

"THE UNIVERSITIES." II.—THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN:  
TRINITY COLLEGE

By JAMES MEENAN, M.A.

(Read before the Society, May 30th, 1946.)

"The relation of the University and College," remarked the Fry Commissioners,<sup>1</sup> "is a matter of some speculative difficulty." It may not appear to be a matter of the first importance to this Society; nevertheless its discussion must form a preface to this paper. The identity, for most practical purposes, of College and University has led to a general confusion of the respective functions of both institutions. It has, as a result, contributed to the bedevilment of the University question, so many attempted solutions of which have turned on the peculiar status of the University of Dublin.

The University of Dublin, or Trinity College—by whichever name we may decide to call it—is the third University in these islands and, of course, by far the most ancient in this country. The College was founded in 1591 by Charter of Queen Elizabeth. Having recited the representations of Henry Ussher, then Archbishop of Dublin, that there was no College in Ireland for the advancement of learning, it set up a College and proceeded to incorporate its Provost, Fellows and Scholars under the name of "the College of the Holy and Undivided Trinity of Queen Elizabeth at Dublin." It further provided that the liberal arts might not be publicly taught elsewhere in Ireland without Royal licence.

Trinity College was certainly established by this Charter; where and when the University was founded is not so obvious. It might be argued that by necessary implication the Charter set up a University in which Trinity was then the only College—a state of affairs that might not continue indefinitely. It has also been argued in some quarters that, whatever construction might be placed on the Charter, the College had in effect swallowed up the University and that, to quote a judgment that in some respects favoured this view,<sup>2</sup> "the College was supreme and the University was a branch or department of it, if indeed the College itself was not, more accurately, the University itself." The question was by no means a matter of academic status or legal argument; it underlay the various solutions of the University question, so freely advanced around the turn of the century, that planned to establish new colleges in the University of Dublin. For our purposes it may suffice to say that in a Note to the Report of the Fry Commission, Lord Chief Baron Palles gave the weight of his great authority to the view that the College and the University were distinct bodies.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Royal Commission on Trinity College, Dublin, and the University of Dublin Cm. 3311, 1907, p. 10 of Final Report.

<sup>2</sup>Irish Law Reports, page 56. See also the evidence of Mr. Justice Madden before the Fry Commission. Appendix to Final Report, page 157.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 61.

It is certain that no further collegiate foundation was added to that of Trinity College. The idea, however, was never quite forgotten. In 1660 the Irish Act of Settlement<sup>4</sup> empowered the Lord Lieutenant "to erect another College to be of the University of Dublin, to be called by the name of the King's College." Restoration penury prevented further action; and posterity was deprived of the engaging heritage of a University with two Colleges, one cherishing the memory of Queen Elizabeth, the other bound in piety to the spirit of King Charles II. Again, in 1793, the Catholic Relief Act<sup>5</sup> contemplated the foundation of a second College in the University of Dublin. This section, also, remained a dead letter.

As things stand, the University of Dublin<sup>6</sup> is represented by the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Senate<sup>7</sup> whose main and, it would appear, only function is the conferring of degrees. There is also the Council, a body representative of the Board, Fellows, Professors and the Senate whose institution in 1874 was a partial delegation of power. The Council nominates to all Professorships in the gift of the College except the Chairs in the School of Divinity. It also exercises power in the revision of courses; in general, however, the Board is the ultimate authority. The Calendar puts the matter with a brevity that subsequent modifications only serve to heighten. "The Government," it says<sup>8</sup> "is in the hands of the Board, in conjunction with the Visitors, but in most matters relating to education . . . it acts conjointly with the Council, while in matters relating to the conferring of Degrees the sanction of the Senate is required." The Board is composed of the Provost and seven Senior Fellows, and the Bursar, Senior Lecturer and Registrar, if they are not Senior Fellows, together with two representatives of the Junior Fellows and two representatives of the Professors. It seems excusable enough to confuse the University and the College, seeing that government rests in the hands of the Senior Fellows. The University Senate, the Council, the Professors themselves are subordinate.

No doubt this arrangement has had its disadvantages, especially when the concentration of power was even greater than it is to-day. A witness before the Commission of 1906, himself a member of the Board, remarked<sup>9</sup>: "The governing body, consisting of the Provost and the seven Senior Fellows, and commonly called the Board, enjoys the perhaps undesirable privilege of being the most heartily and universally abused body in Ireland. This is no peculiarity of the present Board; unpopularity seems to be an essential attribute of a Senior Fellow; my own personal knowledge of this sad fact goes back to 1843 in which year I was a Senior Freshman, and I have rarely heard the "Board" spoken of without the prefix of some uncomplimentary adjective." An institution so long assailed must have been founded in strength; and it appears from the minutes of evidence that the members of the Board were well able to look after themselves. They certainly impressed the Commissioners who spoke<sup>10</sup> of "the high opinion which we have formed of the work done by the Board as the supreme power in the College, and of the liberality

<sup>4</sup>sec. 219.

<sup>5</sup>sec. 7.

