

10

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION  
IN IRELAND:

A LETTER

TO

J. S. MILL, ESQ. M.P.

BY

J. E. CAIRNES, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF JURISPRUDENCE AND POLITICAL ECONOMY,  
QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.

London :

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1866.

(ONE SHILLING.)

LONDON :

R. CLAY, SON, AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS,  
BREAD STREET HILL.

To JOHN STUART MILL, Esq. M.P.

DEAR SIR,

Nothing can be more natural than that the charge of Protestant bigotry should be urged against those who oppose a demand proceeding, or purporting to proceed, from Irish Roman Catholics. No doubt this is the source from which most of the opposition offered to such demands in past times has sprung, and no doubt Protestant bigotry is still a powerful principle of conduct in this country. I cannot, therefore, feel surprised that, having ventured to advance some arguments against the changes proposed to be made in Irish university education in deference to the demands of the Irish Roman Catholic prelates, I should find myself held forth by those who support that proposal as seeking to revive Protestant ascendancy in Ireland. "The proposed change," says Professor Sullivan, in a pamphlet in which he has done me the honour to canvass at much length what I have said on this subject, "has not given satisfaction to the ascendancy party in Ireland, because they know that a properly educated Catholic middle class would soon deprive them of a monopoly which they formerly defended in the name of conservatism, but which they now propose to maintain in the name of liberalism and enlightenment." I confess I am anxious to relieve myself from this imputation, and I do not know how I can do so in a fairer manner than by addressing what I have to say in the way of rejoinder to Professor Sullivan's criticisms to yourself. It would argue very extraordinary confidence in my own skill in "shaking the red flag of Ultramontaniam before the eyes of British Liberals"—which is the office Professor Sullivan has been good enough to assign me—that I should have selected for the experiment, of all British Liberals, John Stuart Mill.

And here at the outset I am anxious to determine, as nearly as may be, the extent of my disagreement with Professor Sullivan; for I think I can show that it is by no means as great as the practical conclusions at which he has arrived in his pamphlet, coupled with the asperity of some of his expressions towards myself, might lead his readers

to suppose. Indeed, it seems to me that Professor Sullivan has differences to settle with his own allies far more serious and fundamental than any that exist between him and me. I need scarcely remind you that the fundamental position of those who have led the attack on the present system of education in Ireland is that "mixed education" is an evil thing, "replete with grave and intrinsic dangers to faith and morals;" and that their avowed purpose is to replace the present system, which is "mixed," and administered by lay boards, by one constituted on the denominational plan, and subject, so far as Roman Catholic education is concerned, to ecclesiastical control. This is the position taken up by Major O'Reilly in his essays on this subject; still more distinctly by Dr. Woodlock in his contribution to the controversy; and, if possible, more emphatically still by the Roman Catholic bishops in their recent correspondence with Sir George Grey. But from the beginning to the end of Professor Sullivan's pamphlet there is scarcely a word\* that is not, so far as I can see, quite consistent with approval of the principle of mixed education, or that favours the idea of placing Roman Catholic education under ecclesiastical control. I beg attention especially to the following passage:—

"I will be told that the true qualification for a professorship ought to be knowledge of the subject to be taught, and not profession of a creed. Why do not those who think so denounce Trinity College, when it advertises that none but Protestants need apply, even for a portership? Why should the principle be only recollected when Irish Catholics endeavour to give voice to their imprisoned intellect? I am answered that this spirit of exclusiveness was the work of other times, and that no such institution

\* The strongest statement I can find in favour of the ecclesiastical pre-tension is the following at p. 22, in which, it will be observed, the point is put hypothetically: "If Catholics choose to admit the right of the clergy to have an influence on the mode of teaching those subjects which are intimately associated with, nay, perfectly inseparable from, religious dogma, they are perfectly entitled to do so." The subjects so associated had just before been explained to be the "rational," as contradistinguished from the "physical" sciences. If the reader will contrast this with Major O'Reilly's exposition of the same problem, he will see how little Professor Sullivan can be taken as the exponent of the views of the party with which he happens now to be co-operating.—See "Two Articles on Education," by Myles W. O'Reilly, LL.D. M.P. pp. 85—87.

would now be established. But we are still in the mental prison-house which this intolerance created; let it be pulled down before we are asked to accept what they call freedom. To be able to accept such a principle, there should be absolute equality. All religious tests should be abolished, not only in endowed colleges and schools, but in all public offices, and not merely in theory, as is the case to a great extent now, but in *practice*; but, above all, Catholics should have time to elevate themselves to an intellectual equality with their Protestant fellow-countrymen. Let that be attained, and we shall hear no more of this controversy between Protestants and Catholics within the domain of literature and science. We shall be able to mingle therein freely, and all alike contribute our offerings to the common stock of human knowledge." (P. 20.)

The drift of the passage is not, perhaps, perfectly clear; but I understand Professor Sullivan to say that he is in favour in principle of the abolition of religious tests in universities, and therefore in favour in principle of what must result from the abolition of religious tests—united education; he would have "all religious tests abolished, not only in endowed colleges and schools, but in all public offices, and not merely in theory, but in practice;" but, religious equality not yet being fully attained in Ireland, he thinks that the best preparation for the system he approves would be a transitional *régime* of sectarian institutions. When "Catholics shall have had time to raise themselves to an intellectual equality with their Protestant fellow-countrymen" in institutions fashioned on the pattern of "the Catholic University," when a few generations have been trained in the doctrine propounded the other day by the rector of that model seminary, that association with Protestants is, from the "Catholic" point of view, tantamount to association with the "irreligious," with the "immoral," then the time will have arrived for realizing Professor Sullivan's ideal, and "we shall hear no more of this controversy between Protestants and Catholics in the domain of literature and science." If this be Professor Sullivan's view—and it seems to me to be the only meaning which the passage I have quoted will bear, as it is also quite in keeping with the general tenor of his argument—then I

beg you to observe that the difference between him and me is trivial compared with that which he will one day have to settle with his ecclesiastical allies.\* Between him and me there is, so far as I can collect, no disagreement as regards the end we pursue. We both desire the triumph of the secular principle in university education—"the abolition of all religious tests in endowed schools and colleges," and "the free mingling of Protestants and Catholics in the domain of literature and science:" but we differ as to the means by which we seek to realize our common ideal. While I would approach it by persisting in the course on which the country has entered, as exemplified in the foundation of the Queen's University and Colleges in Ireland, and more recently in the partial abolition of religious tests in Oxford and Cambridge, Professor Sullivan, on the other hand, holds—I find a difficulty in stating his view in language which shall not seem to misrepresent him, but this is what I understand him to maintain—that the end in view will be best attained by reversing this process, by abandoning the course of reform on which we have entered, and adopting the educational policy of which Doctor Cullen is the advocate, and "the Catholic University" the practical illustration—that is to say, we are to reimpose tests in order to their ultimate extinction, and to train Catholics and Protestants in separate institutions as the best preparation for their future harmonious intercommunion.

Such, to the best of my powers of interpretation, are the positions respectively occupied in this controversy by Professor Sullivan and myself; and having thus stated the

\* I find my anticipation has not far outrun the event. Commenting on Professor Sullivan's declaration that he is one of those "who believe that it is possible to combine a sincere attachment to the doctrines of the Catholic Church with the fullest and freest cultivation of all human science," a writer in the current number of the *Dublin Review* propounds to him the following neat dilemma:—

"When Dr. Sullivan speaks of the 'fullest and freest cultivation of all human science,' we shall be glad to know whether he does or does not claim for such science a greater liberty than the Pope has conceded to it. If he do *not* claim a greater liberty for it, we can see no difference in this respect between his principles and our own. But if he *does*, his opinion is not consistent with 'a sincere attachment to the doctrines of the Catholic Church,' because it directly contradicts one of them." (P. 92.) There are here, I rather think, the materials for a very pretty quarrel.

question between us—so far as it involves considerations of policy and does not turn on points of fact and detail—I must so leave it; for Professor Sullivan has given no reasons for his opinion, and I own I am quite unable to imagine any. But he has another and far deeper question to settle with his ecclesiastical allies—a question which he has found it convenient to ignore, but which I think liberal politicians, before accepting his authority as an exponent of the case, will do well to take account of. It has already appeared that Professor Sullivan's ideal of a university system is not that of the Catholic bishops—is in fact directly opposed to theirs; and I wish now to point out that, notwithstanding that he happens for the moment to agree with them in advocating the claims of "the Catholic University" to State support, there is no coincidence of view between him and them as to the position which this institution is to assume, supposing the present demands conceded. As regards the purpose of the bishops respecting it, this has been indicated with unmistakeable clearness in the draft of a charter which they have submitted to Sir George Grey. In that document it is proposed to vest the government of "the Catholic University"—"our University," as the bishops are careful to call it—absolutely in twelve members of their own order—that is to say, four archbishops and eight bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, with whom would remain the power of appointing and removing at discretion the rector, vice-rector, and professors, and whose "authority would be supreme," not only "in questions regarding religion and morals," but "in all other questions in the said college." Such is the idea of the bishops. Professor Sullivan's view may be gathered from the following passage:—

"Where," he asks, "is the centre of intellectual force for Irish Catholic education? Does the University of Dublin perform that function? Do the Queen's Colleges?" Having decided these questions in the negative, he continues:—"Is there, then, no institution which can be considered to be the intellectual centre of Irish Catholic education? As the teachers of our intermediate schools are for the most part priests, it is evident that the ecclesiastical colleges must be the intellectual centres whence

our schools derive intellectual vitality. Diocesan seminaries for ecclesiastical students may perhaps naturally centre in such institutions; but there is an incongruity that this should be the case with regard to schools for laymen." (P. 13.) And hence he infers the need for "the Catholic University" to serve as *secular* centre for Catholic education—a secular centre, from the governing body of which not merely laymen, but all except the higher ecclesiastics, are, according to the programme of the bishops, to be absolutely excluded! In their views, therefore, with regard to "the Catholic University," no less than in their ultimate aims, Professor Sullivan and his ecclesiastical friends are directly at variance. Now, this is a circumstance of some importance in connexion with the attitude which Professor Sullivan assumes in this controversy. He writes as a Liberal addressing Liberals, and appeals to principles to which Liberals will naturally feel disposed to defer. I have already pointed out the strange incongruity there exists between his principles and the practical policy they are adduced to support; and the fact now brought into view shows that, even could his policy be regarded as effectual for the ends it is intended to advance, it is not the policy, as his ends are not the ends, of those with whom he is acting. Before, therefore, any practical weight can safely be attached to his representations, we ought to know how far his views are really those which are likely to determine the course of the movement into which he has thrown himself. A few facts bearing on this consideration may be mentioned.

Professor Sullivan is doubtless correct in stating that "the Catholic University was not the creation of the clergy alone."\* A leaning towards the denominational

\* Though I conceive he is wholly incorrect in implying (as I understand him to do) that the undertaking was not *mainly* the work of foreign ecclesiastics. In a rescript from the Sacred Congregation to Dr. Slattery, Bishop of Cashel, dated 9th Oct. 1847, the following passage occurs:—"Imprimis vero opportunum Sacra Congregatio fore duceret, si, collatis viribus, Catholicam academiam ad illius instar quæ per Belgii Antistites in civitate Lovaniensi fundata est, in Hibernia quoque erigendam Episcopi curarent." And in a communication of the same kind in the following year (11th Oct. 1848) the topic is recurred to in these terms:—"Cum autem innotescat quanto studio Clerus et integra Natio pro iis adlaborentibus ad bonum Ecclesiæ promovendum referuntur, de Universitate Catho-



principle in education, national feeling, deference to the strongly expressed wishes of the Holy See,—these and other motives could not fail to elicit from the Catholic laity a certain response to the urgent appeals addressed to them by the committee appointed at Thurles. We know, moreover, that this committee, which till within a few years was the governing body of the “University,” included amongst its original members eight laymen—one-third of the whole number—besides eight priests from the lower orders of the clergy. There seems thus, on the first foundation of “the Catholic University,” to have been amongst its supporters what we may, at least by comparison, call a liberal section. Well, what amount of influence has this liberal section of its supporters hitherto exercised on the fortunes of the “University?” Not merely the eight laymen, but even the eight representatives of the lower clergy, have been eliminated from the governing body, which, as appears from the calendar of last year, consists now exclusively of members of the episcopal order—viz. of four archbishops and eight bishops—a constitution which the proposal just submitted to the Government in the correspondence with Sir George Grey shows that it is the intention of the dominant party to render permanent. Another circumstance may be noted in the same connexion. The first rector of “the Catholic University” was Dr. John H. Newman. Along with him not less, I believe, than five or six Englishmen, recent converts to Catholicism, accepted offices in the college. But a few years only passed when Dr. Newman found it necessary to resign his post. The reasons for his resignation have not been given to the world; but a recent occurrence has decisively shown, what has long been suspected, that Dr. Newman does not belong to the advanced school of Ultramontaniam represented in Ireland by Dr.

*lica erigenda Eminentissimi Patres haud desperandum censuerunt; imo consilium hujusmodi iterum iterumque commendarunt,*” &c.

It may be true, for aught I know to the contrary, that, as Professor Sullivan alleges, “the idea [of ‘the Catholic University’] was in the minds of many Irish Catholics long before the Queen’s Colleges;” but Professor Sullivan gives no evidence of this, and I venture to express my belief that he will be unable to show that “the Catholic University” was taken up by any Irish party as a practical scheme till pressed “*iterum et iterumque*” upon the Irish clergy by the foreign tribunal from whose communications I have just quoted.

