles when increases in the credit were later sought; (2) existing educational support programs would be threatened by the high cost of the tax credits; (3) private elementary and secondary schools, most of which are religious in nature, would be given a significant advantage over the public schools with respect to recruiting and retaining students, leaving the less gifted to the public school system; (4) tuition increases would erode



the benefits of the credit; and (5) the credits are inequitable and regressive.

*Dorothy N. and B. Wilson Battey, Webster, New York (written statement)*

Oppose all tuition tax credit proposals for costs of nonpublic school attendance, because they require taxpayers to pay for teaching ideas and opinions with which they do not believe and because they breach the separation of Church and State.

*Orrington E. Dwyer, Pemaquid, Maine (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits as contrary to the public desires and as unfair and contrary to the needs of national life.

*Gordon N. Ebersole, Tonawanda, New York (written statement)*

Opposes Packwood-Moynihan bill because it would provide money for sectarian schools in contravention of the doctrine of separation of Church and State.

*Mrs. Durland L. Kent, Kenmore, New York (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because they violate the principle of separation of Church and State, and because they are inequitable.

*Mrs. Ernest W. Levin, Northport, New York (written statement)*

Believes that tuition tax credits for parents sending children to parochial schools is contrary to the principle of separation of Church and State, and that parents should not be forced to pay taxes to support private education of a religious nature.

*Alice F. Marsh, Flushing, New York (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits for parochial schools since a taxpayer has the option to send children to public schools and should pay separately for the right to use private schools, and because tax credits for private school tuition would injure the public school system.

*Evelyn Peterson, West Allis, Wisconsin (written statement)*

Opposes H.R. 9932, which would provide a maximum credit of \$500 per student, because it will weaken the public school system, create division, and divert attention from the needs of public schools.

*Madeline H. Rapp and May B. Root, Tonawanda, New York (written statement)*

Oppose tuition tax credits for parochial schools because they violate the doctrine of separation of Church and State.

*Lois R. Sprague and Emmett H. Sprague, Rochester, New York (written statement)*

Oppose tuition tax credits because (1) they are too expensive; (2) they will undermine public schools, hurting the middle-income families who depend upon public schools; (3) they will help the rich and upper-middle class; (4) they violate the right to religious freedom by increasing the tax burden of those who do not send children to religious schools, stating that 95 percent of all private elementary and secondary schools are religious in nature; (5) they grant preferential Government assistance to some religions and not to others; (6) they benefit schools which operate without restraint on discriminatory admissions policies; and (7) they would polarize our society.



*United Parents Associations (written statement)*

Opposes any tuition tax credits as unfair, unconstitutional, and because they will hurt the public school system which should be more strongly supported by the Federal Government. Notes also that the non-public schools in New York City have a much lower racial mixture than the public schools, with non-public schools having 25 percent minority students and public schools having 67 percent minority students.

*Dorothy L. and Ervin S. Yanke, New Berlin, Wisconsin*

Strongly oppose tuition tax credits for parochial schools because they impair freedom of religion.

## B. TAX DEDUCTION PROPOSALS

### 1. *Those favoring tax deductions*

*Hon. Thomas N. Kindness, Member of Congress, Ohio (Feb. 21)*

Proposes tax deductions for tuition expenses of higher education to the extent they exceed 3 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, because use of the tax system promotes simple administration, the increase in education will reduce joblessness, the revenue loss is only \$503 million, and, unlike credits, it would be targeted to families with incomes between \$15,000 and \$25,000.

*Hon. Frank Annunzio, Member of Congress, Illinois (written statement)*

Proposes an itemized income tax deduction for one-half of qualified post-secondary educational costs of the taxpayer's children, incurred in attendance at an accredited institution, because the cost of higher education is rapidly growing, having risen 77 percent between 1967 and 1976, and continues to increase, causing a major burden on the middle-income taxpayer. Notes, also, that the Federal Government has traditionally taken an active role in promoting post-secondary education, and that the average cost of tuition at a private educational institution in 1976-1978 was about \$2,500 a year.

