

CHAPTER 10

THE EARLY YEARS IN FREDERICTON: ST. THOMAS 1964-1974

Moving In

Preparations for the removal of St. Thomas's staff and their belongings began in the summer months of 1964. On September 2 the new St. Thomas officially opened for registration. Fears that enrolment would fall because of the move were laid to rest. Registrar Martin reported that enrolment actually rose to 294, compared to 275 the previous year in Chatham. Classes began on September 12. It was chaos, given the unfinished buildings, the considerable mess, and the general state of confusion. Indeed, not all classes began on schedule, and they often had to be cancelled on account of the din of construction.

The Administration Building, with its offices and classrooms, was open, if not entirely finished. Its kitchen and dining hall opened for business only in October. The chapel above the dining hall was still under construction. The new building to the west of the main building, the men's residence, was not entirely finished on the inside but most of the 198 student rooms and six suites for priests were available for occupancy. Construction had begun on the Holy Cross House of Studies, and even a few residence rooms were open for the Holy Cross contingent, although conditions were primitive. Owing to a delay in funding, construction had still not begun on the fourth Larson-designed building, the women's residence, to be situated on the east side of the Administration Building, opposite the men's residence. Until it was completed, St. Thomas's female students were housed in quarters rented from UNB at Maggie Jean Chestnut House, a fine old Queen Anne Revival house, ca. 1895, situated down the hill on Charlotte Street in the east town plat. (The building had been purchased in 1949 and donated

to UNB by Lord Beaverbrook to serve as UNB's women's residence.)

For Fr. George Martin, registrar, it was challenging but exciting. In an interview he recalled:

Nothing was complete. They were still pouring concrete. We moved on the second [of September]. Nothing was ready. Nothing. And for the first month or two we ate our meals down at the Lady Beaverbrook Residence, or one of the dining rooms down there. But it was lucky that it was that way, too, because there was a spirit of roughing it.... You didn't have time to be homesick or to be put off because everyone was roughing it. You were like a pioneer. You were doing something that nobody else had done, and you were enjoying it too. If everything were right, people would have been complaining, but here everyone had to chip in and do things in the rough, as it were, and so they were distracted. They had no time to think, "Oh! Isn't it awful that we're not in Chatham anymore." This was an adventure. I remember the contractor coming to me the day before classes were to begin, let's say Monday the twelfth, we might have been there [only] two weeks, and saying, "How many classrooms do you need tomorrow morning?" And I said, "Four, yeah, two big ones and two small ones." There was no heat and there were no light fixtures. They just dropped down big things from the ceilings. And there was no women's residence. The girls lived in the Maggie Jean Residence that UNB had downtown. They walked up the hill. They were there for a year [or two]. So it was kind of an adventure.

Continuing Leadership Problems

Not everyone saw it as an adventure. Besides having to cope with the mess in their new surroundings, many of the faculty were still deeply unhappy with Duffie's leadership. Fr. Winfield Poole, ever since his return in 1962 to Chatham from studies in the U.S., was one of the most active opponents of Duffie's regime and, by extension, Bishop Leverman's administration. He was involved in writing a number of the criticisms of the president and his style of governance. He helped compose the various petitions and letters to the apostolic delegate Baggio as well as to the authorities in Rome, first protesting the removal of St. Thomas to Fredericton and second proposing a separate diocese for the Miramichi. On August 18, 1964, Poole wrote the bishop to say he had heard from a faculty member at St. Dunstan's University in Charlottetown, PEI, that "Msgr. Duffie recently told Fr. Roach (also of their faculty) that you are willing to 'lend' me to any Catholic College where I might wish to teach." He discussed this with friends at St. Dunstan's and "we concluded that it was a desirable thing, both for them and me." He therefore was requesting from the bishop a leave of absence.

Bishop Leverman replied on August 28, denying the request. We can only wonder why he did so. It was no secret that Duffie had long wanted to have this bothersome and stubborn person, his personal gadfly—regardless of his acknowledged theological expertise and irreproachable moral comportment—removed from St. Thomas. But only the bishop could assign or reassign priests. Given his reservations about Duffie’s leadership, did Leverman somehow wish to force Duffie to learn how to deal with difficult people? Or did he wish to punish Poole for his past disrespect for the bishop and the president by forcing him to stay in an institution where he appeared to be so discontented? Or did Duffie himself have a change of mind, thinking Poole might settle down and cause less trouble in Fredericton? Whatever the reason, the bishop wrote Poole that although

this may have been something discussed away back, you are needed now. The whole picture has changed since then. In loyalty to St. Thomas University, and in your spirit of zeal to assist the new St. Thomas in its difficult period of change, I am sure you will do your part in helping to get it on its feet.