<sup>6</sup>The Chief Baron, in the Note referred to, remarks that the first use of the term University of "Dublin" in a charter was in that of William and Mary of December 15th, 1692. It had already been used in the Act of Settlement, *vid. sup.*

<sup>7</sup>Composed of Masters who have registered their names.

<sup>8</sup>*Dublin University Calendar*, page 1.

<sup>9</sup>Evidence of the Vice-Provost. Appendix to the First Report, page 39. The range of the witness's memory will be noticed.

<sup>10</sup>Final Report, page 13.

with which, during the last half-century it has striven to extend the area of instruction within its walls." They nevertheless recommended a number of changes in the government of the College which would have had the effect of widening it. In the event the constitution of the Board was altered in 1911 to allow for representation of Junior Fellows and Professors; for the rest, the position was eased by natural changes in the membership of what was, in 1906, a particularly senior Board.

However great its powers, the Board had at all times to take account of State policy, which has profoundly influenced the history of Trinity College and the development of University education in Ireland. Undoubtedly the University was set up as a Protestant Episcopalian institution. The Charter, however, was so drawn that both Catholics and Presbyterians might enter and receive their education in the new foundation. As the law then stood, they could become students therein; although the obligation to take the oath prescribed by the Act of Supremacy prevented their taking a degree. The Statutes were remodelled and to a large extent amplified in 1637, during the Chancellorship of Archbishop Laud. Thereafter it was impossible for Catholics to enter; and it is hardly necessary to say that Statutes of such authorship led to what the Fry Commissioners described<sup>11</sup> as "the persistent want of sympathy with Trinity College entertained by the great body of Presbyterians in the North of Ireland." For over a century and a half, then, adherents of two of the three religions in Ireland (one of them overwhelmingly the most numerous) were excluded from the only Irish University. These disabilities were not removed until the Catholic Relief Act of 1793. Even then, only Episcopalians were eligible to become members of the corporation of Trinity College, as was settled in the Heron case in 1845.

The controversies of the nineteenth century affected both College and University. After the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, the obligation that a certain number of Fellows should be clergy of that Church was removed at the same time as the ineligibility of non-Episcopalians to be members of the corporation of the College.<sup>12</sup> By Fawcett's Act, indeed, the College was secularized; and the University became as "godless" in the political sense as the Queen's Colleges themselves.

Thereafter the position was clear enough. Trinity College pointed to the fact that there was now no constitutional reason why it should not be used by Catholics. The Catholic body, on its side, refused to enter an institution which, they claimed, retained a strong Protestant atmosphere however undenominational it might be in law. After the Synod of Maynooth in 1875 Catholics were discouraged from entering Trinity. Between these attitudes there could be no reconciliation, though the holders of one might recognise and respect the feelings of the holders of the other. Eventually the Catholic claim was defined as being for one of three solutions—(1) a Catholic University; (2) a second college, which would be "as distinctively Catholic as Trinity College was Protestant," in the University of Dublin, or (3) a Catholic college in the Royal University which was founded in 1879. The second of these suggestions turned on the distinction, already mentioned, between the University of Dublin and Trinity College.

Fortunately or unfortunately, those measures that came nearest to

<sup>11</sup>Final Report, page 5.

<sup>12</sup>36 Vict., cap. 21. It is instructive to note that this measure, commonly known as Fawcett's Act, was opposed by the majority of the Irish members and that its rejection was seconded by Denis Heron, the ineligible candidate of 1845.

being put into effect<sup>13</sup> proposed to go much further. The proposals of Gladstone in 1873 and of Bryce in 1907 contemplated the union of Trinity College not merely with a second college but also with the Queen's Colleges, the whole to receive the name of the University of Dublin. The devoted resistance of Trinity defeated both of these schemes; and for good or ill the settlement of the 1908 Act left it undisturbed.

There have been so many changes in Ireland in the last forty years that some of the evidence given to the University commissions of 1901 and 1906 reads oddly now. Trinity, however, remains as the oldest and most famous of Irish universities and it still enjoys the unquestioned support of an important group in the community. We have therefore to examine its development in a time of extreme difficulty and uncertainty.

TABLE I.  
*Number of students on the books of Trinity College.<sup>14</sup>*

Average	YEARS		YEARS	
	1900-06 ...	1,002	1930-31 ...	1,455
1910-11* ...	1,225	1938-39 ...	1,488	
1920-21 ...	1,413	1944-45 ...	1,400	

The years shown in this table are not the happiest selection since some of them are influenced by special factors. Nevertheless, it is clear that the level of fluctuation is well above that obtaining in the early years of the century and that Trinity has shared in the general increase in the number of university students. In the previous paper, it was pointed out that the growth in University figures had to be set against the background of a declining population. This applies *a fortiori* to Trinity, especially in the last quarter of a century. Granted the decline in the Episcopalian population of Ireland, it is curious to find the number of students not merely maintained but increased. It may be assumed that the rise is not due wholly, or even partially, to an increased number of entrants professing other faiths; and one is forced to assume that the tendency to a spread of University education is universal in Ireland.