### 2. *Those opposing tax deductions*

*Department of the Treasury: Hon. Donald C. Lubick, Acting Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy (Feb. 14)*

Opposes tax deduction for tuition because it would duplicate the administration of education policies among the various Federal agencies, it would not be measured by family need, and because it would give more benefits to families with higher incomes and higher marginal tax rates.

*National Student Lobby, Joel Packer, Legislative Director (Feb. 16)*

Opposes tuition tax deductions, though agreeing with the goals of the legislation.

## C. TAX DEFERRAL PROPOSALS

### **1. Those favoring tax deferral**

*American Council on Education, Jack W. Peltason, President (Feb. 14)*

Supports H.R. 3268, providing for tax deferral, because such a program could eventually be self-supporting if interest is charged on the deferred taxes; and if the program is coupled with a tax credit (or if it is adopted alone), it would provide widespread relief to the middle-income family from the high cost of education.

*Hon. Abner J. Mikva, Member of Congress, Illinois (Feb. 21)*

Proposes (in H.R. 3268) a tax deferral of up to \$1,000 per student, phased-in to eventually provide a maximum deferral of \$2,000 per student, excluding graduate students. Argues that this would relieve students and their families of the financial pressure of college or university costs. Would favor combining tax deferral program with direct aid increases.

### **2. Those opposing tax deferral**

*Department of the Treasury: Hon. Donald C. Lubick, Acting Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy (Feb. 14)*

Opposes deferral of income taxes for educational expenses because, while it would provide some relief from the liquidity problem of middle-income families, it would require extensive administrative coordination between the Treasury Department and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

*National Education Association, John Ryor, President (Feb. 14)*

Opposes a tax deferral program because (1) the Federal Government presently provides inadequate support for public education and should not, therefore, provide subsidies for a duplicative nonpublic school system, estimating that a tax deferral plan of \$1,500 a year would result in a tax loss of \$8.8 billion in its early years; (2) deferral programs would benefit only a minority of the student population, reaching only 27 percent of the elementary, secondary and post-secondary students; (3) tax deferrals are not efficient or effective in reducing the financial burdens on the middle-class caused by college costs; (4) tax deferrals are unconstitutional; (5) tax deferrals at elementary and secondary levels thwart national desegregation policies; and (6) tax deferrals further fragment Federal educational policies.

## D. EDUCATION "SAVINGS" PLAN PROPOSALS

### 1. Those favoring education "savings" plans

*National Association of Life Underwriters, John P. Meehan, CLU, Boston, Massachusetts (Feb. 17)*

Proposes a "higher education funding act," which would provide for tax-deductible contributions to an educational savings plan, providing for mandatory distributions within five years of completion of secondary school. Contributions would be limited and distributions for educational purposes would be tax-free.

*Hon. James M. Jeffords, Member of Congress, Vermont (Feb. 21)*

Proposes establishment of individual educational trust funds, contributions to which would be deductible and expenditures from which would not be taxed. Up to \$1,000 could be contributed annually. States that this would cost approximately \$1 billion a year, it would target benefits to middle and lower-income families, it would be simple and easy to administer, and it would encourage self-sufficiency and capital accumulations.

*Hon. Guy Vander Jagt, Member of Congress, Michigan (written statement)*

Supports H.R. 6741, providing an incentive to save for future educational costs, because it will ease the financial burden on lower and middle-income families caused by the high cost of education, and because it will preserve the diversity and social vitality of an educational selection.

### 2. Those opposing education "savings" plans

*Department of the Treasury: Hon. Donald C. Lubick, Acting Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy (Feb. 14)*

Opposes educational "savings" plans because their benefits increase as the taxpayer's marginal income tax rate increases, and because it would be impossible to ascertain whether there was actually any increase in a taxpayer's savings because of it or whether the deduction was merely taken for addition to regular savings.