The rector of St. Dunstan’s, Fr. George MacDonald, wrote Leverman on August 31 in an unsuccessful attempt to get Leverman to change his mind. Leverman wrote back: “I cannot release Fr. Poole. There are a number of reasons for this. We are short of priests and teachers, and since we are going through the trying time of transition you can understand my position.” Of course, one of the reasons for the shortage of priests and teachers was that he had moved some of St. Thomas’s teaching priests to parishes, while others had resigned because they did not want to continue teaching under Duffie or because they did not want to leave the Miramichi. On September 5 Leverman wrote Poole, who was now in Fredericton to take up residence in one of the priests’ suites in the men’s residence: “I am sure your repugnance and difficulties will not seem so vivid once you begin your work, in whatever capacity you may be assigned.” Whatever Poole thought of the bishop’s advice, he would continue to teach mathematics at St. Thomas for many years. He even served several years as its academic vice-president, but only after Duffie had resigned.

Poole was not Duffie's only dissatisfied faculty member. On September 8 the president received a letter of resignation from Vance Toner, who had remained in Chatham and who now felt "compelled to resign my position as Professor of Education and Director of Athletics." He was sure that Duffie was well aware that he did not "concur" with his "tactics of administration." Toner said he was "one of a large majority of the faculty which felt the same way about your administration." He was hoping that "the President and his superiors" would come to "some conclusions concerning some change for the welfare of the University." But since it now appeared that Duffie was starting a new term, he must have had "an endorsement" by his superiors of his "policies of operation." Toner was not resigning because of the move,

but for the same reason so many others who could, have avoided going to Fredericton under your administration. I hope you do not construe this as a personal criticism but rather as it is intended, a criticism of your administration and my reason for disassociating myself from St. Thomas.

Toner sent copies of his letter to the bishop and to Henry Ryan, the board's secretary.

Settling In

At least UNB President Colin Mackay was pleased about the way St. Thomas was settling in on the campus. On October 2 he wrote his friend John Deutsch:

St. Thomas is here, and while their new buildings are far from finished, nevertheless the students are in and all seems to be going reasonably well. For the moment, the boys are dining with us in McConnell Hall. Incidentally, I have found their president to be a fairly slap-happy administrator and materials of detail bother him not at all.

Tonight, after walking around the campus and looking about Teachers' College and St. Thomas I could not help but think back over all the fuss and fury of the past months and years, when people kept saying we would never succeed in moving the two institutions to the campus and that it would never take place. Now they are here and everyone (both on campus and off) seems to take it very much as a matter of course.

Duffie may have appeared to be "slap-happy," but for a month he was too busy with details to write to the bishop, who was attending another meeting of the council in Rome. On October 3 he

finally wrote to say they had moved in “over wire and lime and everything piled everywhere.” They got the place operating and everything was now fine. The men’s residence was fully in use with only one vacant bed. Most classrooms were usable. The cafeteria was not ready, but he expected it to be open within the week. Most pleasing of all, enrolment had increased, from 275 the year before in Chatham to 294, with a large contingent (sixty-one students) from the Miramichi.

Concerning the subsequent opening of the cafeteria, the student newspaper, *The Aquinian*, had this to say:

At noon, Tuesday, October the 13th, the last walk down the hill to McConnell Hall was suffered. Our own cafeteria was pushed through to its own moments of culinary success—and the first abortion of the year, the five o’clock supper, was served. Surprising enough, considering the conditions and the hurried process of completion (completed!—without ceiling and proper servatory means), this “meal” appeared as a form of success to some of the students—resulting, probably, from the fact that that most students could stand anything rather than the forced march down the hill, past the perfumed sewer system and through the clear, dustless atmosphere. CHOKER!! But still an exuberant round of applause should be extended to the staff for their overcoming of difficulties, to extend to us a meal.