TABLE II.  
*Number of staff in Trinity College.*

Years	Fellows and Professors	Lecturers, Assistants, etc.	Total
1924-25	63	36	99
1942-43	60	84	144

This is a noticeable increase in a comparatively short period. It seems, however, reminiscent of a problem noted in the previous paper—a growing number of students demanding a staff that cannot be expanded to keep

<sup>13</sup>For the sake of brevity, no allusion has been made to the Mayo scheme of 1868, which was in many ways the most attractive of all the proposed solutions. The account in the text is the barest outline of a very vexed problem; and while it is easy to criticise successive British governments it must equally be admitted that it was exceptionally difficult to win the assistance, much less the approval, of interested opinion in Ireland.

<sup>14</sup>The numbers on the Books do not include students pursuing courses for diplomas, etc. On the other hand, they do include many who are not actually attending a course, and therefore overstate the true number of full-time students to an extent that, unfortunately, is not constant.

pace. Once again a comparison with Great Britain is interesting. Birmingham in 1938-39 had an almost exactly equal number of students: 1,433, and a staff of 159; Bristol in the same year had only 1,005 students, catered for by a staff of 157. The Trinity staff, also, suffers greatly from the fact, criticised by two Royal Commissions, that it is necessary for many of its members to discharge a plurality of functions in order to supplement their basic salaries. The 1906 Commissioners heard the evidence of a Fellow who lectured in Pathology and Bacteriology and Classics and examined in Geometry. The 1920 Commissioners<sup>15</sup> remarked that "No feature of the financial arrangements of Trinity College has appeared to us so strange as the number and singularly varied character of the sources whence salaries are paid to the Fellows and Professors. This feature has no doubt some historical interest in showing how, in the course of successive generations, the resources of the College have gradually been gathered together. But it must be somewhat perplexing to the recipients of the salaries." For the rest, it need only be said that it is clearly most difficult for an institution depending on fees and investments to augment its staff under present conditions. The Board must sometimes look back with regret on the halcyon days of the early nineteenth century when five per cent. was five per cent. and the demand for laboratories and engineering schools had not yet disturbed the classical, and less expensive, traditions of university education.

It may be pointed out, indeed, that in recognising the importance of suiting teaching to the needs of the age, Trinity compared very well with her sister Universities. Her Moderatorship in Law and History was instituted in advance of any English University; that in Mental and Moral Science preceded Cambridge by seventeen years. The honour degree in Natural Sciences was founded at the same time as that of Cambridge; the surgery degree was the first in these islands; the engineering degree among the first, if not actually the first. On the other hand, it is fair to remark that this breadth of vision did not extend to other subjects for which the University might have been thought to be especially fitted by its geographical position.

In more recent times it has inaugurated a number of diploma courses. The diploma in Geography dates from 1929, those in Painting and Social Studies from 1934, that in Public Administration from 1941.

In one other matter Dublin University may claim to have given a lead. In 1903 it was the first of the older Universities to admit women to its degrees.<sup>16</sup> Since then their number has followed a trend quite different from that observed in University College, Dublin.

TABLE III.  
*Number of men and women students in Trinity.*

Years	Men	Women	Percentage of women students
1910-11	1,051	174	14.2
1921-22	1,058	245	18.9
1930-31	1,104	351	24.0
1938-39	1,156	332	22.3
1944-45	1,012	388	27.2

<sup>15</sup>Royal Commission on the University of Dublin (Trinity College). Cmd. 1078. 1920, page 33.

<sup>16</sup>In the previous paper it was stated that the Royal University was the first in these islands to admit women to degrees. In fact London did so in 1878.

In the paper on University College it was possible to trace variations in the number of students in each faculty over the last thirty years. It is unfortunately impossible to give an exactly similar table for Trinity. The figures are incomplete; and they are influenced by the fact that Dublin is one of the few remaining Universities in which students in every school must graduate in Arts. It is therefore difficult to trace the relationship of the numbers in each professional school to the total number of students; and the task is made almost impossible by the fact that the number of students on the books does not represent the true number attending classes. Nevertheless the following figures may be of some interest.

TABLE IV.

*Distribution of full-time students by professional schools.*

Professional School	1905-06			1924-25			1938-39			1943-44		
	M.	W.	T.	M.	W.	T.	M.	W.	T.	M.	W.	T.
Divinity ...	69	—	69	30	—	30	128	—	128	83	—	83
Physic ...	207	7	214	289	38	327	436	101	537	341	128	469
Dentistry ...	—	—	—	16	1	17	6	—	6	5	2	7
Law ...	39	—	39	71	5	76	50	7	57	37	6	43
Engineering and Architecture ...	69	—	69	52	—	52	63	—	63	100	—	100
Commerce ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	19	6	25	10	3	13
Agriculture ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	3	6	—	6
Total professional students ...	391			502			819			721		
Total on books ...	853			1,296			1,488			1,400		

The general similarity of these figures to those shown in University College will at once impress the reader.<sup>17</sup> There is the same rapid increase in the numbers following a medical course, although it would seem that dental students are not at all as numerous as in University College. Engineering appears to be subject to fluctuations but has not increased its proportionate importance appreciably in spite of an expansion in recent years. It is apparent that Trinity, like University College, depends greatly on its Medical School and that it also must view with interest projected legislation in Great Britain. Whether this development will in fact reduce the demand for Irish doctors is a very debatable question; but it is one that, like the kindred issue of emigration, may be left for fuller consideration in a later paper.