Cullen, and in this country by Dr. Manning; and it has always been understood that his retirement from "the Catholic University" was occasioned by finding himself in collision with the former of these personages. Certain it is, at all events, that Dr. Newman, who represented the element of loyalty, moderation, and culture in the society into which he had passed, withdrew before many years from the uncongenial post; and it is, I believe, not less certain that he has since been followed by most of the Englishmen who accepted offices in the college. These are a few indications of which outsiders can take note, and they betoken a course of affairs in "the Catholic University" not very promising, I should say, for the success of Professor Sullivan's secular scheme. Dr. Newman's "plan of a university" may be "as much in harmony with the nineteenth century" as Professor Sullivan thinks: but he forgets that it is not "Dr. Newman's plan," but Dr. Cullen's, with which the public have now to deal. In the correspondence with Sir George Grey we hear nothing of Dr. Newman, nothing of the Catholic laity, nothing of the need of a secular centre for Catholic education; but we do hear much of the bishops, of their pretensions and claims, and of "*our* University."

I have endeavoured to show that Professor Sullivan and I are really at one upon the question of principle involved in the present controversy, and that our difference is merely as to the mode of arriving at the end which we both alike desire. The following passage, I think, confirms this view, and shows further that, even as regards the Queen's Colleges, there is no difference between us that may not be resolved into one of practical detail:—

"Professor Cairnes," he writes at page 57, "tells us that Doctors Murray and Crolly, the Archbishops of Dublin and Armagh, approved of the statutes of the Queen's Colleges, which were submitted to them, and that the name of Dr. Murray was amongst those of the original members of the Queen's University Senate. This is to some extent true, and, as I have said before, if the moderation of these men had been strengthened by a few concessions in practice, and by a just recognition of Catholics in the Senate of the University, and in the appointments to the professorships,

there can be no doubt the colleges would have been received in a different spirit by both clergy and laity. If, as Professor Cairnes says, 'a few more years of their gentle and enlightened rule would have carried with them in support of the colleges, as it had already carried with them in support of the national schools, the great body of the clergy,' the greater must be the blame which they deserve who marred that happy result."

I think I am justified, after this, in assuming that Professor Sullivan has no objection in principle to the system of the Queen's University and Colleges. Had only a few concessions been made in practice; had only a few more Catholics been placed on the Senate and in the professorial chairs, we should, according to him, have had priests and people in accord in supporting them, and, instead of incurring his hostility, those institutions might now, we may fairly assume, enjoy the considerable advantage of being defended, did they need it, by his pen. Unfortunately, the required concessions were not made, and "that happy result"—the triumph of the mixed system—was "marred." "And are not," he adds, sliding again into that singular view of the relation of means to ends which leads him to support "the Catholic University" as a step towards united education—"are not the opponents of the Government proposals now working to mar a second attempt to effect the same object?" That is to say, the success of the Queen's Colleges having been "marred" through the failure to carry into full effect the principle of religious equality in the distribution of the patronage connected with them, those who approve of the colleges are to understand that they will best remedy the effects of that mistake, and best promote the triumph of the system they approve—that of united education—by joining Professor Sullivan and the Catholic hierarchy in a movement undertaken avowedly for its destruction.

Not many friends of the principle in question will, I should think, be sensible of the cogency of this appeal; but most will recognise and regret—as, for my part, I beg to say that I very greatly do—the present very inadequate representation of Catholics in the offices of the Queen's University and Colleges. The circumstance had been

already dwelt upon by Sir Dominic Corrigan in his pamphlet on University Education, and the reply which his arguments elicited from Professor Nesbitt\* deserved, it seems to me, very different consideration from that which it receives from Professor Sullivan, when he dismisses it with the utterly unwarrantable remark that its author, "a member of the ascendancy party," had been indulging in "mean calumnies" and "vulgar gibes" at the expense of Catholics for not producing Senior Wranglers. Professor Sullivan charges Mr. Whittle and me with using "Ultramontaniam" as a "red flag" for the purpose of exciting "British Liberals;" but I think that this and some other passages in the same spirit which might be culled from his pamphlet show that he is himself no mean adept in the art which he attributes to others; and that in his hands "Protestant ascendancy" can on occasion become a very convenient "red flag" for arousing the prejudices of his readers. Professor Nesbitt's argument cannot be answered; but there is no difficulty in tabooing it as a "calumny" of the "ascendancy" party. For what in effect is it that Professor Nesbitt has said? Merely what Professor Sullivan himself admits, and what I must here repeat at the risk of giving occasion for another flourish of the flag in question; namely this, that at the time the Queen's Colleges were founded, the state of education amongst Catholics in Ireland was at so low a point, that, consistently with satisfying the paramount condition in the case—consistently with filling the chairs with men whose position and attainments would give to the colleges that prestige which was indispensable to their success—Catholics could not have been appointed in the numbers that would have been both reasonable and desirable had their literary and scientific qualifications been on a par with those of Protestants. I shall append Professor Nesbitt's argument in a note: the following is the account given by his indignant critic of the state of education amongst Catholics at the time in question:—

"Considering the circumstances of the country, the

\* "Remarks on Dr. Corrigan's Letter on University Education in Ireland," by W. Nesbitt, M.A. Professor of Latin, Queen's College, Belfast. (McGee, Dublin.)

short time that has elapsed since the first partial emancipation of education was effected, the absence of any considerable endowments, but, above all, the fact that the field of science was entirely closed to Catholics—and even still continues partially closed to them—the condition of the Irish Catholic collegiate and intermediate schools is creditable to the Irish clergy. It must, however, be admitted that there is much room for improvement. The classical languages are not taught in such a way as to lay a sufficiently solid and extensive foundation for the subsequent acquirement of that accurate critical knowledge which is one of the chief objects of academical education. Mathematics, for which the generality of Irish students exhibit true aptitude, are too often taught in the antiquated fashion of the pedagogues of the last generation, but not with the thoroughness which often distinguished them. The elements of the physical sciences can hardly be said to be efficiently taught in any of them. An acquaintance with the phenomena and laws of the physical universe must, henceforward, form an essential element of all real education; while, independent of its intrinsic value, a knowledge of physical science, generally diffused among the upper and middle classes of Ireland, would be the most effective and practical stimulant of the development and growth of successful industry. The backward state of this branch of education in Catholic schools is very easily accounted for. In the first place, the physical sciences require experimental illustration, which is expensive; and, in the second, the teachers have not had an opportunity of learning those subjects themselves, or, above all, of working in proper practical laboratories.” (P. 11.) And, again, at p. 16, he writes: “Nevertheless, at the period immediately preceding the foundation of the Queen’s Colleges, *the germs of a love of science began to bud* amongst Irish Catholics, and, had they been fostered, would have shown blossoms and fruit.” And this being the state of education amongst Irish Catholics,—“the germs of a love of science” just beginning “to bud;” classical culture in the backward condition described; mathematics still taught “in the antiquated fashion of the pedagogues of the last generation, but not with the thoroughness which often distinguished

them ;” “ the elements of the physical sciences hardly yet efficiently taught in any” Catholic schools,—Professor Sullivan is nevertheless of opinion that “ it would have been not only just but wise to have bestowed the majority of the Chairs [in the Queen’s Colleges] upon [Irish\*] Catholics.” Let me remind him that such was not the view of the proper mode of distributing academical patronage taken by the founders of “ the Catholic University.” When that institution was founded in 1853, the occasion was surely one on which due recognition must have been given to Irish Catholic merit ; yet, when the appointments came to be made, almost all the professorships in arts were conferred, not indeed on Protestants, but on Englishmen trained in Protestant universities, who had in most instances but recently joined the Church of Rome. If Professor Sullivan will, dismissing prejudice, reflect on this fact, he may perhaps find an explanation of what I fully admit to be in itself a regrettable circumstance—the considerable preponderance of Protestants in the chairs of the Queen’s Colleges, without being driven to suppose a predetermined design on the part of the Irish Viceroy and Chief Secretaries to exclude Catholics from their due share in the honours and emoluments of those institutions. Indeed, if one but remembers who the Viceroy and Chief Secretaries were who dispensed the patronage of the colleges since their establishment in 1849, the idea of any such design being entertained becomes sufficiently absurd.

But leaving this rather invidious topic, which, after all, notwithstanding that it seems to have determined Professor Sullivan’s hostility to the colleges, rather affects the credit of the ministers who dispensed the patronage than the merits of the system, let me turn to a consideration which is really vital in the matter—the actual success of the Queen’s Colleges in performing the work for which they

\* I have inserted “ Irish,” because the argument requires it, and because, though it is omitted in this sentence, it is plainly implied in the context. In the sentence which follows that which I have quoted immediately above, Professor Sullivan writes : “ I recollect myself how rapidly and widely a taste for science was being developed among young Irish Catholics just then, and the rude shock which the aspirations of many received on finding that the new colleges, like the old, were not to be for them.”

were established. Professor Sullivan is indignant that the defenders of the Queen's Colleges should have had recourse to statistical arguments in proof of their success, attempting, so he puts it, "to reduce a question of national justice to one of mere numbers." I own I do not see why "mere numbers" are not a perfectly legitimate consideration in the discussion of such a question; but, however this may be, Professor Sullivan ought at least to have remembered that, in the statistical argument, those who support the cause of the colleges have been entirely on the defensive. The case got up by the O'Donoghue against them, and which formed the ground of the original action of the Government, was based upon statistics, and could only be met by an appeal to that criterion. It was so met; and the result not being satisfactory to Professor Sullivan—the O'Donoghue's case having, in fact, by general admission, including that of the opponents of the colleges,\* utterly broken down—Professor Sullivan now objects to the argument from "mere numbers," and would transfer the question to the region of abstract justice. And yet, strange to say, he is not so confident of the effect of this change in the venue, but that he still wishes to retain the numerical string for his bow. In fact, in spite of his protest against figures, he has devoted no less than twelve pages of his pamphlet to an attempt to rehabilitate the O'Donoghue's statistical case. Into that attempt I do not propose to follow him. I am content to leave my argument on this part of the case as I have stated it, merely reasserting here what my position was, and the general conclusions at which I arrived. My position was this: that the university returns of Ireland—taken in connexion with the actual social condition of Catholics and Protestants in that country, and with the further fact, that the university returns include students intended for the Church on the Protestant side, while they exclude them on the Catholic, whose divinity students are provided for at Maynooth—negative the assertion of Mr. Gladstone that there is still a "gap" to be filled up in Irish university education, in the sense, that is to say, that there is any considerable number of Irish

\* Amongst others, the *Times*, the *Saturday Review*, and the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

youths desirous of university education, who are debarred from it by existing arrangements. And my conclusions were expressed in these words:—

“Omitting details, the general results accomplished by the Queen’s University and its colleges in a career of fifteen years are these: they have in that time educated 3,330 Irishmen, that is to say, 957 members of the Established Church, 938 Roman Catholics, 1197 Presbyterians, and 238 of other denominations.\* They are at the present moment educating more than at any previous time; their students now being within one-fifth as numerous as those of Trinity College, Dublin, and within one-third as numerous as those of the University of Oxford. In a period of fourteen years the Queen’s University has conferred 886 degrees (exclusive of diplomas and *ad eundems*); the number conferred by the London University during the corresponding period of its career being 841, or about 5 per cent. less. The colleges have since their establishment trebled the number of Roman Catholic laymen receiving university education. The quality of their education, as shown by every available test, is not inferior to that obtainable in any of the older universities. Lastly, they have eminently succeeded in what was a leading object of their establishment—the bringing together in the same classrooms of students from all the various religious bodies in the country.” Not one iota of these conclusions has been disturbed by Professor Sullivan’s criticisms.†

\* These figures represent the numbers who have matriculated and attended lectures in the colleges. It is to the purpose, however, to remark, that of those who have gone on to degrees the Catholic *proportion*, as also the Dissenting *proportion*, is considerably larger than the figures I have given would indicate.

† From Professor Rogers’ work on the endowments of Oxford (pp. 217-18), it appears that “Before the Act of 1854, there were well-nigh 1200 endowments (scholarships and exhibitions) attached to the colleges, and enjoyed by members of them.” “This number includes those Fellows of New College, Christ Church, and St. John’s, who are below the degree of M.A. ;” but the great bulk of them are available for Undergraduates. These 1200 endowments are, I have been informed, worth, annually, about £80,000. The total income of the University and colleges was stated last year by Dr. Pusey as not less than £220,000 a year. Such are the inducements which Oxford has to offer, and for all this the result is between 1400 and 1500 students, of whom, perhaps, one-half are intended for a Church which pays some millions a year to its functionaries. This is what is considered a success. On the other hand, the Queen’s Colleges,



In connexion with this part of the case there is a fact to which I called attention, but which Professor Sullivan, though he has adverted to it, has wholly failed to meet. Major O'Reilly makes it a charge against the Queen's Colleges that they are fostering in Ireland a habit of looking to the State for a career, founding himself upon the undoubted fact that for every vacancy in the public service a crowd of candidates issue from the colleges. The fact is, I say, unquestionable: it was urged some years ago by opponents writing in what they conceived the interest of Trinity College, as a proof that the Queen's Colleges were over-educating the people. There was in this view of the case a good deal of plausibility; but how is the fact to be reconciled with the opposite allegation, that there is still a "gap" to be filled in university education? If it be true, as Major O'Reilly urges, that for every cadetship in the constabulary, for every clerkship in the public offices, for every Government appointment in India, there is a crowd of competitors from the Queen's Colleges; if it be also true, as Professor Sullivan will hardly deny, that there is no lack of candidates with university degrees for the learned professions: then will Professor Sullivan inform us who the people in Ireland are, in what section of the community they are to be found, who are in a position to seek a university degree, but are debarred from it by existing arrangements? The only thing approaching to an answer to this question which I can find in his pamphlet is contained in the following passage:—

"Although, as I have above shown, the want of university education for Catholics may be proved by statistical arguments, I do not admit that the question of the higher education of a people should depend solely upon the greater or lesser number of those who may require it. I do not think that there can be too much education in a country, and I will never consent to measure the intellectual wants of Irish Catholics by the length of their purses.

with 162 scholarships, amounting in value to £4,500 a year, of which 138 can be held by Undergraduates, were teaching last year 836 students of whom 756 or thereabouts were intended for lay careers; and this result is branded as a failure.

