

children weighs on the shoulders of fathers and mothers; and when through poverty, or incapacity, or sickness, or the multiplicity of other duties, they are unable to impart, in its fulness, religious instruction to their little ones, they may shift that responsibility on to the shoulders of others only on condition that those who are to assume the burden are trustworthy and fully competent. So true is this that the parent is not at liberty to rid himself of this personal obligation, or surrender his rights. When circumstances oblige him to give over to others the training of his children, this temporary transfer may be made only when there is a certainty that the children's hearts will receive no taint.

But as the Church has condemned the divorce of the teaching of religious truths from that of secular science, (1) the Christian parent must, under the direction of his pastor, make a choice of a system of teaching that is in harmony with Catholic tenets.

Now, how can any such choice become possible unless the liberty of teaching is fully recognized; and unless Catholics are free to open and control schools and colleges of their own? Whenever such action is merely tolerated, so as to throw on Catholic ratepayers the burden of supporting the schools of their choice, while they are also taxed for the support of State schools, to which they may not conscientiously send their children, a grave injustice is perpetrated, and liberty of instruction is not recognized.

The right in justice of the Catholic citizen to claim liberty of teaching is grounded, on his parental obliga-

---

(1) The following proposition is condemned: Catholics may approve of a system of educating youth, unconnected with Catholic faith and the power of the Church, and which regards the knowledge of merely natural things, and only, or at least primarily, the ends of earthly life. (*Syllabus prop. 43*).