

to the ecclesiastical year; the recurrence of feasts and the meaning that the Church puts to them; the community of ideas and consequent sympathy that exists between teacher and pupil as the outcome of religious instruction; the Catholic tone that pervades the school; all these things cannot fail to make a deep impression on the little ones who live and move under their influence several hours every day. Who will deny the right of a parent to provide such a school as this if he sees fit?

The constitutional privileges of a Catholic should secure him from interference in such an essentially domestic function as the training of children. Is it not evident that the intermingling of another authority would inevitably embarrass the liberty of the family, and destroy the unity of education, if it did not annihilate education itself? No authority has a right to impose wearying "programmes" on a parent, or embarrassing restrictions, and above all, it has no right to jeopardize liberty of conscience.

Furthermore, man has a natural right to communicate the truth. We have an inborn inclination to give to others the notions we have acquired by personal endeavor, so that the act of teaching is, after all, the natural use of a faculty which no one has a right to prevent us from exercising.

How slow men are to perceive that the welfare of a nation is involved in the training of its children, and religious training at that. A sound education, rendered possible by admitting the principle of liberty of instruction, is the best earnest of the prosperity of a nation. This truism supposes two others, that true education must be based on religion; that truly religious education can be imparted only by teachers of deep religious convictions.