## E. TAX TREATMENT OF EMPLOYEE EDUCATION EXPENSES

*American Society for Training and Development, Robert L. Craig, Director of Communications (Feb. 17)*

Urges support for S. 2388, providing exclusion of employer educational assistance from an employee's taxable income because the present law is difficult for employers to administer, and because it conflicts with the objectives and goals of affirmative action programs designed to raise employees to higher and better jobs.

*Gerlad W. Padwe, Associate National Director—Tax Services, Touche Ross & Co., (Feb. 17)*

Recommends exclusion of educational expenses of an employee paid directly or reimbursed by an employer, and a clear, unambiguous statement of employer deductibility of such payments. Suggests that this could be coupled with nondiscrimination guidelines, preventing an employer from favoring officers and highly-compensated employees. Feels the present law encourages mediocrity and penalizes ambition, as well as being administratively complex.

*American Hospital Association (written statement)*

Supports S. 2388, which provides that employees are not taxed on employer-provided tuition assistance, because (1) it removes a present discouragement against employee maximization of abilities and productivity through educational programs; (2) it benefits the national economy by increasing the earning potential of those employees who engage in such programs; and (3) because it will hold down health care by increasing productivity of hospital employees and decreasing their turnover.



## F. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES REGARDING EDUCATION TAX BENEFIT PROPOSALS

*Agudath Israel of America. Rabbi Morris Sherer, President (Feb. 14)*

Believes tax credits for parochial schools would be constitutional because the aid is given to the people, not to the schools, and because it is simple to administer.

*William B. Ball, Attorney, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania (Feb. 14)*

Feels that the constitutionality of H.R. 9332, providing tuition tax credits, must be considered in light of both the establishment of religion clause and those values protected by the free exercise of religion clause, and the freedoms of mind and parental nurture protected by the Fifth and Ninth Amendments. States that fundamental freedoms of parents to educate their children in nonpublic schools is well established but that economic pressures make these freedoms empty for many, and that the credit could be constitutional as a means of assisting parents to exercise this freedom. Also, indicates that the establishment clause question must be weighed against the constitutional values protected by the credit and that the Supreme Court, based on its past decisions, would not find H.R. 9332 to advance religion because the benefits flow to no single class or single religious group but, rather, to individuals.

Urges that the bill be amended to remove the requirement that a private school must be accredited under State law, in order to prevent State interference in the supervision of private schools, and suggests that the standard be either tax-exempt status of the institution or compliance with the compulsory attendance law of a State as defined in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, section 801(j).

*Federation of Catholic Teachers, Local 2092 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO: Harold J. T. Isenberg, President (Feb. 14)*

Contends that a refundable tuition tax credit is constitutional under the establishment clause, by the primary effect test set forth by the Supreme Court in *Allen*, citing many existing forms of indirect assistance to non-public institutions, such as R.O.T.C., School Lunch Act, Higher Education Facilities Act, Higher Education Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

*National Education Association, John Ryor, President (Feb. 14)*

Objects to tax benefits for nonpublic schools as unconstitutional, on the grounds that excusing individuals from tax obligations in order that they may practice their religion is advancement of religion in contravention of the establishment of religion clause. Feels that the unconstitutionality of tax credits for elementary and secondary tuition costs was firmly established in *Nyquist*, in which the Supreme Court

rejected the idea that the benefits are constitutional because they inure to the parents rather than the schools. Also, suggests that tax benefits are unconstitutional at the college level because they portend increased government funding in the future.

*National Coalition for Public Education and Religious Liberty, Leo Pfeffer, General Counsel (Feb. 15)*

Argues that both S. 2142 and H.R. 9332 are unconstitutional with respect to aid provided elementary and secondary school students, citing three Supreme Court decisions and one recent District Court decision, holding unconstitutional various forms of tax benefit programs including tax credits for tuition paid to parochial schools.

