

whose father was the *Av Beit Din* in Aleppo), in *Resp. Yaskil Avdi*, VII, sec. 5, rules out readings by minors completely. In any case, everyone would agree that *trei de-rabbanan* is not applicable to justify a woman reader.

As to the extremely sensitive and thoughtful comments of R. Heshie Billet, their application should obviously be left to the practicing rabbin-ate which has its hand on the pulse of the community. We are pleased that R. Billet believes that our article has made clear the limits of halakhic practice in the question of women's *aliyyot*.

#### EMPLOYER'S LIABILITY FOR EMPLOYEE'S SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

TO THE EDITOR:

At the conclusion of my recent article, "An Employer's Vicarious Liability for an Employee's Sexual Misconduct" (Summer 2014), I propose that an agreement be executed between parents and a Jewish institution which would preempt the possibility of a *beit din* rendering a *pesak din* based on secular notions of strict liability.

After thoughtful reflection, though such a proposal will be recognized on halakhic grounds provided that the child's best interests remain uncompromised, on legal grounds a parent cannot waive the legal rights of his child(ren). Such an agreement between parents and a Jewish institution would be against public policy and therefore legally unenforceable.

A. YEHUDA WARBURG