Traditionally the cost of courses in Trinity College has been higher than in the other Irish universities and colleges. The latter were in some ways especially designed to bring University education within the reach of many who lacked the means to benefit from Trinity—quite apart from the other difficulties to which reference has been made. Undoubtedly the extension of University education raises a number of contentious matters. On the one side, there is the strong feeling that higher education should be brought within the reach of the greatest possible proportion

<sup>17</sup>The oscillations in the Divinity school seem quite inexplicable unless the figures were returned at different times of the year and are not comparable.

of the community; and holders of this view will base their case on the talent that is prevented from development by lack of means. It is a matter for argument whether in fact society loses much by the lack of facilities in this matter: in Great Britain it seems that opinion is veering to the view that the wastage, if it exists at all, is not very great and that extension of higher education is to be recommended more on the political grounds of equality of opportunity than on the grounds of loss to society. Whether this view, if true, applies to this country also is another matter for discussion. Supporters of the other view will argue that university education should be a matter of quality rather than of quantity; that it is undesirable on many grounds to give students an education which lack of means will later prevent them using to the full. They will certainly find plenty of examples from the experience of continental countries during the last two decades. Once again, it is arguable how far these dangers are liable to occur in Ireland. It would seem, too, that it may be the type of course rather than university education as a whole that is in question. We hear on all sides, for example, that the professions are over-crowded and that the true policy is to limit rather than expand the number of entrants. Many reasons can be given for thinking that, in our day, these complaints are true; and yet we find that at no time in the last twenty years were the professions ever regarded as being anything else but overcrowded. In the Law Library, for example, it is an article of faith that there are far too many "on the raft" and that things were better fifty years ago. But we find from the evidence before the Robertson Commission that then, in 1901, it was thought that Ireland was too prolific in barristers. Going back twenty years further, to what now seems a Saturnian reign of few barristers and innumerable Land Purchase Acts, we find that the average annual number of calls to the Bar was thirty in the eighties.<sup>18</sup> In other words, professional overcrowding is always with us. Whatever be the truth in the case of the professions, the case for extended University facilities surely remains in the case of the more technical courses—in applied science for example, or, above all, in agriculture.

To return to Trinity College; it is plain that there also we find a tendency shown in the previous paper—a rise in the cost of university education. It is inevitable that it should be so. Quite apart from the fall in the purchasing power of money, the increased scope of many courses calls for heavy expenditure both for capital for equipment and

TABLE V.  
*School Fees in Trinity College.*

School	1900-01	1944-45
Arts ... ..	£83 4 0	£128 4 0
Divinity ... ..	83 4 0	128 4 0
Law ... ..	93 19 0	142 4 0
Physic ... ..	235 3 0	294 6 0
Engineering ... ..	91 8 0	182 14 0
Science ... ..	83 4 0	131 6 0
Dentistry ... ..	—	218 0 0
Commerce ... ..	—	146 18 0
Agriculture ... ..	—	—

NOTE :—It is possible, that the fees for 1900-01 are under-estimated.

<sup>18</sup>Twenty-one in the sixties. Final Report of 1906 Commission, p. 383.

income for maintenance. Having regard to these factors indeed, it seems arguable that the two institutions surveyed in these papers have not increased their fees by any degree remotely equal to the increase in their expenditure.

It will be seen that in most cases the increase over half a century has not been much greater than a third, which is certainly less than the fall in the purchasing power of money. Most of us, one imagines, would be well content if every pound to-day bought as much as 13s. 4d. could command in the days of the Boer War. Subject to the wider considerations outlined above, it would seem that the Irish people get their university education cheaply enough.

The fees, of course, are only part of the necessary expenses. Perhaps there is nothing that lends itself to such variations as the estimation of the cost of maintaining a student through his course. In the present case, we have the assistance of a very interesting article entitled "Inside Trinity College" that appeared in a recent issue of *The Bell*.<sup>19</sup> The author says: "A student who lives in digs will pay at least £1 15s. to £2 a week during term—twenty-one weeks a year for Arts students, about thirty for Medicals. The cost of living in College rooms depends to some extent on individual standards. The total can hardly be less, nowadays, than about £3 a week." It is perhaps impertinent to question the accuracy of an ex-Editor of *T.C.D.* when he writes of his own College; but one receives these estimates with some surprise. It depends, of course, what kind of digs one has in mind. In the previous paper the price was put at 40/- with the proviso that that figure "certainly represents the lowest price at which they will be found." It is difficult to believe that there are many digs to be found at 35/- nowadays; and it is very arguable that 45/- would come nearer to the facts. We have also to remember that the Arts student will spend a longer period in Dublin than the lecturing term. There are examinations before each of them, for example. Thirty weeks in Medicine also seems on the low side; and one would be inclined to add an extra fortnight at least.