Duffie maintained his optimistic outlook. In mid-October he informed Leverman that he had spent Thanksgiving weekend in Bathurst and paid a visit to Chatham for the opening of the convent of the Hôtel Dieu Sisters, where he talked to a number of the priests. “Everything,” he wrote cheerfully, “is going well. The whole spirit was excellent.” St. Thomas was still offering a night course in Chatham, so the registrar, Martin, went up a few days later to supervise. Duffie told the bishop he met some people in Chatham who offered their assistance “in any way they could be of help in Fredericton.” He heard that “no more than five percent” of the Catholics in the area were in favour of having a new diocese, and in fact that “only Fr. McFadden, Fr. McKendy, Fr. Broderick and perhaps Fr. Reinsborough were left in their desire for a new diocese. Whether this is true or simply what people think I wanted to hear is hard to determine.”

Duffie’s brother, he reported, had visited the Kingstons, a family of long-time St. Thomas supporters from the village of Sevogle, and heard that “there has been a great change in opinion since

September in the thinking of some of the people since the good reports have begun coming back from Fredericton.”

As for Fredericton, Duffie enthused that “everything is going splendidly.” Everyone was pleased with the buildings. The Holy Cross Fathers just got approval from the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation for \$280,000 to complete their building. All St. Thomas students were made members of the UNB-STU Creative Arts Society, which offered concerts free for students throughout the year. Technicians were connecting residence rooms to the campus radio station. A couple of students joined the UNB Glee Club. Intramural athletics were going well under the new director, Eugene Gaudet, whom Duffie appointed to replace Vance Toner. St. Thomas students were using the UNB library; ninety-four were enrolled in courses at UNB. The dining room was finally open, even though some finishing work still remained.

Later in the month Duffie wrote to tell the bishop that he made another trip to the North Shore and the Miramichi and again talked to a number of priests, who seemed pleased with what they heard from Fredericton. “It was the first time in two and a half years,” he wrote, “that Fr. Coughlan and Fr. Warner have had no suggestions on how to reform the University.”

The Big Time

Duffie also reported on his recent attendance in Halifax at a meeting of the Maritime presidents with the Bladen Commission. It was quite a learning experience. The commission, it seemed, would have control of university financing for the next decade, 1965–75. He listed the important members of the commission and who did most of the talking. Two long sessions

were helpful, disappointing at times, and rather sharp at times....It is quite evident that the day you get back we have to get three or four strong finance men of public stature on our Board of Governors. At the meetings in Halifax, which was a joint one of the Maritime Presidents and not all the Universities separately, they gave us all a rough time but gave us until April to present a joint brief.

St. Thomas was moving into the big time and Duffie was enjoying every minute. He relished being in complete control. He consulted no one—certainly not his vice-president, Fr. George Harrington, who had recently suffered a stroke and was excused from teaching or administration, except to attend some board meetings. Duffie did not consult with his registrar, Fr. George Martin. Unsurprisingly, he did not consult with his vice-chancellor, Fr. Lynn McFadden, nor with the other members of the board who at most were given policy documents to approve, usually without discussion. The chancellor, however, was different: Duffie was careful to keep the bishop well informed about his activities, and Leverman was content to let Duffie run the show.

Faculty Renewal

Down the hill, UNB's president, also never reluctant to exercise executive authority, was happy with the way Duffie was running things. On November 18, 1964, Mackay wrote Deutsch:

St. Thomas is still full of workmen but Msgr. Duffie is hopeful that the end of the year will see the last of them, at least for the present. To date, the members of the faculty have been so busy getting settled into their new quarters that they have not had much time to think about academic plans for the future. However, Dr. Pacey tells me that he has had a meeting between his own department of English and the St. Thomas department, and I am confident that individuals in the two institutions are going to see more of their opposite numbers in the months ahead.

In reality, as a result of the relocation the teaching staff was in a state of extreme turnover.