Why should not the peasant lads of Ireland come 'from the hill sides where they had tended sheep, or from the strath where they had guided the plough,' to an Irish university, and 'return home for the summer, to tend sheep upon the hills, or guide the plough in the valley, with some remnants of the twelve pounds in a retentive pocket, and much of varied and valuable knowledge in a more retentive brain?' as Professor Thompson, of Galway, tells us the Scottish lads do, who frequent the University of Aberdeen. Have the Presbyterians alone the right to unlimited education, while the Irish Catholics must only take it in proportion to their wealth?" (P. 41).

I own at once that Professor Sullivan has here brought to light a real "gap" in Irish university education; but I venture to submit that, with wages over the greater portion of Ireland still scarcely above a shilling a day, the stopping short of university culture at the rank above the "peasant lads" cannot fairly be attributed to defects in the system of the Queen's Colleges. Let me say here that I have no desire at all to prejudge the point raised by Professor Sullivan as to the possibility of extending such culture to peasant lads; my own instincts would entirely lead me to concur in his generous aspirations for universal education: I only say that, in the actual state of Ireland, the discussion seems somewhat premature, and that the "gap" which he has discovered—the only "gap," I believe, that is not mythical—constitutes no practical answer to the question which I have propounded above.

But though Professor Sullivan has failed, as it seems to me, to discover any "gap" in Irish university education which is not fairly attributable to the low industrial condition of the country, he has brought into view, not indeed for the first time, a weak point in our university system, and one which no friend of university education in Ireland ought to ignore. The defect to which I refer will be understood on consideration of the following table, which I copy from p. 35 of his pamphlet:—

Name of Province.	Total Population in 1861.	No. of Catholics.	Total No. of Students attending provincial Queen's College.	No. of Catholic Students.	No. of Entrances of Students in 1864-5.	No. of Catholics entering in 1864-5.
Ulster . .	1,914,236	966,613	405	22	135	6
Connaught	913,135	866,023	169	78	70	28
Munster .	1,513,558	1,420,076	263	129	83	39
Leinster .	1,455,635	1,252,553	—	[113]	—	—

On this Professor Sullivan remarks :—“ If we assume that the number of Catholics in the Queen's College, Cork, represents the total number of Catholic youths in the province of Munster who require academical education, and that the Catholics of the province of Leinster require academical instruction only in the same relative proportion, then a Queen's College in Dublin ought to have at least 113 Catholic students, as I have indicated in the table by the number in brackets. Sir Robert Peel assures us that these Catholics are ‘entirely deprived of academical instruction.’ Any one at all acquainted with Leinster, and especially with Dublin, knows that this estimated number ought, in truth, to be doubled, in order to express the relative ability, proportionate to population, of Leinster Catholics to pay for academical education.”

But, in the first place, in concluding that the 113 Catholics in Leinster, arrived at by the process described, are deprived of university education, Professor Sullivan overlooks the existence of Trinity College. Now the number of Catholics at present receiving education in Trinity College, is, as ascertained by Mr. Whittle, little short of 100; so that Professor Sullivan's “gap” at once shrinks to the not very imposing dimensions of a little over thirteen students. But, says Professor Sullivan, the proportion of Catholics requiring university education in Leinster ought to be doubled, as compared with the corresponding class in Munster. I admit it would be considerably larger, but by no means to such an extent as

this. The important towns of Cork, Limerick, and Waterford are all, it must be remembered, in Munster, and represent a Catholic population in the aggregate not very far inferior in numbers and wealth to the Catholics of Dublin; and as regards the rural population of the two provinces, of which, in both instances, the great bulk of the Catholics is composed, I am not aware that the difference in their circumstances is such as would sensibly affect their relative need of university education. But conceding, as I do, that the proportional requirements in Leinster are, on the whole, greater than those of Munster, I must, on the other hand, contend that Professor Sullivan has considerably over-stated the requirements of Munster. Professor Sullivan is in error in assuming that the 129 Catholic students on the rolls of Cork College are all supplied from Munster. They include Catholics from Leinster and Ulster, and to some extent, I believe, also from Connaught; and though it is possible that some Munster Catholics may go for their education to Dublin and Belfast, there is good reason for believing that this does not occur to the same extent as the movement of Ulster and Leinster Catholics to Cork. Thus the proportion assigned to Munster is greater than the facts warrant. Let us, however, assume that Professor Sullivan's conclusion as to the 113 Catholic aspirants to university education in Leinster is approximately correct, and how stands the case? We have seen that of these 113 students, nearly 100 find an education in Trinity College. We have therefore only to suppose that thirteen Catholics, or thereabouts, find their way from Leinster to Cork and Galway—an assumption, I am sure, greatly within the facts—and the whole of the Leinster quota is disposed of, and Professor Sullivan's "gap" disappears.\* It would be interesting, in connexion with this part of the argument, to know what the numbers are attending "the Catholic University;" but, strange to say, though

\* The following returns will enable the reader to form a pretty close conjecture as to how the case stands. They include students of all denominations; but if it be considered that members of the Established Church in Leinster who are candidates for degrees, almost to a man go to Trinity College, and that Presbyterians and other dissenting students would go in considerable numbers to Belfast, it will be seen that we shall not be far

this is information which one would naturally have looked for from Professor Sullivan, and though the information was, in fact, needed for the complete exposition of his case, he is absolutely silent upon this point. I confess I should greatly have preferred a plain statement from him of the actual numbers of *bonâ fide* students now at the college, to any returns which are likely to be elicited in reply to the application recently made for them in Parliament.

But I am told that, in denying that the Leinster Catholics are deprived of academical instruction, I am at issue with Sir Robert Peel. Begging Professor Sullivan's pardon, if he will look a little closer into what Sir Robert Peel has said he will find that there are no grounds for this remark. On the occasion referred to Sir Robert Peel spoke as follows:—

“We find that three provinces, Ulster, Munster, and Connaught, have each of them a college—Belfast, Cork,

wrong in assuming the numbers below as composed mainly of Roman Catholics.

*Students who have entered the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway from Leinster in the undernoted Sessions.*

	Session 1861—62.	Session 1862—63.	Session 1863—64.	Session 1864—65.	Session 1865—66.	Average Annual Entrances from Leinster in Five Years.
Cork .	5	0	1	3	3	2 2-5ths.
Galway .	13	10	11	18	17	13 4-5ths.
Total for both Colleges.	18	10	12	21	20	16 1-5th.

Thus, the number of students from Leinster who annually enter the Colleges of Cork and Galway are rather more than sixteen: these, on an average, spend about three years at the colleges;—so that the number actually receiving instruction at the colleges at a given time would be not far from fifty. I shall certainly be much within the mark in supposing that one-half of these are Roman Catholics.

and Galway ; and what do we learn ? I have been looking at the rolls of these colleges, and I find their educational influences are almost entirely limited to the immediate districts in which they are situated ; so that while we have Ulster, Munster, and Connaught provided with collegiate education, we find the metropolitan province of Ireland, and the capital city of Ireland, entirely unprovided with those academic advantages which the youth of Ireland justly and properly claim. This should not be so. We should not have the metropolitan province of Leinster, and the richest city in Ireland, uniting within its limits a more influential Roman Catholic community than, I believe, is to be found in any other of the three provinces, and also a most important body of the Wesleyan communion, entirely deprived, as the rolls of these colleges show, of the advantages of academical instruction afforded by these institutions."

On which Professor Sullivan asks triumphantly :— "What will Mr. Cairnes say to this flat contradiction of his denial that Catholics were debarred by *any cause* from obtaining a degree?" What I say to it is, that the "flat contradiction" exists only in the confusion of Professor Sullivan's ideas regarding the matter in hand. Sir Robert Peel does not say that Catholics are debarred from taking degrees, but this, in which I entirely agree with him, that both they and the Wesleyan Methodists, and, I may add, the Protestant dissenters generally, are in Leinster unprovided with "those academic advantages which the youth of Ireland justly and properly claim." The case is shortly this :—The Catholics of Leinster have access to the University of Dublin, and to the Queen's University ; and they avail themselves, as I have shown, largely of the former, to a slight extent of the latter. But in the former, though they are admitted to all its degrees, and to several of its posts of emolument, they still occupy a merely tolerated footing, and are excluded from its highest prizes ; while the taking of a degree in the Queen's University requires that the Dublin student should transfer himself for three years to a provincial college. Either of these alternatives involves, as it seems to me, a real grievance, and (considering, that Dublin is the chief centre in Ireland of Catholic

wealth, enterprise, and intelligence, as it is also the seat of an important body of Protestant dissenters) a very substantial one—a grievance, moreover, not affecting Catholics alone. I need scarcely say that this admission is perfectly consistent with my denial of Mr. Gladstone's statement that there was a "gap" in Irish university education, in the sense in which Mr. Gladstone used that expression, as indicating that a considerable number of Catholics were debarred from taking university degrees through conscientious objections to the existing system. What Professor Sullivan's statistics show, is not by any means what he adduces them to prove—a "gap" in that sense, but a defect in our present arrangements which inflicts practical inconvenience not on Catholics alone, but on all those, not being members of the Established Church, who reside in a certain portion of Ireland. And here let me observe in passing, how singularly favourable the state of things just indicated was for the experiment of "the Catholic University." Here was the richest field in Ireland of Catholic intelligence, enterprise, and wealth, in which the only rival was an "essentially Protestant university:" the "Catholic University" could not, it is true, grant degrees, but by placing itself in connexion with the University of London, the degrees of that body were (as the bishops admit in their correspondence with Sir George Grey) available for its students. Well, the experiment has been tried; and with what result? I cannot tell: I only know that Professor Sullivan has not ventured to state it, and that out of 113 university students which Leinster might be expected to yield, 100 are to be found on the rolls of Trinity College.

But this by the way. What I am more concerned here to call attention to is the proper remedy for the practical grievance which Professor Sullivan's figures, corroborating the position previously taken up by Sir Robert Peel, have brought into view. Is that remedy to be found in granting a charter to the Catholic University, or in such a recognition of that seminary as is implied in the scheme announced by the Government? I will not now insist upon the objections in principle to the recognition of an exclusive university in Ireland just at the time when we are abolishing religious

tests in all other parts of the empire, nor upon the special force which these objections acquire in the case of a country long distracted by religious strife,—topics which I have already enlarged upon in a former publication, and which ought, in my mind, to be for liberal politicians decisive of the question; but, these considerations apart, would the endowment or other recognition of “the Catholic University” meet the actual exigency? In the first place, it would leave absolutely unprovided for the requirements of the Protestant dissenters of Leinster, a very important body, and one which, I submit, ought not to be ignored in this controversy; and in the next, where is the evidence that such an establishment is really desired by the Catholic laity of Ireland? Is it to be found in the 100 Catholic students still attending Trinity College, Dublin, at the end of twelve years of its competition? or in the argument Professor Sullivan resorts to in explanation of its failure, that, forsooth, Dr. Cullen’s college is in advance of the ideas of the age?\*

I venture to think that the true and the only practical solution of the problem is to be found in the course recommended by Sir Robert Peel—the establishment of an open university college in Dublin. Such a result may be arrived at in either of two ways. Sir Robert Peel seemed to have in view the erection of a fourth college in Dublin in connexion with the Queen’s University; and I know that this plan finds favour with men in Ireland, than whom none are better acquainted with the educational needs of the country. For my own part, I should prefer what seems to me a more obvious expedient, as well as one more in keeping with the actual course of recent university legislation. I mean a comprehensive reform of Trinity College, including the abolition of religious tests† and a thorough liberalization of its government. Such a measure would avoid the necessity of having recourse to Parliament for further endowments; it would turn a noble establishment

\* “If the Catholic University has not had the measure of success its organizer anticipated, it is not that it was behind the age, but, in part, because it was in advance of public opinion in Ireland.” (P. 24.)

† A reform which would not be at all inconsistent with the allocation of a due proportion of its emoluments for the maintenance of a theological college, as a school for the clergy of the Established Church.



with magnificent resources to really national purposes ; it would meet the requirements at once of the Catholics and of the Protestant dissenters of Leinster ; lastly—I confess, for me not its least important recommendation—it would, I believe, effectually defeat the designs of Ultramontaniam in Ireland.

I have already extended my reply beyond the length I had at first intended ; and yet I have still left untouched a portion of the subject on which Professor Sullivan appears to have bestowed immense pains—pains, I own it seems to me, greatly out of proportion to the importance in the controversy of the matter treated of—I mean his criticisms on what I have said respecting the transactions which took place at the Synod of Thurles. Professor Sullivan has gone into these transactions with much minuteness, and, I acknowledge, seems to have had access to fuller information relative to them than I possessed : he has, as the result of his examination, drawn up a series of ten propositions, apparently on the model of the Encyclical Letter, in which he contradicts categorically nearly every statement which Mr. Whittle and I have made on this part of the subject. It must be confessed that Professor Sullivan's "syllabus of condemned propositions" is a very formidable looking indictment ; and, considering the advantages he possessed in regard to obtaining information, I own that the first impression produced upon me on reading this portion of his pamphlet was a painful apprehension of having committed myself, on imperfect information, to some very apocryphal version of an important historical transaction. A more careful perusal, however, tended considerably to allay my alarm ; and a still further study of Professor Sullivan's elucidations, combined with inquiries in other quarters, has brought me finally to the conviction, that all I have said respecting the Synod of Thurles—so far as it was in the least material to the controversy—is substantially correct, and not inconsistent with such new facts as Professor Sullivan has brought to light : on the contrary, I think I can show that the effect of such corrections and additions in detail as fuller information, derived partly from Professor Sullivan

himself, has suggested, is to strengthen very decidedly this part of my case.