Also, views bills as unconstitutional with respect to aid to college and university students because of the uncertainty of the Supreme Court's standards regarding permissible public aid at this level. Feels a tuition tax credit would be constitutional if it were limited to tuition paid to colleges and universities performing essentially secular functions and which do not discriminate on religious grounds. Argues that Congress has a responsibility not to enact unconstitutional measures. Suggests that a constitutional amendment is the proper recourse where Congress believes the Court to be incorrect, and indicates that voters have rejected such amendments to State constitutions in 12 States.

*National Council of Jewish Women, Ray Tucker, Co-Chairman of the Workgroup on Constitutional Rights of the National Affairs Council (Feb. 15)*

Believes that H.R. 9332 is unconstitutional to the extent it provides tax credits for tuition to elementary and secondary schools, noting that the Supreme Court held, in *Nyquist*, that a tax credit for tuition paid to religious schools is but an indirect method of applying public revenues for private religious purposes, and prohibited by the First Amendment.

*Preserve Our Public Schools, Carol Holt, Executive Secretary (Feb. 15)*

Considers that aid-to-parent schemes to be unconstitutional under the First Amendment because all such plans reimburse parents only where they have paid tuition to private schools, making the parents mere conduits for payments to the schools. Also, asserts that such public subsidy threatens the independence of private schools, noting that the Wisconsin Lutheran Synod, the Baptists, and the Seventh Day Adventists oppose such aid for that reason.

*Professor William D. Valente, Villanova University School of Law (Feb. 15)*

Argues that tax credit legislation is constitutional in light of the fact that the Supreme Court's prior decisions have not barred the door to all public aid to parochial schools and that in no previous case has the Court considered a tax credit scheme as comprehensive as that pending in Congress. Asserts that the critical element in *Nyquist* was the narrowly sectarian class of recipients and concludes that the present legislation benefits a broader class and therefore would be constitutional. Also negates the contention that the proposals would be unconstitutional as fostering racial discrimination, but suggests that



the bill might be amended to disallow the credit for tuition paid to institutions practicing discrimination.

*David J. Young, Partner, Dunbar, Kienzle, & Murphey, Columbus, Ohio (Feb. 15)*

Contends that H.R. 9332 is constitutional because the critical element in a constitutional evaluation of this type of program is that the class aided is not primarily sectarian, in which case the Court will view it as a general welfare program. Notes that the Supreme Court reserved this determination in *Nyquist* and that it recently upheld a lower court decision sustaining a State college aid program assisting students at public and private colleges. Also cites examples of programs upheld, including the veterans' assistance program, the Indian education program, in *Quick Bear v. Leupp*, the program for education of pages, assistance program for R.O.T.C. Students, the exemption afforded religious and charitable organizations under the tax law and the charitable contributions deduction, as evidence that Congress frequently includes religious organizations under general aid programs.

*Hon. James M. Jeffords, Member of Congress, Vermont (Feb 21)*

Feels that a tuition tax credit or tuition educational savings program would be constitutional under the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment.

*Hon. Tom Railsback, Member of Congress, Illinois (Feb. 21)*

Believes that the tuition tax credit provided by H.R. 9332 is constitutional, easily meeting the secular purpose and nonentanglement tests set forth by the Supreme Court, and that it is sufficiently distinguishable from the situation in *Nyquist*. Asserts that the Court specifically reserved this type of plan in *Nyquist* with respect to student aid programs made available without regard to the sectarian—nonsectarian, or public—nonpublic nature of the institution. Further, argues that the critical element in *Nyquist* was the narrowness of the class benefitted by the program, and that the expanded class that would be benefitted by H.R. 9332, would enable the tuition tax credit to be upheld as constitutional.

*Hon. Austin J. Murphy, Member of Congress, Pennsylvania (written statement)*

Believes that a tuition tax credit would be constitutional because it would be secular in purpose and neither advance nor inhibit religion.