Faculty who moved from Chatham included veterans Ned Butler (history) and Vince Donovan (Latin and classics), as well as recent appointees Leo Ferrari (philosophy), Fr. A. J. Kandathil (chemistry), Fenton Burke (English), Hafeez Alexander (political science), Leonard Doucette (modern languages), Fr. David Walsh (history), Anne Bradley (education) and Anne Dunnigan (biology). Frs. Higgins and McKendy chose to remain in Chatham. Fr. Edward Troy and Vance Toner, the athletics director, resigned from the university in protest. Sheldon Currie and John Brander left for further studies; Fr. Ed Casey was already on such leave. Fr. George Harrington came to Fredericton but for medical reasons

stopped teaching. Altogether, St. Thomas lost a quarter of its already small staff. The university engaged several new faculty members, including two members the newly arrived Holy Cross contingent: Fr. Brien Waugh, MA in philosophy from the University of Notre Dame, and Fr. Bernie Murchland, MA in English literature from the University of Ottawa and working on a PhD at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Other new members were Oleh Pidhainy, a young Ukrainian Catholic, PhD in history from McGill; Eugene Gaudet, a graduate of St. Joseph's (now part of the new Université de Moncton), with an MEd; Patrick Murray, a recent philosophy graduate, also of St. Joseph's; and David Walsh, a graduate of St. Thomas, recently ordained, who had yet to complete his MA in history. These newcomers made up almost a third of St. Thomas's teaching staff.

Thus, most of the faculty on the new campus were strangers to one another. Academic "departments" barely existed. The department of English consisted only of Murchland, Burke, and the registrar, Fr. George Martin. Martin studied for his MA in English at Fordham but returned before completing the degree; he was teaching a course in linguistics. (Murchland would leave St. Thomas after two years, but Burke remained for thirty-eight). The department had no "head." Although Duffie appointed Waugh to be the head of philosophy, that department was also somewhat amorphous. Besides Waugh, it consisted of Leo Ferrari and Patrick Murray (who would leave at the end of the year).

As for theology, the third Holy Cross priest, the superior, Fr. MacDonald, was officially on faculty to teach theology, but at present was preoccupied with construction of Holy Cross House and would not teach until the second year. The other theology teacher was to have been Fr. Thomas McKendy, formerly St. Thomas's librarian and long-time member of faculty, but he refused to move to Fredericton. Theology courses, therefore, were at present nonexistent. Given the institution's Roman Catholic designation on the UNB campus, Duffie felt pressured to fill the gap.

History was another ill-defined department. During the first year in Fredericton, it consisted of Butler, Pidhainy, and Walsh, with no designated head, although Butler was senior.

The social sciences consisted only of political science: Hafeez Alexander taught full time, and Duffie himself helped out by teaching one introductory course. Fr. Harrington taught sociology in Chatham since 1936 but for medical reasons was no longer teaching. Fr. Casey was on leave, studying for his PhD in sociology at St. Louis University. Thus, for the present, there were no sociology courses on offer and no social sciences department.

Altogether, there were seventeen full-time faculty for the first year in Fredericton. Until Duffie could find more qualified faculty, the notion of academic departments was wishful thinking. He had little experience searching for and hiring qualified faculty, but he was under the gun to do the best he could.

Academic Relations with UNB

While the administration at UNB had cooperated in getting St. Thomas established on the campus, others had not been quite as pleased to see its complement arrive. It had been agreed that St. Thomas would offer a philosophy course at UNB's new junior college in Saint John, UNBSJ, an idea that initially upset some members of the UNB philosophy department. Their chair had written the dean of arts, Alfred Bailey, in March 1964, to object. The department was concerned about the relationship with the St. Thomas philosophy department "and in particular...about the substitutionality of courses at St. Thomas in medieval philosophy" for courses accredited toward UNB's Bachelor of Arts. In the view of UNB's philosophy department, "no course in which the content is presented from the point of view of the theology or dogma of any particular religion or sect should be regarded as constituting a course in philosophy, and should not be given credit." Other departments, however, developed relatively amicable relations. One of the first interuniversity arrangements was the agreement signed in April 1964 to allow Fr. Kandathil to teach chemistry at UNB.

The Bishop Is Still Unhappy

In the spring of 1965, the bishop considered changing the composition of the board, half of whom were from the northern part of the province. In the end, as he wrote Oscar Schneller, the diocese's accountant, he decided "to leave the board alone for at least another year since they are not quite on their feet yet." He did not have "a clear cut picture yet" of what they had to do, although he thought he ought to call a board meeting sometime before convocation. Some board members still had "active forces working against them, directly or indirectly, so I still have my hands full." He admitted he was still concerned about "the split" in his diocese, which he described as "very unhappy" and which made his "authority uncertain":

It will take a generation to adjust to the modus vivendi and it will not occur in my time. I am the small McNally and I have to bear the brunt and be the fall guy. But if it is for the better, well and good.