And here, in order to render my controversy with Professor Sullivan intelligible, I regret that I must quote at some length from what I have on a former occasion written on this subject. Having referred to the support given to the National Schools and Queen's Colleges by Drs. Murray and Crolly, the Catholic Archbishops respectively of Dublin and Armagh, I proceeded to say :—

“Most unfortunately for peace and educational progress in Ireland, just at this time—the same year in which the Queen's Colleges were opened—Dr. Crolly died; and he was followed, two years later, by his abler coadjutor. The successor to each was Dr. Cullen, who, appointed in the first instance to the See of Armagh—through a stretch of papal authority exercised in defiance of the immemorial usage of the Irish Church, according to which the *dignissimus* of those recommended for the honour by the clergy of the diocese is selected—was, on the death of Murray, transferred to Dublin. Dr. Cullen's preparation for the post he was now called to fill had been a sojourn of some thirty years in Rome, where, in the capacity of Director of the Irish Department of the Papal Government, he had made himself conspicuous as a zealous supporter of all the extremest pretensions of the ecclesiastical party. It was indeed avowedly to advance the aims of Ultramontane policy that he was sent to Ireland, the better to equip him for which service he was furnished with the further authority and distinction of Apostolic Delegate. Scarcely had he entered on his mission, when, we must own with true instinct, he laid his hand upon the State system of mixed education as presenting the most formidable obstacle to his aims. He at once denounced it, alike in the higher and the primary department; and, finding the Queen's Colleges, then just opened, still struggling with the difficulties of a *début* made in the face of much carefully prepared odium, one of his first acts was to summon a Synod to Thurles for the express purpose of condemning them. As all the world knows, the colleges were condemned; but it is a noteworthy fact—as showing how entirely the course which the Roman Catholic clergy have

since followed has been due to the foreign influences imported by Dr. Cullen into the Irish Church—that the condemnation was only carried by a majority of one; not only this, but—what may not be so well known—even this slender triumph was obtained by questionable means—through an accident improved by an artifice. During the sitting of the Synod, a bishop, known to be favourable to the colleges, fell sick: his place was at once filled by Dr. Cullen with a delegate of opposite views; the sick bishop recovered; but it was not deemed advisable to restore him to his place till the vote on the colleges had been taken. The Queen's Colleges were thus condemned; and the next step was to start a rival in the same field. For this purpose an apostolic brief was obtained, addressed to 'the Bishops of Ireland,' authorizing and directing them to found a 'Catholic University.' Ere the Synod of Thurles had separated, a Committee was appointed, consisting of eight bishops, eight priests, and eight laymen (all of course Roman Catholics), to whose charge the organization and government of the projected institution was entrusted. Under these auspices appeared in due time in the middle of the nineteenth century 'The Catholic University of Ireland,' established, in the admiring language of its accomplished advocate, on 'the eternal principles which regulated the relations of the Catholic Universities of the Middle Ages.'

"From the sitting of the Synod of Thurles dates the systematic opposition of the Roman Catholic priesthood to the plan of mixed education in Ireland; and from this point, or rather from the elevation of Dr. Cullen, dates also a new policy in ecclesiastical patronage in Ireland, under which, within twenty years, a complete change has been effected in the character of the Irish Roman Catholic priesthood. In 1848 the spirit of that organization was, with few exceptions, national: under the rule of Dr. Cullen it has become, except in the ranks of the lower clergy, an almost purely Ultramontane body, absolutely devoted to ideas of which Rome, and not Ireland, is the originating source."

The drift of the passage, it will be seen, was to establish the origin and character of the opposition to the Queen's

Colleges, and more particularly to show that not even amongst the clergy was the movement a national one, being distinctly traceable to that section of the body, formerly of small weight, but since the elevation of Dr. Cullen rapidly increasing in numbers and power, which represents the extremest pretensions of the Holy See, and is commonly designated by the term "Ultramontane." Well, how does Professor Sullivan meet this argument? In the first place, by suggesting doubts as to the existence of Ultramontanism as anything more than a maggot in the brain of certain weak and credulous enthusiasts, or a convenient bugbear for others who seek to practise on the ignorance and prejudices of the English public. He admits, indeed, that the word has a certain historical import as the antithesis of Gallicanism in the Church; but, as bearing upon modern controversies, and more particularly with regard to such questions as have been raised by the new educational policy of the Government—the pretensions of the clergy in reference to human knowledge and the modes of cultivating and imparting it,—“Ultramontanism,” Professor Sullivan tells his readers, is a “phantom,”—“one of those handy words which float about in society in search of an idea to which to attach itself;” so much so, that in using the word, lest he should be thought to acknowledge any fact corresponding to it, he is careful invariably to insert it in quotation marks. I do not think that I need spend words in dealing with this suggestion, more especially while Mr. Whittle’s able sketch of the modern developments of Ultramontanism is in everybody’s hands. I beg, therefore, to refer such of my readers as may desire information on this point to Mr. Whittle’s pamphlet, though I should imagine there are few persons who take an interest in this controversy, whose acquaintance with modern history will not enable them, even without Mr. Whittle’s assistance, to appreciate the candour and ingenuousness of this portion of Professor Sullivan’s reply. That a *collaborateur* of the *Home and Foreign Review*, addressing Sir John Acton, should pronounce Ultramontanism visionary, may perhaps be thought just a little audacious.

Passing from this, Professor Sullivan takes exception to

my account of Dr. Cullen's appointment, contending, through three pages of letter-press, that the disregard by the Pope on that occasion of the recommendation of the diocesan clergy was not in defiance of "immemorial usage." Now, on this I may observe that the establishment of the literal accuracy of the words placed in inverted commas is by no means necessary, I will not say to the general scope of my argument—for it does not even touch that—but to the special and subordinate point in support of which Dr. Cullen's appointment is referred to. Suppose, for example, the fact were that the proceedings of the Papal Court on the occasion in question were at variance, not with "immemorial usage," but with the ordinary routine observed in the appointment of Irish Roman Catholic bishops, would my statement, on being modified in conformity with this state of things, lose appreciably in force? Now I think Professor Sullivan will not deny that the facts are in accordance with this supposition. He tells us, indeed, that the power exercised by the Pope in setting aside the recommendation of the diocesan clergy was in conformity with a decree of the Propaganda issued in 1829. That may be so, and yet the exercise of the power may have been a very rare one, so rare as to be not unfairly characterised as "a stretch of papal authority." Will Professor Sullivan deny this? Will he mention a single instance from the time the voting system came into use down to the appointment of Dr. Cullen in which *the three names returned by the clergy were all passed over*? I venture to say that he cannot do so, though doubtless some instances might be given of this having occurred *since* Dr. Cullen's appointment, in pursuance, too, of the same Ultramontane policy.\* Yet, while the fact stands thus, it is surely rather idle to enter into a lengthy discussion respecting the mode of appointing Catholic bishops in Ireland in the middle of the eighteenth century, when, owing to the penal laws, the entire economy of the Roman Catholic Church was in a state of disorganization. Professor Sullivan may thus, indeed, succeed in

\* In one instance even the form of taking votes was dispensed with. The person named on this occasion—when it was thought desirable *not* to consult the clergy of the diocese—was the Dean of the Catholic University.

convicting me of using an inaccurate expression ; and if he thinks the game worth the candle, I cannot grudge him the fruits of his diligence. But does he thereby deprive Dr. Cullen's appointment of the significance which I attached to it, as indicating the anxiety of the Ultramontane party at that conjuncture to place a man of Dr. Cullen's known character and views at the head of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland ?

But, secondly, I am "equally incorrect" in what I have said about Dr. Cullen's office of "apostolic delegate." Indeed, I could hardly have been otherwise, seeing that, as Professor Sullivan informs me, I do not even know what the term "delegate" means. On this point, however, he is good enough to enlighten me, as well as, with much condescension, to explain how, in a certain sense, every bishop in Ireland is an "apostolic delegate," and to set forth, besides, other subtle and abstruse distinctions in ecclesiastical technology, which, lest I should again betray my ignorance, I shall not venture further to describe. But, while thanking him for his recondite information, I must honestly confess that, after much and painful pondering of what he has said, I am quite unable to discover wherein my error consists. What I said was that "it was avowedly to advance the aims of the Ultramontane policy that he (Dr. Cullen) was sent to Ireland, the better to equip him for which service he was furnished with the further authority and distinction of apostolic delegate." This was my version, and the orthodox version as rendered by Professor Sullivan is as follows :—"Nor has he ever been appointed apostolic delegate simply. He was appointed on the 6th of April, 1850, in order that he might canonically convoke the Synod of Thurles, and for the causes which might arise out of the special legislation of that Synod ; and he was so appointed because he was Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland." It seems to me that this is only saying somewhat more circumstantially than I did that he was appointed apostolic delegate, "the better to equip him for advancing the aims of Ultramontane policy."

So much for Dr. Cullen's appointment. Coming next to what I have said respecting the occurrences at the Synod of Thurles, I am told that on this subject I have displayed,

“if possible, still greater ignorance.” Professor Sullivan, in the first place, controverts my statement as to the source from which the original suggestion of a National Synod to pronounce upon the Queen’s Colleges came. My statement implied that it came from the Roman Court. Professor Sullivan asserts that it proceeded from a meeting of Roman Catholic bishops, held in Dublin in 1849, and presided over by Archbishop Murray. But on this point his informants have misled him. No doubt the resolution which he quotes was passed at the meeting of 1849, but this resolution was taken in conformity with a suggestion contained in a papal rescript of the previous year—that dated 11th October, 1848, and addressed by Cardinal Fransoni to Dr. Slattery, then Archbishop of Cashel, as will be seen by the extract I subjoin in a note.\* As regards

\* “Inter cætera, SSmo. Domno. nostro probante, illud commemorandum vobis censuit Sacra Congregatio, *ut Sacerdotales conventus ex ordine, et ad SS. Canonum et librorum liturgicorum tramitem in posterum fiant*; alioquin sententiarum varietas indies augebitur, nihilque boni ex hujusmodi conventibus, qui potius sæcularem quam religiosam speciem præ se ferant, exurget ad Ecclesiasticam disciplinam, cui solummodo inservire debent, rite dirigendam: proindeque utillimum [sic] erit acta conventuum ad Apostolicam Sedem transmittere, sicuti etiam statis temporibus litteras dare de statu vestrarum Ecclesiarum prout sancitum est, ut opportuna hinc responsa excipiatis.”

It was in obedience to the words I have italicised that the determination was taken to transfer the consideration of the question of the colleges from the informal Dublin meeting of 1849 to a regularly constituted Synod, as expressed in the resolution quoted by Professor Sullivan. That this was the relation in which the two incidents stood to each other, is placed beyond doubt by the following passage from a letter, addressed by Dr. Murray a few months subsequent to the Dublin meeting (22d Dec. 1849), to the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation. Having referred to the Dublin meeting, he continues:—“His peractis, decretum est, ut quæ in hujusmodi conventibus agi solebant, ad aliud tempus opportunum rejicerentur, cum nempe, *ut sanctissimus Pater Noster monere dignatus est, synodicè conveniremus.*” And on the letter of instructions to Dr. Cullen from the Sacred Congregation (18th April, 1850), the same words are thus referred to:—“Eoque præsertim hortationes in Apostolicis Litteris contentas dirigi significes oportet.” As I am referring to this letter, I may take the opportunity of reciprocating Professor Sullivan’s good offices by a word or two of “useful” information. In more than one passage, he scoffs at my statement that the main reason for summoning the Synod was to obtain a decision on the colleges, adding—“Of the sixty-nine pages containing the printed decrees of the Synod, two only are occupied with the Queen’s Colleges,” which proportion he would apparently have his readers believe represented their proportional importance amongst the subjects discussed. But what says Cardinal Fransoni? “Licet Hiberniæ Episcopi ea potissimum de causa plenariam Synodum celebraturi videantur

this point, then, it would seem that my ignorance was nearer the mark than Professor Sullivan's knowledge. The Holy See *did* "originate the idea of the Synod," and "Ultramontaniam had [something] to do with the matter."