*Hon. Guy Vander Jagt, Member of Congress, Michigan (written statement)*

Believes that tuition tax benefits would be constitutional because they would apply commonly to all taxpayers, whether their dependents attended public or private institutions, noting that the Supreme Court's decisions in this area do not foreclose a general credit of this nature.

*American Humanist Association, Bette Chambers, President (written statement)*

Believes that a tuition tax credit proposed in the Packwood-Moynihan bill would be unconstitutional because it provides funding for religious activities of schools.

*E. G. West, Professor of Economics, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada (written statement)*

Believes that a tuition tax credit, such as that proposed in the Packwood-Moynihan bill, would be constitutional because, under the rationale that the individuals themselves contribute public funds in the first place, the credit is merely the cancelling-out of a previously prohibited act of Government against parochial schools, and an attempt by Government to provide a financial facility under which families could borrow money against a pledge of their future income.

*American Association of School Administrators (written statement)*

View tax credits as unconstitutional under *Nyquist, Grit v. Wolman*, and *Franchise Tax Board v. United Americans*, striking down different tax subsidy programs for nonpublic school students and parents, noting also that a District Court in *Public Funds for Public Schools v. Byrne*, recently held (February, 1978) that a tax deduction for nonpublic elementary education violated *Nyquist*. Also, note that the Supreme Court has held that exclusion of parochial schools from tax funding did not violate the parents' constitutional rights to enroll their children in such schools.

*American Civil Liberties Union: John M. Swomley, Jr., Professor of Social Ethics, St. Paul School of Theology, Kansas City, Missouri (written statement)*

Believes that the proposed tuition tax credit would be unconstitutional because (1) it lacks a secular purpose, noting that it was first proposed to the Congress in 1971 by Bishop William E. McMannus and that the proposals do not apply to the extra-curricular expenses of students in public schools; (2) its primary effect is advancement of religion, since it is available only to children receiving week-day religious education, rather than summer school or week-end education, and since the bills do not preclude application to schools with practice religious discrimination; and (3) it creates excessive entanglement with religion, since Government would have to check Church school financial records to ascertain whether the credits were applied to religious or nonreligious activities, and because religious leaders would eventually seek Congressional action to increase the credits.

*Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Syracuse Chapter: Elizabeth M. Zahora, President (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits because, as 95 percent of nonpublic schools are religiously affiliated, the credit would be unconstitutional as compulsory taxation to foster religious beliefs of some individuals.

*Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, James E. Wood, Jr., Executive Director (written statement)*

Believes the proposed tax credit bills would be unconstitutional under *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, as the credit is a law respecting establishment of religion and it has an effect of promoting religion, and because it will necessarily lead to excessive entanglement of Government with religion when IRS administrators make continuing determinations of the degree of religious permeation in a school's curriculum.

*Lee Heimlich, Bronx, New York (written statement)*

Believes the Packwood-Moynihan bill, S. 2142, is unconstitutional under *Nyquist*.

*Ruth M. Merket, Buffalo, New York (written statement)*

Considers tuition tax credits to be unconstitutional.

*Missouri Coalition for Public Education and Religious Liberty, Hugh Wamble, President (written statement)*

Believes the proposed tuition tax credits are unconstitutional as a public grant of funds to religious institutions, and that they are based on an invalid notion that private education is a public purpose.

*Preserve Our Public Schools, Thiensville, Wisconsin: Carol Holt, Executive Secretary (written statement)*

Opposes tuition tax credits for parochial education as unconstitutional, under *Nyquist* and *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, because they would use Federal dollars to aid parochial schools.

*Rev. Alfred W. Swan, Madison Wisconsin (written statement)*

Feels that S. 2142, the Packwood-Moynihan bill, would be unconstitutional.