It is, in short, a far cry from the days when Dr. Mahaffy could tell the Fry Commission that a student living economically could get through on £80 a year or, living on a more comfortable scale, on £120 to £130.<sup>20</sup>

But, as *The Bell* article points out, much of these expenses, however swollen at present, may be off-set by prizes. It is impossible not to be impressed by the number of prizes of one kind or another that are open to competition. The College itself, as will be seen later, expends a considerable sum every year; and the accumulated endowments of the last

TABLE VI.

Prizes available each year, by Faculties.

FACULTY	AMOUNT
Arts ... ..	£1,855
Divinity ... ..	524
Law ... ..	13
Physic ... ..	855
Engineering ... ..	120
Agriculture ... ..	30
Commerce ... ..	40
TOTAL ... ..	£3,437

<sup>19</sup>*The Bell*, Vol. X, No. 1, April, 1945. "Inside Trinity College," by W. J. White, page 63.

<sup>20</sup>Appendix to Final Report of Fry Commission, page 173.



century have provided rewards in the older courses. The following figures are offered with great reserve. University Calendars are notoriously difficult reading; and even the admirable clarity of the *Dublin University Calendar* has its traps for the stranger. These figures also, as will be explained, are not complete.

These figures, however, leave out a lot. They do not include prizes on the examinations that are held each term nor, in the School of Divinity, the many catechetical prizes. Neither do they include the outstanding rewards of scholarships. These are awarded in Classics, Mathematics, Experimental Science, Modern Languages, Natural Science, History and Political Science and Mental and Moral Philosophy. The Scholars form part of the corporation of the College. Their full number is seventy but non-Foundation scholarships, instituted in 1854, may be won by those who are ineligible under the Statutes to win a Foundation. The non-Foundation scholarships carry the same privileges, except that women scholars (to whom they are now confined in practice) receive a quarterly salary of £30 in lieu of the right to rooms and £5 quarterly enjoyed by men. Scholars' fees are merely a guinea a half-year during their undergraduate course; they have commons free and their rooms at a reduced rate. The tenure of a scholarship is three to four years. About fifteen scholars and four or five non-Foundation scholars are elected each year. Quite apart from the honour and glory, it is obviously a very useful reward.

Sizarships are granted each year to students of limited means. The holders have commons free, are exempt from half-yearly fees, and pay a reduced entrance fee. For practical purposes they last for about five years. They provide a means of entry for many who would otherwise be unable to bear the expense of a University education; and it is not without interest that the College has been well repaid for its generosity. In his evidence before the Fry Commission, Provost Traill stated that in the preceding sixty years some twenty-two sizars had become Fellows of the College.

There are other prizes that deserve mention, such as the Madden and the Whately prizes. They belong to a stage after a degree has been reached. They do not, except indirectly, bear on the present argument which is directed towards showing the extent to which the impecunious student can finance himself through College. It is clear that it is well within the bounds of possibility to do so.

These prizes and exhibitions come principally from the funds of the College. Over the last century, however, there has grown up a substantial endowment of funds for particular prizes. In these days of falling interest rates, however, the revenue from trust funds must be watched with some anxiety.

It is obvious that the prospect of declining yields may affect the financial position of the College itself. The Registrar has very kindly furnished the following statement of income averaged over a period of five years ending in 1945.

TABLE VII.

*Average yearly income in five years to 1945 and income of Trinity College in 1906.*

1906				1940-45			
Estates	...	...	£43,000	} Property	...	...	£69,000
Investments	...	...	10,000		Tuition and degree fees	...	37,000
Tuition and degree fees and students' payments	...	20,000		Students' payments	...	15,000	
Miscellaneous receipts	...	3,000		Miscellaneous receipts	...	2,750	
				Compensation for lands under Land Act, 1923	...	3,000	
				State grant to School of Physic	...	2,250	
TOTAL	...	...	£76,000	TOTAL	...	...	£129,000

It should be noted that the £15,000 received from students goes to the provision of commons, the upkeep of rooms and wages for servants, etc. If it be deducted, the true income of the College is about £114,000.

That sum represents a comfortable increase on the revenue of 1906 but rising costs must have offset the greater part of any advantage that could be derived from that. More than that, the war of 1914-18 certainly, and that of 1939-45 probably, meant a fall in the number of students with consequent effects on the amount received in tuition and degree fees. After the last war the position was so serious that a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate the finances of the College. The Commissioners were most sympathetic—in this and in other respects—and reported in favour of a non-recurrent grant of £113,000 to compensate the College for its losses during the war years. It also recommended that it should receive an annual grant of £49,000. These proposals would certainly have placed Trinity in a very strong position indeed; and the innovation of an annual grant would have removed all anxiety for years ahead. Unfortunately for Trinity, its financial difficulty was not the only Irish problem of those years; and these recommendations were not put into effect before the signing of the Treaty and the change of government.

The result of these misfortunes has been that, by modern standards, the income of the College is exceedingly low for an institution of its size and standing. There is also the great source of weakness that so much of it comes from property. This property, it may be said, comprises some houses around the College; the agricultural land passed under the Land Purchase Acts long ago. The bulk of the income is derived from investments, a precarious source in these days. It can be easily imagined that with prudent management a comparatively small capital sum could yield an impressive sum in the days before the war of 1914. At that time, Trinity must have been a reasonably wealthy institution, indeed a very wealthy one, by Irish standards. The high-rate investments, as we all know, are now being paid off and being replaced with stock on which the return is markedly less. A few years of such a process would very seriously affect the prize funds and the income of the College. To that degree, its income may look a good deal more solid than it is in fact.

