the schools without any regard to the rules thereof.

The bill prayed an injunction against the committee from preventing the admission of the complainants' children to the said schools, &c.

The judge who delivered the judgment of the Court dismissed the bill, in effect holding, as stated in the head-note of the case (*Ferriter et al.* v. *Tyler et al.* 15 Am. Law Register 570), that it was the right of the directors of the public schools to prescribe the hours of attendance of the pupils, and to make a proper system of punishment for absence, &c: that in doing this the public rights and convenience must govern, without regard to the wishes or convenience or private preference of parents or others: that this rule applied to the attendance of the children on public or private religious worship on week-days during the prescribed hours for school, and that such purpose did not excuse violation of the rules of the school.

One of the editors of the *American Law Register* in commenting on the case very fairly states the questions involved in the following manner: (1.) Whether, in case of conflict, the conductors of the school may lawfully insist upon their rules and regulations, setting aside those of the church where the children receive religious education; in other words, how far school education may interfere with or supersede religious education? (2.) How far the school laws or regulations will control the right of the parents to direct the attendance of their children upon religious services, and expose the children to punishment for obeying their parents in this respect?

The consequences that would flow from these questions being answered in the way they were answered by the Supreme Court of Vermont, seem to us most appalling, and present a picture most discouraging to those citizens of the United States, who have any regard for the future welfare of their country. These latter may be glad to see so monstrous a doctrine combatted by such an eminent jurist as Hon. Isaac F. Redfield of Boston, who in commenting on the case says:

"There can be no doubt that in this case the children were required to disobey their parents, and were punished for not doing so. They might as well have been subjected to corporal punishment as to exclusion from school. Then the case would have been precisely parallel with that of *Morrow* v. *Wood*, 13 Am. Law Reg. N. S. 692, and the able and judicious opinion of Mr. Justice Cole would fully apply to this case. Since the common schools have been compelled, by the contrariety of opinion upon religious subjects in the country, to virtually abandon all instruction upon the subject, it must not be expected that it can be also tolerated in a Christian country, that they should be allowed to teach positive irreligion, or what directly conflicts with Christian teaching upon morals. The first great command of the Decalogue, as to our duty to each other, is, "Honor thy father and thy mother." There could then be nothing more in conflict with Christian teaching than to require the children to disobey their parents. It is creditable, we think, to the Roman church that their children were too well taught in their primary duty to their parents to obey the school, when it came to a conflict between the school and their parents. It is greatly to be feared that we are all quite too indifferent to the general effect of so magnifying the authority and wisdom of the common schools in the eyes of the children, above their parents, in all matters even remotely pertaining to education, and at the same time teaching the children that mere text-book knowledge is superior to all other attainments. There can be little doubt, this may have contributed more than we comprehend to that general disregard and disrespect among the young toward their elders, which is so much deplored by many. But when it comes to the matter of religious teaching, which is so exclusively under the control of the parents, and by the very organic law of the state made sacred above all other rights, it might be supposed no one could fail to comprehend the unreasonableness of the claim here made. What is said in the Constitution of the State about the duty of maintaining schools, and the consequent necessity of their claims being vindicated by the courts, is all very well. But