



1948

Constitutional Law--Use of State Funds for Transportation of Children to Parochial Schools

John G. Prather
University of Kentucky

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/klj>

 Part of the [Constitutional Law Commons](#), and the [Religion Law Commons](#)

Click here to let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Prather, John G. (1948) "Constitutional Law--Use of State Funds for Transportation of Children to Parochial Schools," *Kentucky Law Journal*: Vol. 36 : Iss. 3 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/klj/vol36/iss3/10>

This Note is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kentucky Law Journal by an authorized editor of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

to the First Congress to establish a similar freedom for the nation and proposed such a measure, which became the First Amendment. To Madison, religion was wholly a private matter beyond the scope of civil power either to restrain or to support.⁷

The problem of support manifests itself in the form of numerous attempts to obtain public funds in aid of religious institutions. In the category of cases upholding such aid, the extreme case seems to be *State ex rel. Johnson v. Boyd*.⁸ Public funds were used here to pay teacher's salaries to Catholic Sisters teaching in several schools which were formerly operated as parochial schools. Except for state aid, these schools would have been forced to close. Religious services were discontinued during school hours but the students who formerly attended these schools continued to attend them without regard to the school district in which they lived. In an action to recover salaries paid to the Sisters as teachers, it was held that public supervision of the curriculum and the fact that no religious instruction was given during school hours was sufficient to denominate these schools as "public" schools. However, eight other jurisdictions have denied the validity of attempted use of public funds by sectarian institutions as violating the principle of separation of the church and state.⁹

It would seem that the same problem is presented in several cases involving the furnishing of textbooks by the state to students in parochial schools. Thus, in Louisiana, free textbooks were furnished all school children on the basis that private schools were not the beneficiaries of the appropriation but that the children and the state alone were the beneficiaries.¹⁰ This case was appealed from a decision of the Louisiana Supreme Court upholding such action on the authority of *Borden v. Louisiana State Board of Education*,¹¹ decided the same day, in which three Justices dissented on the ground that the purchasing of books to be used in sectarian schools is to use such money "indirectly" if not "directly" in aid of the church conducting the schools. Similarly, transportation furnished children going to parochial schools in Baltimore County, Maryland, was held to be a public function and a valid exercise of the state's police power

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ 217 Ind. 348, 28 N. E. 2d 256 (1940).

⁹ *Knowlton v. Baumhouer*, 182 Iowa 691, 166 N. W. 202 (1918) *Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. v. City of Atchison*, 47 Kan. 712, 28 Pac. 1000 (1892) *Williams v. Bd. of Trustees Stanton School District*, 173 Ky. 708, 191 S. W. 507 (1917) *Jenkins v. Inhabitants of Andover*, 103 Mass. 94 (1869) *State ex rel. Public School District No. 6 v. Taylor*, 122 Neb. 454, 240 N. W. 573 (1932) *State ex rel. Nevada Orphan Asylum v. Hallock*, 16 Nev. 373 (1882), *Collins v. Kephart*, 271 Pa. 428, 117 Atl. 440 (1921) *Synod of Dakota v. State*, 2 S. D. 376, 50 N. W. 632 (1891)

¹⁰ *Cochran v. Louisiana State Bd. of Education*, 281 U. S. 370, 74 L. Ed. 913, 50 Sup. Ct. 335 (1930).

¹¹ 168 La. 1005, 123 So. 655 (1929).

for the protection of children from traffic hazards.¹² It may be noted that the religious issue was not raised by the *majority* of the court in these cases. However, the dissenting opinions in these cases considered such aid to be a contribution to a sectarian school. It might be worthwhile to note here also that these cases, which have upheld such action, arose in states which have had large Catholic populations throughout their history

The position of the minority of the court in the *Everson* case is supported by numerous decisions. In *Smith v. Donahue*,¹³ the New York court said, "the parochial schools are furnished by the Roman Catholic Church, in order that, along with secular education, the youth of the Church may receive instructions in its religious beliefs and rules. In accord with its principles in that respect, the state will not interfere, but it may not assist in aid of any distinct religious tenet."¹⁴ As to furnishing books and supplies to the pupils, the court goes on to say, "We think the act plainly comes within the prohibition of the Constitution (State) if not directly in aid of the parochial schools, it certainly is an indirect aid."¹⁵

Contrary to the Baltimore County transportation case, the majority of decisions involving the furnishing of transportation to pupils attending a sectarian school hold that such action is an appropriation of moneys in aid of the school and for this reason is unconstitutional.¹⁶ *State ex rel Traub v. Brown*,¹⁷ held, "we are of the opinion that to furnish free transportation to pupils attending sectarian schools, is to aid the schools. It helps build up, strengthen and make successful the schools as organizations." The court further commented that it was not impressed by the reasoning in the Louisiana textbook cases. In a later case, the New York Court became more emphatic and ruled that furnishing of transportation at public expense to pupils attending parochial schools is unconstitutional as a use of public money in aid of a school or institution of learning in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught.¹⁸

Legal writers have criticized granting such aid under the argument that the pupil is the beneficiary. The basis of their opinions is that the logical result of such argument would justify the use of public funds to pay practically all the expenses of a private or parochial school and thus a result would be achieved indirectly that could not be achieved directly.¹⁹ Another writer has foreseen a

¹² *Bd. of Education of Baltimore County v Wheat*, 174 Md. 314, 199 Atl. 628 (1938).

¹³ 202 App. Div. 656, 195 N. Y. Supp. 715 (1922)

¹⁴ *Id.* at — 195 N. Y. Supp. 715, 719 (1922).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Note (1941) 141 A. L. R. 1136, 1152.

¹⁷ 6 W W Harr. (36 Del.) 181, 172 Atl. 835 (1934)

¹⁸ *Judd v Bd. of Education*, 278 N. Y. 200, 15 N. E. 2d 576 (1938)

¹⁹ Note (1938) 37 MICH. L. REV. 335.

reawakening of internal religious strife as a result of departing from a strict separation of church and state, saying: "Entrance of the state upon a program of religious subsidy, however benign, reawakens the slumbering forces of intolerance and hate and invites them to a contest for public support."²⁰

It is submitted that the decision of the majority of the Supreme Court in the New Jersey school board case is another step toward returning to the situation existing at the time of the enactment of the First Amendment. When the problem arises again, it would seem to be in the public interest for the Court to retreat to the line of decisions which held that such state aid was in aid of the church which seems to be the only logical interpretation of such action. This appears to be the only possible way to avert the inevitable consequences of increased taxation and public religious wrangling that are sure to result if the door is opened wider.

JOHN G. PRATHER

²⁰ Note (1941) 50 YALE L. J. 917, 926.