Undoubtedly its city property is exceedingly valuable ; but it may be a source of more embarrassment than gain. The land outside the College is, of course, on lease ; and the return from it can be increased but slowly. As for the College itself, the uniqueness of the site is no advantage. It needs considerable sums for maintenance and cannot be liquidated. The College Park may be excellent building land ; but one cannot imagine the Board leasing building plots ; and one can easily imagine what Dublin would say if it did.

A comparison of the present paper with its predecessor may lead the reader to the conclusion that, if there are striking differences between Trinity College and University College, there are equally impressive resemblances. This seems to be especially true in the case of finance. In both cases, their income is very small when set against the number of their students ; in both cases the income from fees is very small. Neither institution receives anything to speak about from local authorities. In the past, Trinity College has benefited greatly from private endowments ; but this source of income has dried up in modern times, as University College knows to its cost. The State makes an annual grant to University College that readjusts the balance of income between the two institutions, but that grant, measured per student, is far lower than the grants given to any English University ; while Trinity, for practical purposes, receives nothing at all.<sup>21</sup> The following table shows the poverty of the two Dublin colleges when compared with English institutions.

TABLE/VIII.

*Income of Trinity College, University College, Dublin, and certain British Universities.*

	No. of Students	Treasury Grant	Total Income
Reading ... ..	688	£42,000	£153,448
Birmingham ... ..	1,303	86,500	245,741
Trinity College ... ..	1,400	2,250	114,000
Leeds ... ..	1,584	82,000	312,636
Liverpool ... ..	1,586	98,000	283,449
University College, Dublin ...	3,037	82,000	185,100

NOTE.—Figures for Trinity College and University College for 1944–45 ; for English Universities for 1943–44.

It is instructive, and salutary, to compare the sums that the British people, personally and as a community, think proper to give their Universities with the provision that is thought adequate in this country. Reading, for example, is a very small and new institution. It admittedly has benefited greatly from the generosity of Messrs. Huntley & Palmer. And it receives more money each year than our oldest or our largest College.

It is important to realise that this glaring contrast is already heightened by the increase of State grants in Great Britain. The annual grant during the war years was £2,140,000. In 1945 it was increased to £5,650,000. For 1946 it stands at £9,415,000. It is not so much a question of the difference in the figures, striking though that is ; it is much more the

<sup>21</sup>The grant to the School of Physic is for certain work carried on there.

difference in attitude that they disclose. In Great Britain, at least, it is recognised that modern conditions place an increasing strain on universities and that their finances have been gravely affected by the recent war. It is recognised that if they are to hold their own, let alone be capable of increasing their usefulness to the community, their finances must be improved. It is recognised that expansion in this connection cannot come at all from private endowment and only to a very limited extent from increased fees. The position is very different in Ireland; where it can be said without exaggeration that we have neglected the whole question of higher education. Next session, it is to be hoped, we will be in possession of statistics for all the Irish universities and colleges; and the question of State subsidies is perhaps better discussed against a general background.<sup>22</sup> But, in the case of Trinity as in the case of University College, one is left with a deep impression of two colleges that have admirably discharged the work they were founded to perform and have upheld the good name of Irish scholarship and now find their usefulness limited by social and financial changes that are beyond their power to control.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup>Like the connection between professional training and emigration or the optimum number of University students, to mention only two matters that affect them all.

<sup>23</sup>It would have been quite impossible to write this paper without the help of the Assistant Registrar and his staff to whom I must express my sincere thanks. I have also to thank the Registrar, and several members of the staff, for their assistance and information

## APPENDIX.

The last paper contained a survey of the places of residence of students of University College, Dublin. This attracted considerable interest; and it was decided to make a similar inquiry in Trinity College. Unfortunately it is not possible to present an exactly comparable table as, in Trinity, information as to place of origin or residence is only available in respect of those who come on the books each year. Consequently, the inquiry covers a much smaller selection than in University College; and, for reasons already stated, it is less accurate even within these narrower limits.

Nevertheless, it was decided that the results, however qualified, would be worth the labour involved; and the figures are shown in the following table:—

TABLE 1.

*Place of Residence of Students Coming on Books.*

County or City	1928-29	1943-44
Dublin C.B. ... ..	172	142
Belfast C.B. ... ..	24	30
Derry C.B. ... ..	14	8
Cork C.B. ... ..	11	5
Limerick C.B. ... ..	5	2
Waterford C.B. ... ..	4	2

TABLE 1—continued.