## II. COMMENTS REGARDING NON-TAX EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROPOSALS

### A. ADMINISTRATION'S EDUCATION FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROPOSALS

#### 1. *Those favoring*

*Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Hon. Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Secretary (Feb. 14)*

Endorses the Administration proposal because it meets the tuition problems of lower and middle-income families, including the liquidity dilemma of middle-income families, and because it provides for a consistent administration of college aid programs.

*American Council on Education, Jack Peltason (Feb. 14)*

Indicates that this proposal would target aid directly to those students with the greatest need.

*National Education Association, John Ryor, President (Feb. 14)*

Supports expansion of existing student assistance programs as a more effective and less expensive way of channeling funds to the middle-income parent, without expressly supporting the Administration proposals.

*Wisconsin Education Association, Paul du Vair, President (Feb. 14)*

Supports the Administration proposal because it benefits low-income families more directly than would tax incentives.

*American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, John E. Tirrell, Vice President for Governmental Affairs (Feb. 15)*

States that middle-income families are in need of assistance and that expansion of existing programs is a feasible means of providing such assistance, either by itself or in combination with tax credits. Urges that the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program be expanded to middle-income families while protecting current recipients by removing the one-half cost limitation and requiring that those who would have received grants under the present law have priority in the case of less than full funding. Argues that mere expansion of the loan program would not help middle-income families because it does not actually reduce the cost of college.

*Coalition of Independent College and University Students, Lawrence S. Zaglaniczny, National Director (Feb. 15)*

Supports the Administration proposal for expanding existing student aid programs to help finance college education, as preferable to tax credit approach, because it is less costly and would give more "bang for the buck."

*Great Lakes Colleges Association, Jon W. Fuller, President (Feb. 15)*

Urges support for the Administration proposal, believing that the needs of the middle-income family may best be met by Federal educational assistance related to the level of need.

*John Hopkins University, Stephen Muller, President (Feb. 15)*

Supports expansion of existing student aid programs as a preferable solution to help the financial plight of middle-income families, noting that the Administration's proposal will not provide much help for students at private institutions since most of them are from families with incomes above \$25,000.

*National Council of Jewish Women, Ray Tucker, Co-Chairman of the Workgroup on Constitutional Rights of the National Affairs Committee (Feb. 15)*

Supports expansion of existing grants-in-aid and guaranteed loan programs, as proper and equitable means of meeting financial problems of middle-income families.

*Taxation with Representation, Thomas J. Reese, Legislative Director (Feb. 15)*

Supports expansion of Guaranteed Student Loan Program, as preferable to tax credits, because family financial need is primarily a short-term cash flow problem with respect to college costs. Considers loans to be more effective in meeting this problem because they can be larger than tax credits and some costs of repayment may be borne by the students after graduation.

*Independent Colleges and Universities of Indiana, Wallace B. Graves, President (Feb. 16)*

Supports the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program to offset the increased inaccessibility of higher education for middle-income families, believing this program is the soundest means by which a blend of governmental and nongovernmental institutions may be retained. Recommends funding this program on the scale proposed by the Administration, and that the schedule of payments limits currently fixed at a maximum of \$2,800 be increased to \$4,800 per year.

*Edward Blankstein, President, Edward Blankstein, Inc., Princeton, N.J. (Feb. 17)*

Approves the Administration's proposal but not to the exclusion of the tax credit concept, feeling that both are needed to meet the financial needs of lower and middle-income families.

*Education Policy Research Center, Joseph Froomkin, Director (Feb. 17)*

Prefers the Administration's aid proposal because it keeps the subsidy for education visible, its cost is less than a tax credit proposal (only \$1.2 billion), and because it distributes much of its benefits to students from families in the \$15,000 to \$25,000 income brackets.

*Hon. Abner J. Mikva, Member of Congress, Illinois (Feb. 21)*

Supports proposed expansion of direct student aid under the Administration proposal, but would reduce the range of support to families with incomes under \$20,000, rather than \$25,000, and would

increase the maximum support to a range of \$800 to \$1,000, from the \$250 level. Would also favor combining Administration aid program with a tax deferral program.