His big concern at the moment was fundraising. He had discussed "the pros and cons" of a campaign with the fundraiser for UNB. Schneller's advice was that it might be too early for a campaign for additions to the college. Besides, the bishop could finance through loans what he wanted for now.

Leverman disagreed. He thought they could arrange a successful campaign, such as a national appeal to attract special gifts from corporations. Such a campaign, he told Schneller, would "project the College in the eyes of the people. The Saint John crowd know we have a College but they do not realize it. A campaign would turn this around." Such people had to understand "vividly" that they had a college in St. Thomas. The time to strike was now, "later would be too late." He quoted something Schneller himself had said earlier: "The time to have a drive is when you do not need one." Besides, declared the bishop, "the spirit urges me." He hoped to raise "a million or a million and a half dollars" and was confident of success. He had asked UNB's chief fundraiser if he thought "the Miramichi affair" and opposition there might hurt the type of campaign they were planning. That person had replied that it was unlikely based on what he knew about "the economic and social condition of New

Brunswick” and through his experience with the UNB campaign. In St. Thomas’s case, however, the bishop told Schneller they should avoid the words “campaign” and “drive,” which were “ugly words.” Instead the campaign would be called the “St. Thomas University Program.” The bishop asked Schneller’s advice, telling him that if he agreed, the campaign could be well underway before he left for Rome at the end of summer.

StFX on the Miramichi?

The issue of higher education on the Miramichi remained unresolved. In June 1965 the bishop received a startling letter signed by Charles A. McCoombs (Northumberland County high sheriff), William J. Kerr (mayor of Chatham), and T. J. Driscoll (principal of Chatham High School). They informed him that “a certain Maritime Catholic university” had expressed interest in establishing a junior college in Chatham, “using the already existing facilities.” Preliminary discussions took place, but because any Catholic institution would come under the bishop’s jurisdiction, they needed his approval. The signatories said they were acting for “a group of interested citizens”—Catholics and non-Catholics—“determined to press for the establishment of facilities for higher education in the area.” The Catholics “quite naturally hoped that such an institution would be under Catholic auspices.”

This development caught the bishop by surprise. Naturally he was displeased. He was in charge of higher education for Catholics in his diocese and was not about to share the responsibility with another. In a letter dated June 21, 1965, he responded that this was “the first time such interest has been brought to the attention of my diocese.” The bishop was forgetting that some years earlier, in 1956, St. Thomas and StFX had entertained the notion of affiliation. True, at that time Leverman had not yet completed his redrawing of diocesan boundaries to bring Chatham and St. Thomas into Saint John’s fold, yet he had almost certainly been told about the possibility by advisers (including President Mackay at UNB), as it was then that he first became interested in the possibility of affiliating St.

Thomas with UNB.

In any case, Leverman now declared that he didn't know what university his correspondents were talking about, or what "responsibility and financing might be involved on either side." He pointed out that St. Thomas had embarked on "a big venture in re-establishing itself in Fredericton." Such a venture, he continued, "demands the full resources of the whole Diocese. Already expansion is imperative." The question of establishing another college, even a junior one, was complicated. It meant weighing resources and "a close study of all potentials: financial, academic and otherwise. No matter what group would be interested, the Diocese must necessarily be involved and deeply so." He told them they were talking about a costly proposition, and added: "This is incontestably true when already your own University is in the early stages of struggle." As to the feasibility of such a project, it was "a question which demands far-reaching thought."

In other words, forget it.