## Place of Residence of Students Coming on Books.

County or City	1928-29	1943-44
Antrim ... ..	16	20
Down ... ..	22	18
Armagh ... ..	11	11
Derry ... ..	8	8
Tyrone ... ..	7	14
Fermanagh ... ..	5	—
Cavan ... ..	6	9
Monaghan ... ..	6	5
Donegal ... ..	14	16
Louth ... ..	4	5
Meath ... ..	3	4
Dublin ... ..	16	17
Wicklow ... ..	10	10
Wexford ... ..	6	10
Kildare ... ..	3	6
Leix ... ..	6	2
Offaly ... ..	1	5
Carlow ... ..	2	3
Kilkenny ... ..	—	4
Longford ... ..	4	3
Westmeath ... ..	1	4
Cork ... ..	14	14
Kerry ... ..	10	5
Limerick ... ..	2	2
Tipperary ... ..	12	3
Waterford ... ..	3	—
Clare ... ..	5	3
Galway ... ..	2	2
Mayo ... ..	7	7
Roscommon ... ..	2	2
Sligo ... ..	3	3
Leitrim ... ..	—	—
Ireland ... ..	441	404
Abroad ... ..	27	17
TOTAL ... ..	468	421

## NOTE :

In 1928-29 students coming from abroad were distributed as follows:—England and Wales, 16; South Africa, 5; India, 4; U.S.A. and Germany 1 each.

In 1943-44, students coming from abroad were distributed as follows:—England and Wales, 11; Scotland, U.S.A., France, Czecho Slovakia, South Africa and Gold Coast, 1 each.

Dún Laoghaire Borough is included in Dublin C.B.

The large proportion of students from north-east Ulster will be noted: it is in striking contrast to the U.C.D. figures. On the other hand, one notes that in both institutions there are few from certain areas in the midlands or from the City and County of Waterford. Both similarities and differences appear more clearly in the next table.

TABLE 2.

*Place of Residence of Students Coming on Books in T.C.D. and U.C.D. in Percentages.*

Area	T.C.D.			U.C.D.
	1900-05(1)	1928-29(2)	1943-4	1944-5
Dublin ... ..	40	36.7	33.7	33.9
Leinster (excl. Dublin) ...	11	12.0	17.3	21.6
Ulster ... ..	20	28.4	33.0	10.9
Munster ... ..	10	14.1	8.6	21.3
Connacht ... ..	4	3.0	3.3	9.7
Abroad ... ..	11	5.8	4.1	2.6
Unknown ... ..	4	—	—	—
Total ... ..	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

## NOTE:

(1) Figures supplied by the Provost to the Fry Commission. First Report, p. 21.

(2) This year has been taken as being removed from the changes following the Treaty.

(3) T.C.D. figures based on students coming on the books in each year: U.C.D. figures are for all students.

The variations shown above are of the greatest interest. The forty-five years covered by the table saw political and economic changes that must have profoundly affected the University. The sharp increase in the number of northern students may come as a surprise to many. It is interesting, also, to notice that the number of students from south and west was comparatively unchanged over the period. Tabulation by percentages is, of course, a tricky business; it might be as well, therefore, to state that the numbers coming on the books in the years shown were as follows:—1900-05 (annual average) 253: 1928-29—468: 1943-44—421.

It is curious that, in respect of Dublin, the figures for the two institutions almost exactly agree. When we come to the proportions for the provinces, however, we find a significant contrast. It is one, however, that is in no way surprising in view of the influence that religion and politics have exercised on the development of university education. Another aspect of this contrast is shown in the final table.

TABLE 3.

*Place of Residence of Students in T.C.D. and U.C.D. by Counties and County Boroughs in Percentages.*

Area	T.C.D.		U.C.D.
	1928-29	1943-4	1944-45
County Boroughs ...	52.1	53.2	39.4
Counties ... ..	47.9	46.8	60.6
Total ... ..	100.0	100.0	100.0

## NOTE:

The T.C.D. figures are based on statistics of those coming on the books in each year. The U.C.D. figures are for all students.

The percentages are calculated on the number of students who are known to be Irish-born.

In calculating figures for 1928-9, suburbs such as Dun Laoghaire and Howth have been reckoned as part of Dublin C.B.

### DISCUSSION ON MR. MEENAN'S PAPER.

**Professor Duncan**, proposing the vote of thanks, said: I should like first of all to commend most heartily the labour Dr. Meenan must have put into this paper, the amount of not very accessible but always relevant information he has accumulated, and the sympathetic and discriminating way in which he has handled it. The College to which I have the honour to belong has been so often the object of unreflecting praise and of ignorant hostility that it is refreshing indeed to see it put upon the cold slab with kindly comprehension, but yet with objective clear-sightedness. It is therefore with both pleasure and gratitude that I move the thanks of the Society to Dr. Meenan.

Let me mention first a few particular points on which I desire more exact information or have some comment. For particular purposes I think we may now take the identity of College and University for granted. Does Table I include medical students, etc., who, having graduated, are no longer "on the Books in Arts," but are nevertheless pursuing full-time courses of instruction in the University? In Table II, does the total include the part-time Professors in the Medical School, etc.? And does it include or exclude the Fellows, Professors and junior staff absent on leave? Trinity has clearly followed the rule that University populations rise in years of economic depression, but her headache must remain the question: "How likely is it that the influx of students related to the primary world depression of 1929-32 and the secondary local depression of 1932-38 and the war conditions of 1938-45 will maintain itself?" A governing body such as the Board is likely to be very efficient in a limited sense, and my experience in Government offices in London during the war has led me to comment very favourably upon its dispatch of business (though not necessarily on the wisdom of its decisions). Incidentally, the recent-age composition of the Board, one of its most peculiar features, is not inherent in the older statutes of the College, but an unintended accident of various emendations of those statutes which removed some of the former incidents of Fellowship.

