

The Ohio Supreme Court has ruled two times that Article I, section 7, prohibits tax funding of private religious schools.

House Speaker Matt Huffman is on record saying that the State is required to fund private religious schools. His interpretation of Article I, section 7, is counter to two Ohio Supreme Court decisions and the plain reading of Article I, section 7 and Article VI, section 2.

In the 1872 Minor case ([Board of Education of the City of Cincinnati v. Minor](#)), the court upheld the Cincinnati Board's policy prohibiting Bible reading in the schools. In the 1945 Findley case (Findley v. City of Conneaut) the court held that the City of Conneaut had no authority to issue bonds or expend funds raised by taxation for the support of a sectarian school.

It is appalling that the Ohio legislature has been funding a private school system for operations. More appalling, in a Capital Bill two years ago, the state provided funding for some private school facilities.

In June 2025 the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas ruled EdChoice vouchers unconstitutional. The case is now pending in the 10th District Court of Appeals. In an article subsequent to the 10th District hearing, one news outlet described the State's defense of the EdChoice voucher program as "embarrassing."

The Ohio Constitution requires the State of Ohio to "secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools" and prohibits state tax funds from flowing to the private school system.

If private schools demand public funds for facilities and operations, such schools should be willing to submit to all the rules and regulations that pertain to public schools.

What are Ohio's state officials thinking? Do they think that the Constitution is a litany of suggestions? Nice ideas? Mere choices? Dead letter? Or are they intentionally defying the supreme law of Ohio? Article I, section 7, means what it says—no tax money for private religious schools.