Nevertheless, I think it is extremely probable that Professor Sullivan may be correct in what he says of the "alarm" created at Rome, on the news arriving there of what had taken place at the meeting in Dublin. That meeting was presided over by Dr. Murray, and Dr. Murray was then the strenuous advocate of the cause of the Queen's Colleges. Considering the position which Murray then occupied in the Irish Church, it would have been only natural that he should have been selected for the dignity of presiding at the forthcoming Synod, and, had this happened, we now know, beyond controversy, what would have been the result. In short, it is plain that Dr. Murray, while accepting the suggestion of the Sacred College, that "meetings of the clergy should in future be held in due order, and agreeably to the course of the sacred canons and rituals," was by his prompt action—availing himself of his great and deserved influence in the Irish Church—on the point of taking the game out of the hands of the Roman Court. We can, therefore, have no difficulty in understanding the "alarm" with which the intelligence of the proceedings at the meeting of 1849 was received in that quarter. The moment was evidently critical, and the Roman authorities met the danger with their accustomed address. The death of Dr. Crolly occurring just at the time, Dr. Cullen was appointed to succeed him, and was at once

*ut quoad Collegia uniformis disciplina pro Hiberniam retinenda communi deliberatione statuatur," &c.*

In another place, for having said that the Synod was summoned for the purpose of condemning the colleges, I am lectured in the following fashion:—"A Synod is a deliberative body, and its acts, like those of Parliament, are passed by the votes of the majority. . . . How then could the Synod have been summoned for the purpose of doing an act the nature of which could not have been predicted when the Synod was summoned?" How indeed? But illogical as the idea is, the Sacred Congregation, I am afraid, entertained it. Cardinal Fransoni, in his letter of instruction, writes as follows:—"Quod vero alias controversias spectat eorundem Collegiorum causa excitatas, *Episcoporum erit, præfatis Rescriptis sedulo perpensis, ut fideles ab iis Collegiis frequentandis retrahantur,*" &c.



invested with the authority of "apostolic delegate," "in order," says Professor Sullivan, "that he might canonically convoke the Synod of Thurles, and for the causes which might arise out of the special legislation of that Synod." Just so; and by this means the policy of the national party in the Irish Church, and with it the hope of gaining the priesthood to the support of the colleges, was effectually frustrated. I do not know whether Professor Sullivan will think that the case as thus presented loses in force with a view to the purpose of my argument; but, if he does, he is welcome to the benefit of the fuller statement. To me it seems that the more we go into details, the more conspicuous the essentially foreign character of the ecclesiastical opposition to the Queen's Colleges becomes.

The next point on which, according to Professor Sullivan, I have misrepresented the proceedings at Thurles, is in my statement as to the number of votes by which the condemnation of the Queen's Colleges was carried. I said that they were condemned by a majority of one; whereas, says Professor Sullivan, "the simple condemnation of the principles on which the colleges were established was carried unanimously." No doubt Professor Sullivan has certain technical grounds for this statement; but I beg you to observe the value of his contradiction as regards the question in dispute between him and me. The proposition which was carried unanimously was that contained in the first of the nine decrees passed respecting the colleges. As will be seen, by reference to the words which I give below, \* it contained merely a formal recognition of the authority of the Pope, coupled with an acceptance of what had been said respecting the Queen's Colleges in the rescripts of the two previous years. These rescripts, it is true, condemned what they described as the principle of the colleges; but it is well known that Archbishop Murray and the bishops who agreed with him held that the condemnation did not apply

\* "Cum in Romano Pontifice, Christi in terris vicarium, et Sancti Petri successorem agnoscamus et veneremur, cui divinitus munus optimis doctrinis fideles instituendi, et a pestiferis et veneno infectis pascuis arcendi, commissum; libenti animo, et eo quo par est obsequio monitis et rescriptis assentimur, quæ respiciunt quæstionem de Collegiis Reginæ apud nos nuper erectis, quæque, ipsius Christi vicarii auctoritate munita, a S. Congregatione de Prop. Fide nobis sunt communicata."

to the facts of the case,—that, in fact, it was founded on a misunderstanding: \* consequently, the acceptance of the rescripts implied nothing as to the practical issues in debate. The passing of the first decree was thus a purely formal proceeding; and it was this which was carried unanimously. On the other hand, the practical issues were contained in the resolutions which followed,—those, namely, which prohibit ecclesiastics from “taking or retaining” any office in the colleges under pain of suspension *ipso facto*, and which declare the colleges to be “*talia quæ omni ratione . . . rejicienda et evitanda.*” These, I say, were the decrees on which the practical question as to the attitude which the Roman Catholic clergy were to assume towards the Queen’s Colleges depended; and *these were carried by a majority of one.* Such is the state of facts in view of which Professor Sullivan thinks himself justified in charging me with a grave misrepresentation of the proceedings of the Synod. When a writer aims at giving in a few words the gist of a complicated transaction, he is fortunate if, in doing so, he does not leave himself open to contradiction on incidental and irrelevant points. My statement, I acknowledge, is not free from vulnerability of this sort; and Professor Sullivan is entitled to whatever credit belongs to a victory achieved by taking advantage of such flaws.

But his greatest triumph in this line has yet to be recorded. On my story of the sick bishop and the rôle taken by his representative in the proceedings of the Synod he is particularly severe. He finds it “difficult to conceive” how “any man of intelligence, however ill-informed, could have penned this passage.” “Doctor Cullen,” he asserts, “did not secure the ‘majority of one’ ‘through an accident improved by an artifice.’ Dr. Cullen did not appoint a delegate of opposite views to ‘fill the place’ of a ‘sick bishop.’ No ‘sick bishop’ was ‘upon recovery’ ‘not restored to his place till the vote upon the colleges had been taken.’ No bishop ‘fell sick,’ and ‘recovered;’”

\* Accordingly Dr. Ennis (Dr. Murray’s envoy at Rome), in urging the petition in favour of the Queen’s Colleges, pleads:—“The consenting to such a demand cannot offend any party; it will not contradict or revoke the letter which has been transmitted.”

and so the volley of contradictions is prolonged through all the modes of negation. Having, however, ascertained the facts to the best of my means of information, I make bold to affirm that my statement as to the "sick bishop," and the effect of the occurrence on the decision of the Synod, was, for all the intents and purposes of the discussion, substantially correct.

The facts of the transaction, as nearly as I have been able to ascertain them, were as follows:—Dr. French, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kilmacduagh and Kilfenora, was, at the time of the meeting of the Synod of Thurles, in a delicate state of health. The business of his diocese was administered by his Vicar-General, the Rev. Michael Nagle, and the views both of Dr. French and of Mr. Nagle were known to be favourable to the Queen's Colleges. It was generally expected that the Vicar-General would have represented his Bishop in the Synod, in which case the vote of the diocese of Kilmacduagh and Kilfenora would have been given in favour of the colleges. What happened, however, was this:—Dr. McHale, Archbishop of Tuam, from the first amongst the most violent of the opponents of united education in every form, was Metropolitan of Dr. French, and, I suppose, in virtue of this character, claimed the right of nominating his proxy in the Synod. He accordingly named Dr. McEvelly, then principal of his college at Tuam, now Bishop of Galway. Dr. McEvelly's views on the question of the colleges are pretty well known. It is he who has commenced in Galway the practice of refusing the sacraments of the Church to the poor people who send their children to the Galway Model school, and his position during the period in question, at the head of Dr. McHale's college, leaves no room for doubt that his views on the subject of education then were not different from what we now know them to be. Amongst the names appended to the Decrees of Thurles, Dr. McEvelly's appears as procurator for Dr. French—*Procurator Rev<sup>mi.</sup> Ep<sup>i.</sup> Duacensis et Fena-borensis* [Kilmacduagh and Kilfenora].\* Such, I believe,

\* "There is something painfully grotesque," says Professor Sullivan, p. 53, "in the ignorance which could imagine it possible that Dr. Cullen would dare to exclude from the Synod one of the bishops summoned to

are the facts of the transaction,—if I have misstated them I shall be glad to be corrected by Professor Sullivan from his better sources of information—and I think they justify me in making the following assertions:—That during the sitting of the Synod, a bishop known to be favourable to the colleges was sick [in my former statement I said, “fell sick”]; that his place was filled with a procurator [in my former statement I said, “delegate”] of opposite views;\* and that this procurator actually voted on the decrees involving the essential issues in a sense adverse to the Queen’s Colleges, adverse, also, to the opinions known to be entertained on the subject by the bishop he was supposed to represent: in a word, I think the facts I have stated justify me in adopting my former language, and asserting that “the condemnation of the colleges (in the only sense in which the public are concerned with the act) was carried by a majority of one,” and that “this slender triumph was obtained by questionable means—through an accident improved by an artifice.” In truth, had I, when writing my former paper, informed myself as fully respecting the details of these transactions as I have since done—had I known then as much about them as I have no doubt Professor Sullivan knew when he undertook to refute me—I might have very materially strengthened the ground of the charge; for I might have stated, that, of *three* bishops who were absent from the Synod through illness, *two* were represented by procurators, who voted on the question of the colleges in opposition to the views which the bishops they were supposed to represent were known to entertain. One of the bishops thus “represented” was Dr. French, whose case we have just examined. The other was Dr. Egan, of Kerry, who was

attend it, or that he would venture to appoint a ‘*delegate*’ of another bishop;” and he asks triumphantly, “Of whom would the person so appointed be the *delegate*? Certainly not of the bishop who did *not* delegate him as *his* representative.” Will Professor Sullivan kindly inform us of whom Dr. McEvelly was the delegate?

\* It is true he was appointed by Dr. McHale, not by Dr. Cullen; but Dr. Cullen presided at the Synod of Thurles, and no opposition was offered to the appointment, which was entirely favourable to the objects Dr. Cullen had in view. Is it uncharitable to assume that the occurrence took place with Dr. Cullen’s cordial sanction and approval?

also favourable to the colleges,\* but whose procurator, Mr. O'Sullivan, P.P. of Kenmare, following the example of Dr. McEvelly, voted against them. By what "artifice" the "accident" in Dr. Egan's case was "improved" for the benefit of Ultramontaniam and the edification of the faithful, Professor Sullivan will perhaps, out of the fulness of his knowledge, inform the public. These things I might have stated, and I might also have referred to the introduction into the Synod of the Abbot of Mount Mellary. Lest I should bring down upon myself another lecture on the ecclesiastical antiquities of Ireland, I shall not venture to say what may have been the usages of the Irish Church in regard to the right of abbots to take part in synodical assemblies; but I think I may venture to assert that Dr. Fitzpatrick, the abbot in question, was at this time a very young man; that he had not long been appointed to his post, which, if not created for the occasion, had a little time before been resuscitated after a prolonged period of abeyance; that his appearance in the Synod, to which he was summoned by Dr. Cullen, caused considerable surprise; and, lastly, that in the proceedings of the assembly he proved eminently serviceable to his patron. It is very possible that Professor Sullivan's information respecting Dr. Fitzpatrick, and the part he took in securing the majority of one, may be fuller than mine; and, if so, I hope he will supply the deficiencies in my account. But, however this may be, he will not, I think, deny that the introduction of this personage into the Synod by Dr. Cullen was at least a questionable proceeding, and one

\* Dr. Egan's name stands second in a list of seven Irish bishops, appended to a document published in 1850, entitled "*Breves Vindiciæ contra calumnias in Duobus Libellis, anno 1848 Romæ typis excusis, contentas,*" and addressed to the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation. The "calumnators" were Archbishop McHale and Bishop O'Higgins. That the bishops who signed the "vindication" were favourable to the colleges appears from the whole document—it was indeed their course upon this question which had been the ground of the attack. If there be any doubt upon this point, it will be removed by the following extract appended to the "vindication":—"Quamvis ab initio, novis instituendis Collegiis nullum præstiteram favorem, attamen, quia firmiter mihi persuasum est, Episcopos, qui eorum institutioni non resistebant, solâ conscientia fuisse actos, nomen etiam meum huic eorum defensionis subscribere decrevi." Edvardus, Walsh, Ossoriensis. The date of the document is 8 Jan., 1850, six months before the Synod was held.

which at the time was in fact questioned by many of the clergy of Ireland, and that on it the indispensable unit of majority depended. In short, I think he must admit that, had it not been for the tactics which I have exposed—the nomination of Dr. McEvelly, an opponent of the colleges, to represent the “sick bishop,” Dr. French, who was known to be favourable to them; the similar manœuvre performed in the case of the Bishop of Kerry; and, lastly, the introduction into the Synod of this youthful Abbot of Mount Mellary—the result, in spite of all the influence of the Apostolic Delegate, would have been, instead of a majority of one in condemnation of the colleges, a majority of four in favour of supporting them.

But, says Professor Sullivan, to what purpose is this argument, since “the fact still remains,” that the “sick bishop signed the condemnation of the colleges?” This, he says, “is indeed a fact,” which “may not be so well known,” to me, but which he commends to my attention; and he intimates his opinion that I have never read the acts of the Synod. I confess I should have thought from the confidence with which he makes this statement that he had not read them; for, with the decrees of the Synod now before me, I assert that the name of the “sick bishop,” that is to say, of Dr. French, does not appear amongst the signatures. The place which it would occupy is filled by that of his procurator, Dr. McEvelly. Professor Sullivan is thus mistaken on the matter of fact; and, surely, he is not less mistaken in point of logic. Does he really mean to contend that the presence of Dr. French’s name amongst the signatures to the decrees—supposing the fact to be as he assumes—would be conclusive proof that he would have voted in favour of each of them, if called upon to do so before they were carried? With the fact before him that all the dissentient bishops signed the decrees, it is difficult to conceive that this could be his meaning; yet if this be not his meaning, how have I “laboured in vain” in proving that the “sick bishop” would, if present, have supported the colleges?

So much for the Synod of Thurles. I wish now to say a few words on another topic—not, indeed, in reply to

Professor Sullivan, whose notions of the *morale* of controversy, though not perhaps the strictest, are yet sufficient to preserve him from trading on an oft-refuted calumny, but to less-informed or less scrupulous disputants. A few months ago, the present Vice-President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Monsell, is reported to have made in public the following statement:—

“Government in past times, desiring honestly and sincerely to do what seemed to them best for Ireland, had, in addition to the Protestant University of Dublin, established colleges from which religion was excluded. No one can now obtain in Ireland a university degree, except by becoming a member of that university, or of those colleges. To the principles of both a majority of the Irish people object; their children are therefore excluded from degrees. Well, the Government, in no way changing their own views, recognise that Irish parents are the proper persons to decide on what principles their children shall be educated; and soon degrees will be attainable with as great facility by members of the Catholic University as by those of the Queen’s Colleges.”