*American Association of School Administrators (written statement)*

Supports Administration proposals because they are a more efficient means of targeting aid where it is most needed than are tax credits.

*American Association of University Professors, Morton S. Baratz, General Secretary (written statement)*

Supports the Administration proposals because they would greatly aid families with incomes of \$25,000 or less. Feels that direct aid is the cornerstone of proper Federal student assistance, and believes that the benefits should be need-based.

*American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), Walter G. Davis, Director of Education (written statement)*

Supports Administration proposals to increase the number of students receiving Federal educational aid from 2.2 million to 5.3 million, and to include families with incomes between \$16,000 and \$25,000, not now eligible, in the group receiving aid, and to raise the ceiling on income for Guaranteed Student Loans from \$30,000 to \$45,000, in order to grant relief from the high cost of education to those in the middle-income group.

*Lois R. Sprague and Emmett H. Sprague, Rochester, New York (written statement)*

Support the Administration proposals as more sensible responses to the high cost of education than tax credits.

## **2. Those opposing**

*Larry L. Leslie, Professor of Higher Education, University of Arizona (Feb. 15)*

Opposes expansion of need-based college student aid programs because they have proven faulty with respect to middle-income families whose need is great but who have not received benefits under such programs, and because expanding such programs to the middle-income families could precipitate inter-class conflict if program is inadequately funded or if any financial retrenchment becomes necessary.

*Hon. James M. Jeffords, Member of Congress, Vermont (Feb. 21)*

Opposes Administration aid proposal as too little and too complicated.

*William E. Titus, Esquire, Greenlawn, New York (written statement)*

Opposes Administration proposals because of their cost, and the belief that tax dollars should not be increased as a result of increased Federal aid to private school children and college bound students.



## B. OTHER COMMENTS REGARDING EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROPOSALS

*Council for American Private Education, Robert L. Lamborn, Executive Director (Feb. 15, 1978)*

Notes that of the 49.1 million children in elementary and secondary schools, 9.8 percent (4.8 million) attend private schools, and that out of 106,600 elementary and secondary schools, 16.8 percent (17,950) are private. Indicates that most of the private schools are church-related. Also, states that, of the families having children in private schools in 1976, 6 percent had gross incomes below \$5,500; 10 percent had gross incomes under \$7,400; 25 percent had gross incomes under \$11,600; 50 percent had gross incomes under \$17,100; and 75 percent had gross incomes under \$25,000.

States that member organizations in CAPE account for 85 to 90 percent of all private schools, are nondiscriminatory on the basis of race, color, and national origin, but many do serve one predominant religious faith. Maintains that private schools are a necessity, operate under "marketplace" forces, and their numbers denote their importance in the educational community. Also, asserts that private schools relieve public schools of a heavy financial burden.

*Parents of children attending Our Lady of Perpetual Help School: Mrs. Adrienne Jackson, Mrs. Zeffere Howard, Mrs. Sandra Ferguson, Mrs. New Velvet Washington, and Mrs. Mary Greene, of Washington, D.C. (Feb. 16)*

State that private school education selection stemmed from a desire that a parent's children have better opportunities than the parent was able to have in public schools, finding that public school environment demonstrated a lack of respect, discipline, adequate physical facilities and individual attention. Stress that the financial burden of sending two children to private schools (a minimum annual cost of \$1,300) on a parent with an annual salary of \$16,000, is a sacrifice the parent is willing to make because of the higher quality of education in private schools and the low quality of education in the public schools in Washington, D.C. Feel that there is a better discipline and supervision received in the private schools and a greater concern of the teachers for their students. One parent indicates that financial hardships deprived her of the choice of sending her children to private schools. Another parent notes that she must pay \$3,100 a year to keep five children in private Catholic schools, and an additional \$265 a year on books, but that her children get a superior standard of education and better discipline, moral standards, respect for others and for property and for themselves.