Turning to more general points, Dr. Meenan brought out admirably many of the problems which are at present vexing the less contemplative members of Trinity and similar institutions—first and foremost, contrary to popular belief, Trinity is both poor in comparison with similar Universities, and dependent to an extremely high degree upon the fees paid by her students (32 per cent. of her revenues being derived therefrom). It is, unfortunately, on the cards that we shall have to contemplate raising our fee-revenue still further, in default of other sources of income, in order to maintain the standards of a modern University which has no recourse to the taxpayer. It is, however, worth noting that the increases in fees shown in Table V, even if they were to be substantially increased in the near future, would still be out of all relation to the change in the value of money during the period. Similarly compared with secondary school fees at the present time, they are singularly low. This means that University education, in Trinity as elsewhere, is relatively a bargain, compared either with its costs in the past and with comparable costs to the present. This naturally raises the very important question, which Dr. Meenan is wisely referring to his concluding paper, whether our numbers of graduates may not be out of balance with their opportunities of employment. Considering this island as a unit, that has been true for a century, but has been of no particular importance, because

Irishmen (in fact) and graduates (we hope) have considered the world as their oyster. But the oyster is fast breaking up into a collection of mean, little, self-contained sub-oysters, and, if that process continue along its present lines, we may soon find this island population saddled with an intellectual proletariat.

Dr. Meenan suggested three criteria of a living University—freedom in accepting students of all sorts, shapes and kinds; vigour in extending and reshaping its courses of instruction to fit in with the developing field of knowledge; and output of original work of research. On all three scores I am confident Trinity can hold its own with all comparable institutions—and I say this deliberately, as a vigorous internal critic. The objectives cannot always be fully reconciled. Given limited resources, better and fuller teaching inevitably means less research and *vice versa*: from that there is no escape.

May I conclude by once more emphasizing how deeply the Society is indebted to Dr. Meenan?

Miss Stafford, in seconding the vote of thanks, referred to the King's letter of January, 1904, empowering the Provost and Senior Fellows of Trinity College to admit women to the degrees of Dublin University. It was suggested at the time that when the original statutes were framed there was "no desire on the part of women to proceed to such degrees."

The *Irish Times* of the 17th November, 1906, considered the achievement of women in the Scholarship and Moderatorship examinations of the year of such a character as to justify mention by name of the recipients. A Moderatorship was described as the culminating distinction of a distinguished academic career.

Miss Stafford in referring to the speeches of the late Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, who from the time of his translation to the See of Dublin spoke on so many public occasions with such eloquence and vehemence on the settlement of the Irish University question said that it was difficult now to recapture the enthusiasm which the question aroused in the eighties and nineties of the last century. His Grace by his contacts with the leading Statesmen of the time—Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. John Morley, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Hicks Beach, and Mr. Bryce—brought the whole question into front page headlines. She quoted the reference of His Grace to the venerable traditions of the Ancient University of Dublin and pointed out that His Grace and Mr. Gladstone stressed the fact that whatever form the settlement of the Irish University question might take, the new University or College should not be one lagging and hobbling behind the Ancient University of Dublin.

If a new College or Colleges had been established under Dublin University as proposed as a basis for a settlement that found considerable support, Miss Stafford wondered what the effects of such a settlement would have been not only on the University life of the country but on the Ireland of to-day.

Miss Stafford referred to the Organisation of the Women Graduates of the three Universities—Dublin, National and Queen's—forming the Irish Federation of University Women which in turn was affiliated to the International Federation of University Women.

Finally, she suggested that the position of women in the mediaeval Universities of Europe, from which they were not excluded would be an interesting study for the Society.



Senator Johnston, S.F.T.C.D., pointed out that the proportion of students to total population was about 1 in 1,000 in Great Britain. In Ireland, it appeared to be somewhat higher. Were we more susceptible of Higher Education in Ireland?

Trinity College had a valuable tradition of helping along poor students who showed merit. Financial conditions make it more and more difficult to pursue this policy to the extent that would be desired. University fees had been increased, and now formed a higher proportion of total University revenues, but total University expenditure had increased much less than the cost of living as compared with 1914.

It was generally agreed that University education should be made more accessible to all classes of the community. Did we want quality or quantity in the development of such educational facilities? Should this be regarded as a personal right in accordance with an ideal of equality of opportunity? Or should the matter be approached from the point of view of the general welfare? In practice it might seem to make little difference, but it does make a difference whether the emphasis is on personal rights or social obligation. In her long history Trinity has caught many "gems of purest ray serene" and thus made a valuable contribution to the nation of which she is an organic part as well as to the world. But the net is by no means wide enough, and financial conditions make it difficult to widen it.