Passing by the numerous other misstatements and false assumptions with which this short passage abounds, which I should hope have been sufficiently disposed of by what has been already said—I fear, *ad nauseam*—by others, as well as myself, I wish to call attention to two: the assertion that “religion is excluded from the Queen’s Colleges,” and the suggestion in the last sentence, that the system pursued in them excludes, in reference to the religious and moral training of students, due regard for parental authority and feeling. The only adequate reply to be made to these allegations is, that they are not only not the truth, but in all respects directly the reverse of the truth. The Act establishing the Queen’s Colleges not only does not exclude religion from the system of instruction in the colleges, but makes careful provision for including it; and parental authority, so far from being disregarded by the regulations of the Queen’s Colleges, is, in all points connected with the religious and moral training of the students, deferentially and scrupulously considered. In support of these statements, I subjoin, in an Appendix, extracts from the Col-

leges' Act and the Statutes, to which I beg to refer my readers; and I will here add—what (speaking for the College with which I am myself connected) I can state from my own personal knowledge—that the provisions contained in those enactments are, so far as their fulfilment depends on the authorities of the college, rigorously carried into effect. Every facility is afforded to the clergymen connected with the College, as Deans of Residence, for giving religious instruction to the students of the denominations which they severally represent. Rooms are set apart for them: in framing the regulations for lectures their convenience as to hours is considered: the Dean connected with the Established Church—I still speak of Galway—lectures regularly within the College: if the other Deans do not also adopt this course, it is simply because they prefer to give their instructions in their respective churches. These remarks, it will of course be understood, are applicable to the several Protestant Deans only, for, since the passing of the Thurles decrees, no Roman Catholic clergyman has been permitted to hold the office. But, whether one course or the other be adopted (and the alternative rests entirely with the Dean), these officials maintain a constant intercourse with the students of their several denominations. They have thus opportunities of observing their behaviour, and they send in their reports upon it—at least this is what happens in Galway—regularly at the end of each session, to the President. To show that this supervision is by no means perfunctory merely, I may mention that, not long ago, a student of Galway College was expelled from the college in consequence of a representation respecting his conduct made by a Dean. I am far, however, from meaning to assert that this department of the system is in a satisfactory state. I do not believe it can be, so long as, in return for such services as I have described—services involving much labour, time, and anxiety—no fee or emolument of any kind is provided; for by a singular oversight—the one great oversight, as it seems to me, committed by the framers of the Colleges' Act—the maxim that the labourer is worthy of his reward, was in this case ignored; and for the co-operation of the clergy, the founders of the colleges thought it prudent to trust to the



possession, by vicars, curates, and other spiritual pastors, of heroic virtue. On the whole, their confidence has been justified to a far greater extent than could reasonably have been anticipated. Let us hope that this will not be taken as a reason for refusing to perform an act of tardy justice.

It is in view of these regulations and practices that Mr. Monsell thinks himself justified in asserting, that "the Government had, in past times, established colleges from which religion was excluded," and in suggesting to his hearers that, in the Queen's Colleges, parental authority and feelings are systematically set at nought. When a Vice-President of the Board of Trade does not scruple to indulge in assertions of this description, one can hardly wonder to find a Mr. James Ignatius D'Arcy informing the public that "the vital principle [of the Queen's Colleges] is the non-recognition of God's existence, or of any other religion than one deducible from pure reason. . . . That the Queen's Colleges, as at present constituted, are such as might have pleased republican France when the worship of the Goddess of Reason obtained." \* A reference to the extract which I have given in the Appendix from the Statute on "Punishments," will show that conduct by a student in conformity with what Mr. D'Arcy calls "the vital principle" of the colleges is, under the statutes, an offence, placed in the same category, and liable to the same penalty, with "immoral or dishonest practices," and "treasonable or seditious conduct."

Before concluding, I will take this opportunity of making a few observations on the Government scheme. I understand that scheme to be a plan for reconstituting the Queen's University on the principle of the University of London,—that is to say, as a university granting its degrees to all comers, on the simple condition of passing an examination,—accompanied with a provision for admitting to its senate a "due proportion" of members holding the educational views represented by the Catholic University. Assuming this to be substantially the measure about to be submitted to Parliament, I have no hesitation

\* *Daily News*, 29th March, 1866.

in expressing my opinion for what it is worth, that it is at once the most plausible and the most mischievous of all the plans which the present conjuncture has brought forward. The plausibility of the scheme consists in the appearance of liberality which a proposal for "opening" a university is, by a very natural confusion of ideas, sure to have for the majority of people. People have been accustomed to hear of proposals for "opening" Oxford and Cambridge as emanating from university reformers, and they will naturally conclude that, if it be right to "open" Oxford and Cambridge, it cannot be wrong to "open" the Queen's University. The mass will not consider that the process of "opening" means in the two cases entirely distinct things; that in the former it signifies the admission of Dissenters and Churchmen to degrees on equal terms, while in the latter it signifies the admission of those who have gone through no systematic course of training to the same degrees as those who have; that in the one case it signifies the abolition of religious tests, in the other the abolition of educational tests. It may be well perhaps to state here that the Queen's University is now as "open" as the most thorough-going educational reformers have ever desired to render Oxford or Cambridge, and that the further opening proposed by the Government will not have the effect of removing any religious or class distinctions,—for none such now exist,—will not alter in any respect the relative footing on which Catholics, Dissenters, and Churchmen now stand in the Queen's University, which is one of strict equality, but simply will dispense with collegiate training as the condition of a degree,—will dispense, that is to say, with the one effectual security we possess for the thoroughness of the education which the degree represents.

But I shall be told that the London University dispenses with collegiate training, and that its degrees nevertheless rank as high as evidences of intellectual cultivation as those of the universities in which collegiate training is enforced. Now there is no need that I should enter here into the general question which this assertion raises; for I am quite prepared to admit that the London University performs a useful, and even an indispensable, function in

the educational economy of the country.\* It provides a convenient, and—unless the policy be adopted, which no one has ventured to propose, of conferring without conditions, on every institution that demands it, the power of granting degrees—so far as I can see, the only means of meeting the case of those persons who, while desirous of obtaining university degrees, refuse to submit to the conditions on which education is offered in the national establishments. I admit also that it has succeeded in maintaining the character of its degrees. But what I venture to question is the expediency of establishing in the country another institution of precisely the same sort. Not only is a second university of this kind not required, since, on the plan now adopted of sending examiners to the localities where the candidates reside, a single one is capable of embracing the whole empire without any more inconvenience to the distant than to the central parts, so that, not Ireland alone, but the Mauritius and India are brought within its sphere of operations—not merely, I say, is a second university of this kind not required, but its existence could only be productive of evil. I confess I heard with astonishment that the Government plan had been advocated in some quarters as a means of raising the standard of education in Ireland. To me it seems abun-

\* Which is much more by the way than Dr. Newman, who may be supposed to represent the views of at least a section of those who are engaged in the present agitation, would admit. In his "Discourses on University Education" the following characteristic passage occurs:—"I protest to you, gentlemen, that if I had to choose between a so-called university which dispensed with residence and tutorial superintendence, and gave its degrees to any person who passed an examination in a wide range of subjects, and a university which had no professors or examiners at all, but merely brought a number of young men together for three or four years and then sent them away, as the University of Oxford is said to have done some sixty years since, if I were asked which of those two methods was the better discipline of the intellect,—mind, I do not say which is morally the better, for it is plain that compulsory study must be a good, and idleness an intolerable mischief,—but if I must determine which of the two courses was the more successful in training, moulding, enlarging the mind, which sent out men the more fitted for their secular duties, which produced better public men, men of the world, men whose names would descend to posterity, I have no hesitation in giving the preference to that university which did nothing, over that which exacted of its members an acquaintance with every science under the sun." (pp. 232—33.)

dantly evident that its tendency would be powerfully the reverse. Just consider for a moment what its operation would be. At present, so far as there is any rivalry between the Queen's and the London University, it is a rivalry in reputation, and therefore essentially a healthy one. The idea of underbidding each other for students never enters into the heads of the authorities on either side; for, as at present constituted, they meet distinct educational needs. But assimilate them; and, by the law of their nature, a competition for students will at once set in. The position of the London University at present may be sufficiently assured to render it superior to such a policy; but the Queen's University would certainly endeavour to attract to itself those Irish students who now get their degrees from what would then be its rival; and what means so obvious for this purpose as to lower the cost of the commodity, that is to say, to render the acquisition of a degree somewhat easier? The new competition would thus at once result in a depression of the standard of education. This can scarcely be regarded as matter of speculation: the experiment has been already tried in our medical schools; with what result let Sir Dominic Corrigan say.

But the depression of the standard under the new system would be determined by causes still more decisive. The prospect of obtaining a degree on the terms of passing one or two examinations would lead numbers to prefer this method to the more arduous and expensive one of spending three years in going through regular courses of instruction in the Queen's Colleges. Now, all who have had any acquaintance with the working of the Queen's Colleges know the wretched state of preparation in which, owing to the want of good intermediate schools in the country, the great majority of the candidates for matriculation now present themselves. The effect of this has been to depress the standard of requirement at matriculation, in spite of the anxiety of the college authorities to prevent this result, for in practice it is impossible to reject candidates in the wholesale fashion which would be necessary if none but the qualified were admitted. Still, while the collegiate system is enforced, the practical evils are not of a serious kind. The chief sufferers are the professors, on whom

falls, in addition to their proper duties, the work which ought to have been performed by the schoolmaster. The work, however, is done; and the students are brought at the end of three years to a respectable state of proficiency, as their success in the various open examinations of the country shows. But suppose the Government scheme to be carried, and a collegiate course no longer indispensable, and what will be the result? A large number of those who now go to the colleges will pass direct from the schools to the new Queen's University; year after year a crowd of utterly unqualified candidates will present themselves for degrees; and does any one suppose that the Examining Board in Dublin will reject these by the scores, or perhaps by the hundreds, who must be rejected if the present standard of attainment is to be maintained? For my part, I hesitate to give my countrymen credit for such stoical virtue. The case of the London University is not in any way parallel. In the first place, the state of intermediate education in England is, as compared at least with its state in Ireland, at a high pitch. Secondly, it would be vain to expect that we should have in Dublin such a governing body, more especially if it be constituted in conformity with the principle indicated by Sir George Grey, as the Senate of the London University now presents. And, lastly, if the attempt were made to keep the Dublin standard up to the London level, competition would effectually compel a reduction.

It will, perhaps, be said that the new system would operate beneficially on the intermediate schools, through the competition it would open for them in the new Queen's University, in the same way as in England the examinations for "Associates in Arts," conducted under the English universities, are benefiting the English schools. I do not know how far the latter experiment can really be considered a success; but, assuming that some benefit would accrue to the intermediate schools in Ireland in this way, the result would only be realized so far as candidates for degrees passed at once from the schools to the university,—that is to say, so far as training in the intermediate schools was substituted for training in the Queen's Colleges. If any one supposes that this would be a gain for education in

Ireland, I can only say, his notions of the character of the instruction given in the schools and in the Queen's Colleges have been derived from other sources than mine. As for the free-trade maxims with which some people think they can solve all educational problems, I need scarcely say that they are simply inapplicable. If they are not, State education itself is a blunder, and the question we should have to discuss is not the reconstruction of the Queen's University, but its abolition.

Such, it seems to me, would be the tendency of the proposed scheme, even without taking account of the inevitable accessory—the introduction into the governing body of men who would sit there as the representatives of a religious party. Formally, no doubt, the proposition of the Government will be for the admission of a certain number of Catholics on the Senate; and Parliament will be asked why Catholics should not have a place in the government of an institution in which Catholics have so large an interest? But this way of talking is, in truth, the sheerest hypocrisy. No one—at least, no liberal politician—objects to a Catholic, as such, taking his seat on the Senate. At the present time the Senate contains five Catholics.\* If that be not a sufficient representation, there is no reason that it should not be enlarged, if the Crown can find Catholics who possess the proper qualifications for such a post. But what Sir George Grey means by “the requisite alteration in the composition of the Senate” is very evident: his words doubtless point to such an alteration as would bring the Senate into harmony with its new relations to “the Catholic University:” they imply, therefore, the introduction on the Senate, not of Catholics simply, but of Catholics of a certain colour—Catholics who are in the confidence of the party who desire the destruction of the system they would be called upon to administer—such Catholics, for example, as Major

\* At least it did according to the latest Calendar which I have at hand (that for 1861). How the case stands now I cannot precisely say; several recent vacancies having, for some mysterious reasons, not yet been filled up. The mystery has since (July 9th) been solved by the appointment (27th June, nine days after the Government had constitutionally ceased to rule) of a batch of new senators, amongst whom are Lord Dunraven, Mr. Monsell, and Professor Sullivan.

O'Reilly, or Mr. Monsell, to whom I shall do no injustice in assuming that, as they have no faith in united education, and look upon it already as a failure, and as, on the other hand, they regard the denominational scheme as the true one, they would, as members of the Senate, so use their powers as to assist the definitive triumph of the system in which they believe.

