

depose in favor of this system of education. The first fact is the universal esteem in which they were held. This esteem is testified by the numerous colleges which were confided to their care all over Europe. Now it is absurd to suppose that the whole of Europe, could have been so far deluded, as to become infatuated, and that for nearly three hundred years, with a system of education so bad, as not to deserve that a reason should be given for its condemnation. Their system was so much esteemed and was found by experience so superior, as Lord Bacon observes, to every other, that the classes of other colleges were almost deserted for those of the Jesuits. Even Mr. Du Boulay, the historian of the university of Paris acknowledges this. "Students flock to the schools of the Jesuits, whilst those of the university are abandoned."—*Frequentantur eorum (viz. Jesuitarum) scholae magno numero scholasticorum, et Academicarum depopulantur.*—l. 6. p. 916. They enjoyed to such a degree the public confidence, that when they quitted France under Henry IV. who in the beginning of his reign expelled them, and a few years afterwards revoked the unjust sentence, which had banished them, the students preferred to follow them to other countries, rather than to place themselves under other teachers. A similar mark of esteem was shewn to them at their expulsion from France two years ago. Their colleges in Switzerland and Spain are filled with French students.

Another fact which deposes in favor of this system is the great number of distinguished men who owed to it the development of their talents. I shall first mention a few of those who distinguished themselves in the society, and afterwards a few of those who were educated in its colleges.

Among those who distinguished themselves in the society, we find the names of Bouhours, Cossart, Rapin, De la Rue, Jouvenci, Giannatazi, Vallins, Masenius, &c. in the annals of literature; the names of Arriaga, Scheiner, Kircher, Fabri, Buffier in those of philosophy. The erudition of Petau, Sirmond, Bollandus, Papebroch, Henschenius, Hardouin, Labbe, Tournemine Nicolai, men very different from the *moving libraries* of the Canadian Courant, is well known to the learned world. The talents of Clavius, Dechales, Fournier, Scheiner who first discovered, in the year 1611, the rotation of the sun upon its axis, (see his work *Rosa Ursina*) Grimaldi, Riccioli, Boscovitz, Pegenas are admired by mathematicians and astronomers. Bourdaloue, La Colombier, Cheminais, De la Rue Seigneri, Pallu, Neuville rank high among christian orators; and Mariana Strada, Maffet, Tursellin, Daniel, Bartoli Longueval, Charlevoix, Berruger, yield to none the palm of history.

From the Masters let us turn to the pupils.—This society with its *defective* system of education cultivated the talents of the Bourbons, the Condes, the Contys, the Bouillons, the Luxembourgs, the Villars, the Brissacs, the Montmorencis, the D'Etrees, the Broylies—names encircled with the laurels of military glory. This society with its *defective* system of education formed for the church

the Rochefoucaulds; the Polignacs, the Flechiers, the Bossuets, the Huets, the Fanelons, the Fleuryrs, This society with its *defective* system formed for the magistracy the Lamoignons, the Bignons, the Novions, the Potiers, the Pelletiers, the Henaults.—It formed for the sciences and for literature a Justus Lipsius, a Descartes, a Cassini, a Corneille, a Rousseau, a Crebillon, a Moliere, a Pompignan, a Gresset. Even the too celebrated Voltaire was their pupil. They formed his mind for literature, but their efforts to form his corrupted heart for virtue proved unavailing.

Hence we may conclude with the apologist of this celebrated order; either the education received in youth does not contribute to the success of great men, and in that case every education is good; or it does contribute to their success, and in this case the education of the Jesuits must be deemed excellent: at least it cannot be deemed so very *defective*.

3, Let us now see whether reason is as favorable to their system of education, as facts and authorities are.

In the Courant's remarks there is an evident, but, alas! an abortive attempt at depth and sagacity. He would wish for proper masters—nothing more reasonable. He would desire a supply from England and Ireland; that is fair—or *from the United States!* Doubtless to infuse into the hearts of the rising generation sentiments of loyalty, of patriotism, of attachment to the British government! Do you not then know, sir, how much depends upon the first impression which youth receives? But the education of the heart, the direction of the will, the enlightening of the conscience, the communicating of principles to regulate the conduct of men as good citizens or good christians, seem to form no portion of the Courant's system of education.

Let none be surpris'd at this assertion. I draw it from his own words. He would wish for a system of education *established on the broad basis of civil and religious liberty*. Now if this phrase means any thing, it means that during the course of education teachers should not inculcate any principles or maxims relative to religion or government, which may have a tendency to interfere with the religious or civil creed of students. For if he can complain of Catholic colleges for requiring that Protestant boarders should assist at the Catholic service, although, as we shall hereafter see, this is not contrary to Protestant principles and is required merely to avoid considerable inconveniences, he must complain much more of a direct and positive endeavor to engage the youth to alter their principles. Hence it immediately follows: that in his system, the doctrine of the Trinity cannot be taught because it would shock Unitarians; that the divinity of Jesus Christ, and the truth of the christian religion cannot be taught, because the first would shock Unitarians, and both would shock Jews; that the existence of God cannot be taught, because it would shock Atheists; that the essential obligation of the law of nature, and the essential distinction between right and wrong cannot be taught because it would shock the disciples of Hobbes,

of Helvetius, of La Metrie; that the civil authority has the right of punishing criminals with death, cannot be taught because this would shock Tous-saint, the Canadian Courant, &c.; in short it follows that no single truth relative to religion, morality or government, can be inculcated, because there is no truth however evident that has not, and may not yet meet with opponents: for as Cicero observes, there is no absurdity, however great, that has not been maintained by some philosopher; *nihil tam absurdum dici protest, quod non dicatur ab aliquo philosophorum.*—De Divinatione, lib. 2 p. 38.

Perhaps the Courant did not intend to carry his principle to such length. His expressions, however, authorise my assertion. If he did not mean to go so far, he ought to have reflected upon the tendency of his words. There is much danger in laying down principles couched in vague, undefined terms, which admit all the latitude of interpretation which passion, interest or impiety can desire.

Although I am willing to excuse the Courant as much as possible, I cannot help observing that besides the words upon which I have just animadverted, the tenor of the first half of his article on education leave him open to the suspicion of desiring an irreligious system of education. For what other tendency can his anxiety to exclude the clergy, that is to say the ministers of God to whom by right of office the moral and religious part of education belong, from all interference with education, even as committee-men? To whom then does England, does Europe in general, does Canada owe its scholastic institutions? How many schools have not the clergy established in various parts of the Province? And if more have not been established, it is not always owing to want of zeal on their part, but to other obstacles: sometimes to the want of means, at other times to the difficulty of finding masters worthy of confidence, (for their attention to this point, to say the least, is as scrupulous as that of the Courant) sometimes to the difficulty of collecting children from widely separated habitations, and sometimes to the stubbornness of parents who would not co-operate with the zeal of their pastors. All these circumstances are carefully kept in the back ground by the *impartiality* of the Courant. Neither does he observe that the portion of the Canadian population which possesses not the art of writing and reading, even that ignorant portion *whose nakedness has been exposed before the Imperial Parliament*, is as well, nay better instructed in the duties of religion and morality than the great bulk of the population of England. For the superior attention of the Catholic clergy to the duty of catechising children, and of instructing the ignorant is an indisputable fact.

Extraordinary assertions! some will be inclined to say—extraordinary as they may appear to the unreflecting, they are nevertheless correct. They who wish to enquire how far the knowledge of religion has flourished in England under the fostering care of the established clergy, would do well to weigh the following remarks. "The attention of the nation, says Dr. Lingard, has been lately turned to the subject (namely the state of religious