

journal. Its respectability and the merited esteem in which it is held will add new weight to my reflections if found correct.

It is my intention to examine more particularly that portion of his remarks which relates to the colleges of Canada. In the course of this discussion I may find the opportunity of noticing his remarks relative to the negligence of the clergy in establishing schools for the bulk of the population. In treating these subjects I shall speak with candor and with liberty. I shall not abuse the patience of my readers by vain declamation, common place remarks, vague principles, assertions without proof. When I make assertions I shall endeavor to prove them; when I allude to facts they shall be known facts, or facts easily verified. In laying down principles, I shall endeavor to establish them, if they are not self-evident; and if they are, I shall express them in clear and unequivocal terms.

Without further delay, let us enter upon the discussion.

The strictures which the Canadian Courant passes on the Catholic institutions of the province are comprised under the three following heads, in which I shall use his own words.

He complains 1st, That the Catholic colleges of Canada follow "a system of education introduced by the Jesuits."

2. That "the present defective system is the chief, if not the only cause of throwing Canadians into the back ground of commerce."

3. That there is cause of serious complaint on the part "of the protestant population, for the intolerant rule which compels all the inmates of these schools, of whatever sect they may be to attend to the worship of the Catholic church; which rule leaves them open to the suspicions of practicing an indirect system of proselytism."

Let us examine these causes of complaint. 1st, The system of education followed in the colleges of this province is complained of, and represented as worthy of public animadversion, because it is the system of the Jesuits.

The author is doubtless well acquainted with the system of education introduced by the Jesuits. He has doubtless visited their colleges, examined their mode of teaching, enquired into their reasons, conversed with their pupils. At all events he must be perfectly conversant with the works in which their system is explained. He has perused with attention the *ratio studiorum*, drawn up by six of the most eminent men of their society, and Jouvenci's *De arte docendi et discendi* in which their plan of studies is developed. For if he has done nothing of all this, he must be a rash and thoughtless man to judge what he is ignorant of; he must have but little respect for the public, to publish as certain what may probably or possibly be erroneous. But if he rendered himself master of his subject, before he published his judgment, why does he withhold from the public the reasons upon which he grounds his judgment? Is it a matter perfectly evident of itself, that a system of education followed in Europe for nearly three hundred years, and here, in this province, as the Courant says, for nearly a century

—is it perfectly evident that this system is bad? Or does he suppose that his empire over the public mind is so great, as to render it superfluous for him to adduce his reasons—the *ipse dixit* of the Canadian Courant being sufficient to decide the opinion of his readers? To me, I must confess, the matter is not so clear. It may be obtuseness of intellect on my part. That is not my fault. Neither is it my fault, that I do not sufficiently feel the magic influence of the Courant's authority to bow submissive to judgments which he deigns not to ground upon a single reason.

Had he given his reasons, I might have weighed them. Since he has not, all that I can do is to compare with his sweeping condemnation the authority of eminent men, incontrovertible facts, and solid reasons, which depose in favor of the system of education followed by the Jesuits. 1. The first authority which I shall bring forward is that of the immortal Lord Bacon. *Ad pædagogicam quod attinet, brevissimum foret dictu' consule scholas Jesuitarum: nihil enim, quod in usum venit, his meliorem. De dignit. et augm. scient. bb. 7, p. 183.* With regard to the art of teaching I have but one word to say: examine the schools of the Jesuits; nothing more excellent has yet appeared.

The authority of so great a man is enough to decide the question. Nevertheless to shew that he was far from being alone in his way of thinking I shall bring other authorities.

Catharine 2nd, Empress of Russia, in her letter to the Pope written in 1783 declares, "that she protects the Jesuits from motives of reason and justice, as well as from the hope that they will be useful to her empire—that none are more capable than they of instructing her subjects."

The celebrated Frederic 2nd, of Prussia, in his letter to Voltaire, dated 5th July, 1770, declares, that he loves the Jesuits. "I will preserve this precious seed in order to furnish it to those who may wish to cultivate a plant so rare." Now most assuredly no one will pretend that Frederick was actuated by religious zeal—his irreligious principles are well known. But let us return again to learned men—some who do not reflect that princes are guided in their judgments by the counsels of distinguished individuals would prefer the authority of men of known learning and talents. Open then the Belgic annals of the learned Grotius, and he will there tell you "that the Jesuits have acquired great authority by the sanctity of their lives and the success with which they instruct youth in literature and science." *Annal. de reb. Belg.*

"Who," says Mr. Kern, a Protestant, & Professor in the University of Gottingen,— "Who are now-a-days the enemies of the Jesuits? Atheists, revolutionary philosophers, Jacobins, and those who are unacquainted with them. But every true royalist should love those who are the objects of Jacobinical hatred; for we may be sure that there is question either of God, of religion, of justice, or of subordination. The re-establishment of this celebrated order, far from being a source of uneasiness, is, on the contrary, a happy omen for our age. It is so constituted as to be, according to the

acknowledgment even of many Protestants, the strongest barrier that can be opposed to the doctrine which tends to civil and religious anarchy. Mr. John de Muller goes so far as to say that *the order of the Jesuits is the common bulwark of every kind of authority.* The Jesuits strike at the root of the evil: they teach youth the fear of God and obedience. True it is, they do not teach Protestantism. But have we the right of obliging Catholics to teach any other doctrine than that which they profess? Did we ever hear of Jesuits' teaching any doctrine similar to that of our modern schools? Did they ever teach the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, and all its fatal consequences, as it is now taught in our Protestant universities? They have been accused of being opposed to the authority of Princes. But they have been sufficiently justified on this point, both by Henry IV. of France, and by the assembly of the French clergy under Louis XV. And by what means could so disastrous a doctrine find place among men who taught nothing but what is grounded on the principles of christianity? Experience proves the rapid progress which irreligious and anarchical principles have made since the suppression of the Jesuits. Philosophical universities and philosophical faculties, says Dollas, an English Protestant, were substituted, on the continent, for the colleges of the Jesuits. Education under the united efforts of faith and reason ceased: reason, with all its errors was preferred. Faith was abandoned, reviled, and is now known only under the name of superstition. In the year 1777 the order of St. Ignatius was abolished; in 1793 a King of France was beheaded. Reason has been deified, and temples have been dedicated to its worship. During the space of two centuries, the Jesuits had educated in their college of Clermont at Paris the principal portion of the nobility of France in the principles of religion, in the sciences, and in the love of their country. But a few years after the dismissal of these able teachers, this very college issued into the world the Robispiers, the Camille Desmoulins, the Talliens, the Noels, the Frérons, the Cheniers and other demagogues. Is it then surprising that the Pope and Catholic Princes should re-establish men whose services have been appreciated by Protestants, by the great Leibnitz, by Frederick the II. and whom Bacon proposed as models when he said, *that when there was question about education, the shortest method was to consult the schools of the Jesuits.*"

Can any thing be more satisfactory than these authorities—satisfactory I mean to those who wish to know and make known the truth. They may perhaps be somewhat galling to the Canadian Courant.

It will be observed that none of the distinguished persons whose authority I have cited were Catholics. So that their judgment cannot be supposed to have received any bias in favor of the Jesuits system of education from their religious prepossessions.—Their opinion evidently proceeds from the force of truth.

But let us proceed to undeniable facts which