But it has been argued, that the experience of the London University does not justify such apprehensions. Under that university, we are reminded, distinct educational systems also exist,—King's College, for example, representing the denominational, as University College represents the secular plan; yet these antagonistic schemes affect in no way the action of the Senate, the character of that body being essentially neutral. The inference suggested is, that in Ireland, also, we should have a governing body free from all bias—at least as far as the discharge of its public functions went—in favour of particular systems of education. Those who attach much weight to this argument seem to me to be singularly oblivious both of the salient facts of the present case, and of the avowed policy of the Government. Has it not been one of the grounds on which the Catholic Bishops have demanded a charter for their Catholic University, that their views are unrepresented in the Senate of the University of London? And has not Sir George Grey recognised the validity of this argument, when he speaks of “the requisite alteration in the composition of the Senate” as following from the admission to its degrees of the students of the Catholic College? Besides, we cannot overlook the distinctly avowed policy of the Government. In that speech at the opening of the session, in which his admirers see such profound statesmanship, Mr. Gladstone announced, as the basis of his Irish policy, the principle of governing Ireland, no longer according to imperial, but according to Irish ideas; and he particularly instanced education as eminently a department to which this rule was applicable. Now, I am not at present going to canvass the principle laid down by Mr. Gladstone—though, if I were, I think I could show, that, as left by him, it is capable of being turned to almost any conceivable account, good or bad, according to the taste or purpose of him who applies it; but with this

principle distinctly announced by the Government as the basis of their policy, and remembering that their entire action in this matter has been induced by a desire to conciliate that party which arrogates to itself the title, *par excellence*, of "Irish," and "Catholic," I ask, what, in the face of these facts, would be the value of the precedent of the London University, in connexion with the present controversy? Suppose the Government scheme carried, and that, when "the requisite alteration in the composition of the Senate" came to be made, Mr. Lowe, or some other advocate of the secular principle, objected to the appointment of religious partisans, urging as a precedent, the neutrality of the London University Senate, would not the ready answer be at hand, that this was falling into the precise error which the Government wished to avoid—that of applying English ideas to the exceptional circumstances of Ireland?

Nor is the precedent of the Irish National Board any more to the purpose than that of the London University. There is no need now to consider how far the course pursued by that Board since its reconstruction in 1860 might be used in the way of warning on the present occasion, on which perhaps something might be said; but, assuming that the practical results of that change have been in all respects satisfactory, what I contend is, that this would form no grounds for anticipating a like result from the contemplated changes in the Queen's University. For between the two cases there is this fundamental distinction, that in the one—that is to say, in the case of the National Board—the members, whatever may be their private sentiments, are bound, if not formally, at least in honour, by the fundamental rules of the National System, which are those of united education; whereas under the proposed changes in the Queen's University, the members would be bound by no rules whatever, while those who should be admitted in pursuance of Sir George Grey's promise to the Bishops would inevitably take their place on the Board as the partisans of a system opposed to that which now prevails. The paramount duty of these latter would not be, as is the case with the members of the National Board, to administer the institutions entrusted to them in conformity with the principles of united education, but, quite the contrary, to



represent on the Board the interests of denominationalism, and to promote these as far as their powers permitted.

It is under this aspect of the case, as involving the admission to the governing body of what is now a system of united education, of those who will enter that body avowedly as the enemies of united education, that the Government measure, apart from the objections to it on the general grounds which have been already stated, is obnoxious to the friends of that principle; and it is, I apprehend, the same consideration that gives the measure any value it possesses in the eyes of the enemies of the united system. Both parties also doubtless perceive that the present step cannot be a final one; that the sectarian and the mixed colleges, once co-ordinated under a central head, must in the end be treated according to the same rule, and that consequently the present measure will entail as an inevitable corollary the endowment of "the Catholic University." This at least is certain, that no party in Ireland has asked for, or desires, the proposed measure as a definitive scheme. On the contrary, they have each in turn, with unmistakeable emphasis, rejected it. The Bishops tell Sir George Grey that "if the changes referred to . . . be unaccompanied by an endowment of our Catholic University and a reconstruction of the Queen's Colleges, we cannot regard them as satisfactory to the Catholics of Ireland. . . . Without an endowment the proposal of the Government would confer but little, if any, substantial benefit upon our Catholic University, for degrees can be obtained through the London University, and property can be acquired and transmitted without a charter by availing of certain legal expedients." Doctor Woodlock, dealing with the same proposal when propounded by Sir Dominic Corrigan, and replying to his question urged in support of the "open" plan—"Where is the line to be drawn in the system of affiliation?" answers:—"It is to be drawn so as to secure for the Catholic University the position she is entitled to, at the head of Catholic education in Ireland. Less than this the Sovereign Pontiff will not sanction; and it was at his suggestion the University was first established. *With less than this the Bishops of Ireland will not be satisfied; and*

it was they who founded the University, and who by their continued and determined opposition to dangerous systems of education have brought this question to its present stage; *less than this our Catholic people will not accept,*" &c. Lastly, Professor Sullivan, representing, as I conjecture, another section of the party, is not less distinct in his repudiation of the principle of the scheme. "I am much mistaken," he says, "if there be half a dozen educated Catholics in Ireland who agree with Mr. O'Reilly and Sir Dominic Corrigan about the principle upon which that [the London University] is founded." This is the light in which the measure is regarded by those for whose special behoof it is designed. I need scarcely say that it finds no favour among the supporters of united education. In every one of the numerous memorials emanating from the different sections of this party, which are published in the correspondence lately presented to Parliament, the principle of the Government scheme is in the strongest terms condemned.

To sum up the substance of the foregoing remarks, this scheme of so-called University reform tends at once to depress the standard of education in Ireland, and to break up the mixed system. Based upon a principle, as I have attempted elsewhere to show, radically unsound, certainly unsupported by a single high authority, it has not even the poor merit of offering an effective compromise; for it meets no want, and it will settle no controversy. It is wholly uncalled for by any party in Ireland: as a definitive scheme it is positively offensive to every party. If accepted at all, it is avowedly only as a means towards an end which its authors repudiate. It has, however, one recommendation which in the eyes of the Government outweighs all that can be said against it: in the words of Mr. Fortescue, it enables the Government "to redeem the pledge which was given last year to his honourable friend the member for Tralee."

Believe me, dear Sir,

Very sincerely yours,

J. E. CAIRNES.

MILL HILL, HENDON, N.W.

15th June, 1866.

## POSTSCRIPT.

While these sheets are passing through the press, it has transpired that a supplementary charter, effecting all the objects indicated in the several announcements of the late Government—so far as these may be accomplished without an Act of Parliament—has been issued, and has actually passed the Great Seal of Ireland. This has been done notwithstanding Mr. Gladstone's promise that the House of Commons should have ample opportunity for discussing the merits of the measure "before the Crown should be committed to any formal act." Mr. Fortescue, indeed, has stated in the House of Commons that the promised opportunity was afforded on two occasions—first, when Sir George Grey's letter to the Lord Lieutenant was laid before Parliament, and again, when on introducing the Irish Reform Bill he referred to the plans of the Government with reference to the Queen's University. Whether the announcements made on these occasions amounted to a technical fulfilment of Mr. Gladstone's promise or no, is really a question of no practical moment. Where every one has been deceived, I suppose deception must have been practised; and it is a simple matter of fact that, outside the limited circle of officials who were privy to this business, no one, whether friend or foe, understood the announcements in question in the sense which Mr. Fortescue assigns to them. The undeniable fact, therefore, is that the issuing and signing of this charter has been the act of a few officials performed while Parliament, absorbed in another subject, remained under the impression that the question was still open and reserved for its discussion. Now, if an act so performed is to determine definitively the policy of the country; if a system of education, long established, admittedly successful, approved by successive Parliaments, may be altered in its essential features, and perhaps broken up by such means, put in force under cover of the excitement caused by a Reform debate; if this can be done in the teeth of distinct pledges to the contrary given to Parliament, then it is plain constitutional government in Ireland is a mere name. The course taken by the late

Government has thus raised a question of immeasurably greater moment than even the character of the Irish educational system. That question is briefly this:—whether Ireland is in future to be governed by a clique, acting under the dictation of the Irish Ultramontane party—more remotely under that of the Sacred College at Rome—or by the British Parliament. In comparison with this issue the Irish University system becomes an affair of small account; and what every constitutional politician, be he Liberal or Conservative, will desire, is, that it be decided quite irrespective of the merits of the particular measure which has been the occasion of raising it. As, for my part, I do not believe that the people of this country are prepared to deliver over a portion of Her Majesty's dominions to the rule of Ultramontane priests and their lay abettors, I cannot regard the signing of this charter under the circumstances I have described as settling in any degree the question with which it proposes to deal. On the contrary, I fully expect that in the result it will open this question more effectually than ever. Parliament, I feel assured, will find the means of asserting its authority, to the discomfiture of those who have put this slight upon it; and Irish University education will, I believe, receive its permanent form and character, not from the juggling of back-stairs intriguers, whether in Downing Street or Dublin, but from the constitutionally expressed opinion of the people of the United Kingdom.

J. E. C.

9th July, 1866.

APPENDIX.

Houses of the Oireachtas



## APPENDIX.

(A.)

*Extract from Professor Nesbitt's Pamphlet, pp. 15—23.*

*Charge of injustice to Roman Catholics in the Collegiate Appointments.*—I now come to a topic which Dr. Corrigan says he approached with reluctance, and into which, I assure you, I follow him with a like feeling. It is, however, a necessary part of the task I have assigned myself.

The point to which I refer, is the allegation that the principle of religious equality upon which the Queen's Colleges were founded has been departed from,—a position which Dr. Corrigan seeks to maintain by contrasting two ministerial statements with the actual administration of the Colleges.

The first statement I have already cited. It is that in which Sir James Graham speaks "of the Collegiate system as avowedly an extension of the National System of Education." This statement Dr. Corrigan regards as a ministerial assurance or pledge "that the principle of the system of National Education was to be the principle for the Queen's University and Colleges;" and he holds that in both the principle has been infringed. As regards the University, the infringement consists in this—"that the Senate does not include, like the National Board, an equal number of Protestants and Catholics." "The Senate of the Queen's University," he says, "may be considered analogous in its constitution and action, in many respects, to the Board of National Education. The Board of National Education consists of twenty commissioners; these commissioners are equally divided into Protestants and Catholics, ten of each; and on this mainly depends the success of the system, for this equal division carries with it an assurance of justice and impartiality. Were they all one-sided, they might be still impartial [our English neighbours will perhaps think this possible only for Irishmen], but 'Cæsar's wife must be free even from suspicion.' The Senate of the Queen's University does not consist, as on the same principle it should, of an equal number of Protestants and Catholics."

Now a very brief statement of facts will suffice to show the candour of this objection. The ministerial statement was made in 1845. Dr. Corrigan was nominated to the Senate in 1850, and that constitution

of the National Board on which we are told the success of the system mainly depends, and which, we are further led to believe, secured Dr. Corrigan's services to the Queen's University, was first introduced in 1860.\*

What then Dr. Corrigan's charge of ill faith comes to is this, that some fifteen years after Sir James Graham's declaration that the collegiate system was identical in principle with that of primary instruction, and ten years after Dr. Corrigan's appointment to the Senate, a change, not contemplated at the time Sir James Graham's declaration was made, and in fact, as I shall presently show, of a nature which that statesman, rightly or wrongly, regarded as inadmissible, is made in the constitution of the National Board, and because a corresponding change is not made in the Senate of the Queen's University, the original principle on which the Colleges were founded has been departed from, and the understanding on which Dr. Corrigan accepted office is violated!

So far as to the first count in the indictment—that which relates to the University. A similar one is brought against the Colleges. We are told that a direct ministerial pledge was given that a certain proportion of the Professors should be Catholics, and that in the appointment of professors the pledge has been systematically ignored.

Now it is no doubt true that it was stated by Sir J. Graham, in replying to the memorial of the Roman Catholic bishops, that in certain cases the profession of the Roman Catholic faith would be an additional recommendation. But this very language implies, what Dr. Corrigan tells us the minister explicitly stated, that the first consideration would be competence. And that competence did not then bear the fantastic sense which some would now give it, may be seen from the language of Sir Robert Peel, who, in showing that it would be the interest of any ministry to give the most liberal consideration to the claims of Catholics, at the same time declared "that the honour and interest of the Crown were involved in the appointment of the *most* competent persons to these professorships." Again, when it is said that the minister, though he could not assent to legislation on the subject, admitted that the demand was "reasonable in principle," it should be further stated that the demand was accompanied by a yet further requirement, that some six chairs, including those of logic, geology, and anatomy, should be filled exclusively by Catholics, and that the ministerial reply was that "the proposition could not for a moment be entertained." The truth of the matter is that the principle laid down for the selection of professors—and none other could have been laid down consistently with the constitution of the Colleges—was that of fitness for the office, not the profession of a particular

Dr. Corrigan forgets that when Sir James Graham introduced the Colleges Bill, religious equality did not mean the numerical equality of religious sects. The proportion of Roman Catholics to Protestants on the National Board was then four to seven, but amongst the four were a Murray and a Blake, and it may be that Catholic interests were no less secure in their hands than in those of the numerous guardians of the faith who have succeeded them. When Dr. Corrigan took his seat at the Senate, the proportion was four to nine.



form of religious belief; that on this ground the Government refused to allocate particular chairs to members of the Roman Catholic Church, or to reserve for them a definite proportion of the whole; but that it was at the same time conceded that, saving the paramount consideration of merit, it would, under certain circumstances, be a strong recommendation, *en seconde ligne*, that a candidate should be a Roman Catholic.

I need not tell you how faithfully this programme has been carried out. You know, as I do—and but for his letter I should have said, as Dr. Corrigan does, how anxious successive Governments have been to appoint Roman Catholics—how it had occasionally required all the efforts of those upon whom the working of the Colleges devolved, and who were answerable for their success, to make the adherence to the Roman Catholic faith only an additional, not the primary, recommendation for a professor's chair. I am less acquainted with the circumstances of Belfast than with those of the other Colleges; but I have made strict inquiries, and I am told by those most conversant with the facts, that the charge of "the exclusion or elimination of Catholics," preferred against that College, is quite without foundation. Two of the original professors were Catholics. One of these, an eminent philologist, died; the other transferred his services to the University of Melbourne. In the period which has elapsed since the foundation of the Colleges, the same authorities assure me, there have been only three occasions on which there has been a serious competition on the part of Roman Catholic candidates. On the first of these, the Roman Catholic candidate was, I gladly acknowledge, a man of great accomplishment, and of remarkable purity and simplicity of character. He was not appointed, but an excellent appointment was made; and so I leave the case, merely asking that some weight should be attached to the assurance to which I have referred, that it was not religious belief that turned the scale. On the second occasion a man was appointed who stood out conspicuous above the other competitors, one whose claims even a Catholic tribunal would have found it difficult to set aside, and whose selection even his rivals must have approved—

"Pan etiam Arcadia dicat se iudice victum."

On the third, a Catholic, a highly distinguished alumnus of the College, was chosen amidst general applause.

As regards the other Colleges the charge is simply ridiculous. I assert without the slightest hesitation—and if any one desires detailed proof, I am prepared to enter into an examination of the particular appointments—that in no single instance from the opening of the Colleges has any Catholic competitor with anything like equal pretensions to a Protestant rival been in these Colleges set aside. If the rule of merit was ever departed from, the relaxation was in favour of Catholics. I had rather, however, not be forced to such a scrutiny; the task would be invidious. I choose to leave the matter to the successive administrations whose conduct is arraigned, fully cognizant as they are of the facts. It is more pleasing, and it will at the same time best illustrate the unsoundness of Dr. Corrigan's principle of

selection, to refer to the results of that which, in common with the founders of the Colleges, I regard as the true principle, and in doing so I will take an instance which those acquainted with the condition of education in Ireland will admit to be not the least favourable to the views of Dr. Corrigan—I mean the chair of mathematics.

Up to the present this chair has been filled in the several Colleges by eight professors. Of these, four have been senior wranglers; one was a man who could derive no honour from universities, but from whom universities sought to gain lustre by enrolling him among their members; the others have been taken from the *élite* of the University of Dublin. The tangible results of the teaching of these men have been remarkable; but I attach more importance to that for which we have no measure—the influence they must have exercised on the youth with whom they have come in contact.

This is what *has* been, under the *régime* of unrestricted competition. And now let us for a moment speculate on what *might have* been, had Dr. Corrigan's principle of selection been admitted—had, as he proposes, Protestants been held ineligible till at least one-third of the chairs in each College was filled by Catholics. To begin with, most of these men would have been excluded from the chairs they have filled.\* They have all been Protestants, save one, whom let me mention *in memoriam*—a Catholic, but a man whose “praise was in all the churches”—the lamented Mulcahy. But the evil would not have ended with depriving the Colleges of the services of these men. The source of supply would have been cut off—it could not, of course, be expected that superior men would submit to the degradation of a mock candidature, or stand waiting for “a Protestant vacancy,”—and the era of what are called “the competent” would have been definitely inaugurated.

And whence, under existing circumstances, could a sufficient supply of the competent be secured, if Catholicism is to be a “note” of competence? At first sight it is not easy to see. No one dreams that Catholic intellect is less acute than Protestant; but to get an adequate supply of Catholic intellect of the required maturity, it is necessary to have a sufficient seed-plot for its cultivation, and at present it would not be easy to point to such. Less than one-twentieth of the students of Dublin are Catholics. The proportion at the English and Scotch Universities is still smaller. The Queen's University does more for Catholic education than, perhaps, all the others put together; but, then, it has been only a few years in existence; its students come with a much more limited stock of knowledge than the *élite* of the old universities, and there are none of those valuable foundations within their reach which enable the students of those universities to prolong and deepen their studies; lastly, the ablest of them are generally carried away by the attractions of the public service. To Dr. Corrigan, however, the matter is all plain sailing. “There is never,” he observes, with great *naïveté*, “any difficulty in Ireland in procuring competent persons from

\* A consideration of the condition of the Colleges at the time of the several appointments will show that nearly all the candidates would, under this rule, have been disqualified.

either side." He has ascertained, for instance, that the Commissioners of National Education have had no difficulty in procuring Catholic clerks for the Education Office. But he is not satisfied with even this proof: he takes "a higher test." He finds, amongst other distinctions he enumerates, that within the last seven years some sixteen Catholic students have obtained honours at the matriculation examination of the London University; and he infers that, with such facts before us, "it is presuming too far on credulity to believe that a Catholic teacher could not be found with Latin and Greek enough for Galway or Belfast, or even for Cork."

Here, then, we have, at last, a definition of "competence"—"Latin and Greek enough for Galway or Belfast, or even for Cork"—and if clerks for the Education Office are forthcoming, surely professors with this slender equipment cannot be far to seek. The only pity is that they should be sought at all. Dr. Corrigan has already told us that these languages, with the other branches of liberal education, may be taught at home; and this being the case, there is surely no reason for transferring to a college those worthy teachers who are already in their several localities doing all that is required—no reason at least but one, that they may be secured a competence; which, after all, is perhaps more germane to the matter than we might at first suppose.\*

It may seem waste of labour to dwell on reasoning of this kind, but it is well we should see clearly where the principle of "competence" will lead, and we may be grateful to Dr. Corrigan for showing us the way. This he has done effectually. Once give up the principle of choosing the best, and there is no safeguard against taking up with the worst. Never was there a case in which the adage was more true—

"Si paullum summo decessit, vergit ad imum." †

*Proposed mode of appointing Professors.*—Perhaps of all the strange things in this strange letter the strangest is the way in which competence is to be ascertained. The "mistake of [appointing senior wranglers and the like, with now and then a man of original genius] has been committed equally by all the successive Governments which have been in office for the last fifteen years," and may easily be made by their successors. It is, therefore, necessary to find a tribunal which, recognising that "the cleverest men are by no means the best

\* A friend once said to me that he never heard mention of a "competent man" without suspecting a job.

† Dr. Corrigan urges the appointment of Catholics, as such, by the example of the Belfast Academical Institution. In that Institution, it appears, a particular religious communion which had acquired the power, set about appointing exclusively professors of their own faith, and the remedy applied was the application of what Dr. Mommsen calls "the collegiate principle"—that is, the appointment of a colleague to each professor to neutralize his influence. One would have thought that the obvious lesson from this case is the inexpediency of appointing professors on sectarian grounds.

professors," shall be more likely to choose the "competent." The Government, then, is to be superseded, and the appointment is to rest in a local board made up of the Council of the Queen's College in which the vacancy may arise, the municipality, and the neighbouring gentry; and candidates for professorships are to lecture before this august body, which will thus be able to dispense with testimonials,— "testimonials can be had in any number and for any office,"—and to judge for itself of "their power of conveying information lucidly in a lecture-room." It requires some effort of imagination even to conceive an arrangement of this kind, but it is worth while to make the effort. Just fancy the Town Commissioners of Galway sitting in judgment on the lucidity of Mr. D'Arcy Thompson's analysis of a chorus of *Æschylus*, or a Town Councillor of Cork criticizing the late Dr. Boole's exposition of the fundamental conceptions of the differential calculus.

"Spectatum admissi risum teneatis."

But the spectacle would be impossible. Of course no man of eminence could fulfil the conditions of such a candidature, even if he were not stricken with the fatal disqualification of being a Protestant. "Competence" would have exclusive possession of the field.

To me—if I may express the humble judgment of one who has watched the appointment of professors from the opening of the Colleges with the utmost care—it seems that the present method of selection is as nearly perfect as any that could be devised. The Government is alone responsible for the appointments that are made, but this is far from implying that the Government appoints arbitrarily, or on its unaided judgment. In every instance the Colleges are fully and fairly consulted through their heads, and in this way the Government secures all the assistance which enlightened self-interest can supply; at the same time that the Colleges, while exercising their legitimate influence, enjoy immunity from the solicitations of candidates. The actual system is in effect as nearly as possible identical with that which has given to the German Universities the most distinguished expositors of every branch of science and learning.\*

\* Mr. O'Reilly, in his "Two Articles on Education," tells us that "the Professors (in the Prussian Universities) are named by the King on the proposition by the Faculties of a list of three." I can endorse the statement of Professor Cairnes, "that the plan adopted in the Queen's Colleges does not in effect differ from this."

(B.)

*Extracts from the Colleges Act and the Statutes.*

## COLLEGES ACT.

[CHAPTER LXVI. 8th &amp; 9th Vic.]

XIV. And for the better enabling every student in the said Colleges to receive religious instruction according to the creed which he professes to hold, be it enacted, That it shall be lawful for the President and Professors, or other governing body of each of the said Colleges which shall be constituted in and by the said Letters Patent, to assign lecture rooms within the precincts of such College, wholly or in part, for the use of such religious teachers as shall be recognised by such governing body, subject in each case to the approval of Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, and also subject to the like approval to make rules concerning the days and times when such religious instruction shall be given therein, and for securing that the same shall not interfere with the general discipline of the College : Provided always, that no student shall be compelled by any rule of the College to attend any theological lecture or religious instruction other than is approved by his parents or guardians, and that no religious test shall be administered to any person in order to entitle him to be admitted a student of any such College, or to hold any office therein, or to partake of any advantage or privilege thereof ; but this proviso shall not be deemed to prevent the making of regulations for securing the due attendance of the students for divine worship at such Church or Chapel as shall be approved by their parents or guardians, respectively.

## STATUTES.—CHAPTER VI.

VIII. " That if any Professor shall, in any Lecture or Examination, or in the discharge of any other part of his Collegiate duty, teach or advance any doctrine, or make any statement derogatory to the truths of revealed religion, or injurious or disrespectful to the religious convictions of any portion of his class or audience, or shall introduce or discuss political or polemical subjects tending to produce contention or excitement, such Professor shall be summoned before the Council, and, upon sufficient evidence of his having so transgressed, shall be formally warned and reprimanded by the President ; and if any such Professor be guilty of a repetition of said or similar offence, the President shall forthwith suspend him from his functions, and take steps

officially to recommend to the Crown his removal from office, as having transgressed the Statutes of the College, and violated his obligations to its authorities.

IX. That every Professor shall, upon entering into office, sign the following Declaration :—I, A. B., do hereby promise to the President and Council of the Queen's College, that I will faithfully, and to the best of my ability, discharge the duties of Professor of \_\_\_\_\_ in said College ; and I further promise and engage that in Lectures and Examinations, and in the performance of all other duties connected with my chair, I will carefully abstain from teaching or advancing any doctrine, or making any statement derogatory to the truths of revealed religion, or injurious or disrespectful to the religious convictions of any portion of my class or audience. And I moreover promise to the said President and Council that I will not introduce or discuss in my place or capacity of \_\_\_\_\_ any subject of politics or polemics tending to produce contention or excitement, nor will I engage in any avocation which the President and Council shall judge inconsistent with my office ; but I will, as far as in me lies, promote on all occasions the interests of education, and the welfare of the College.

We will and ordain that any Student guilty of any of the following offences shall be liable to expulsion from the College ; but it shall be competent to the Council, shall they deem it more conducive to the discipline of the College and the reformation of the offender, to impose some lighter punishment for the same :—

#### CHAPTER XVII.

I. Habitual neglect of attendance for Divine Worship, at such Church or Chapel as shall be approved by his parents or guardians.

II. Habitual neglect of attendance on the religious instruction provided for Students of his church or denomination, in the licensed boarding-house in which he may reside.

III. Immoral or dishonest practices.

IV. Treasonable or seditious conduct.

V. Drunkenness.

VI. Grievous offences against College rules or discipline.

VI. Wilful and serious injury to the property of the College.

#### CHAPTER XVIII.

I. We will and ordain that every Matriculated Student, being under the age of twenty-one years, shall be required to reside during the College Terms with his parent or guardian, or with some relation or friend to whose care he shall have been committed by his parent or guardian, and approved of by the President, or in a boarding-house licensed and arranged for the reception of students in manner herein-after described. . . .

V. That if the Bishop, Moderator, or the constituted authority of any church or religious denomination, shall notify to the President his or their desire that there shall be boarding-houses specially licenced for the

exclusive use of the Students of such church or denomination, and shall specially recommend persons applying for licence to establish the same, the President shall, in every such case, grant such licence, provided he shall obtain satisfactory evidence of the suitableness of the proposed establishment, and of its means of providing for the health and comfort of the Students.

VI. That in the case of Collegiate Students residing in a seminary or school which is under the special jurisdiction of the Bishop, Moderator, or the constituted authority of any church or religious denomination, the President shall, on receiving a notification from such authority, consider residence in such seminary or school as equivalent to residence in the house of a parent or guardian, and shall exempt such seminary or school from licence or inspection, but shall require the same attendance at matriculation as in the case of a Student residing with his parent or guardian.

VII. That for the better maintenance of moral and religious discipline in the licensed boarding-houses, such clergymen or ministers as We shall, from time to time, by warrant under Our Sign Manual, appoint Deans of Residences, shall have the moral care and spiritual charge of the Students of their respective creeds residing in the licensed boarding-houses.

VIII. That the Deans of Residences shall have authority to visit the licensed boarding-houses in which Students of their respective creeds reside, for the purpose of affording religious instruction to such Students, and shall also have power, with the concurrence of the Bishop, Moderator, or other ecclesiastical authority, respectively, to make regulations for the due observance of the religious duties of such Students, and for securing their regular attendance on Divine Worship. . . .

IX. That no clergyman or minister shall be competent to assume or continue to hold the office of Dean of Residences, unless approved by the Bishop, Moderator, or constituted authority of his church or religious denomination.

X. That the Registrar shall, at the commencement of every Collegiate Session, furnish each Dean of Residences with a list of the names and residences of the Students of his religious persuasion who may reside in the licensed boarding-houses.

XI. That each Dean of Residences shall, at the termination of every Collegiate Session, report to the President on the general conduct of the Students under his moral care and spiritual charge, in the licensed boarding-houses, and on the manner in which discipline, regarding such Students, has been observed in the several licensed boarding-houses in which they reside.

Houses of the Oireachtas