The Bishop Is Incensed

But the issue of higher education on the Miramichi would not go away. Leverman received another letter, dated July 21, the same day he wrote McCoombs and company, that displeased him even more, as it was signed by seven priests. One of the signatories was none other than Winfield Poole, now teaching at St. Thomas in Fredericton. The others were former professors Frs. Reinsborough, Henry McGrath, and Bernard Broderick (significantly, the latter two were long-standing members of St. Thomas's board of governors); Msgr. H. C. Elhatton, Fr. William Wallace, and Fr. P. R. McCarthy. They too called for a new affiliated Catholic junior college in Chatham, to be located in the buildings of the old St. Thomas campus, and this time they named names: the college would be affiliated with StFX in Antigonish, NS. The authorities at StFX had indicated unofficially that they were willing to accept such a junior college and would "cooperate actively in setting it up." They understood that such

a proposal would require much consultation, but also that any further steps would require the bishop's "favour and cooperation." They argued that, because the Catholic Church on the Miramichi suffered "a net material loss" on account of the removal of St. Thomas, "compensation for this loss should be part of any solution." They proposed that the diocese

arrange to have restored to the Miramichi the Chatham campus of St. Thomas University with the appurtenances formerly attached to it, as the site of the projected junior college, and that the Catholic people of this region make compensation to the diocese for its net capital investment in the Chatham campus.

The new junior college would be in a position to do valuable work for the diocese through adult education "in the manner of a community college through night classes, summer schools and its extension department." Affiliation with StFX, with its "internationally acknowledged" Coady Institute, offered "great promise" for extension work in the area. A major motivating factor for the priests and people of the region in seeking such a college was "the desire to promote vocations to the priesthood and religious life." St. Thomas had been "eminently successful in this respect" in the past. Furthermore, they asked for "the return of the many valuable books removed from the library in Chatham to the UNB library." They hoped to see the junior college open in a year's time, by September 1966. The signatories forwarded a copy of their letter to the apostolic delegate, Archbishop Pignedoli.

The bishop was incensed. Taking it as a personal attack on himself, he ignored what could well have been an emollient to the recent bruises and scars felt by so many Miramichers. He wrote

Schneller:

The Miramichi is at it again. First a letter from a lay group, the Mayor, Sheriff and a school principal. Then another from a group of priests. It does not matter that the names are getting slimmer and that some names are conspicuous by their absence. They do not want much—just give back their teachers, the money, the library and all the support needed to start and maintain a junior college! However, they are very kind as they do not expect me to do that this year but by the fall of 1966. Then they send a copy to the Apostolic Delegate. He in turn thinks that it is so much better and is urging me to do something. What can I do? Nobody puts his foot inside that area except myself.

Recently he was up to the Miramichi for a funeral; he found it "very noticeable when in danger of

meeting me they went to their cars and left. I wonder why they would do that? Were they embarrassed? They are being helped more now than ever before.” Duffie told him it was because “they have lost and we must supply something to appease them.” Yet, Leverman argued to Schneller, they have actually gained by the removal of the university to Fredericton, “since the college has been saved. We started with nothing but they will never acknowledge that. If you see me on a small parish in Ontario, do not be surprised. They will try anything. What a persistent crowd.” He did not know how to answer the letter. Regardless of who was interested in starting a junior college, his diocese had to be involved. “You cannot have another school within the Diocese without it being the effort of the Diocese.” The people in Antigonish will not touch it without his support. Anyway, “Who wants to deal with them?” He was not going to bother the government about any junior college: “It would be a political blunder!” The government did not want another college. They would never give it grants. It would be too expensive for the people on the Miramichi and “would cripple the efforts we are making.”

Leverman’s pride was no doubt severely wounded. More than a month later, on August 30, 1965, he wrote Msgr. Elhatton as “an elder in the Church.” He inquired about the possibilities but concluded that such a proposal went “far beyond our potential.” For the diocese to take on another college at this time would be “to say the least dangerous and could result in bringing to naught all the efforts and sacrifice made so far.” St. Thomas in Fredericton “is progressing.” Plans were underway for further development there, and indeed there would have to be “greater expansion” if St. Thomas was “to keep pace with the ever increasing demands of our times.” The logical and reasonable course was to put all efforts into the “new St. Thomas” in Fredericton:

This will demand all our energy, our complete and total enthusiasm and valiant support. It is not a personal matter but for the welfare, prestige and good of the Church and Education. Would it not be wonderful to be in such a position as to undertake another college? It may come in a few years with the rapid development of our days. At present it appears to be neither feasible nor practical. We must cut our cloth according to our measure. The social, economic and educational changes are rapid and disturbing. In many ways it is not clear just where we are going. The answers are not easy or simple. Everywhere we find influences working, a

questioning of every phase of our complicated existence. It is a period of transition so it requires cool, objective thinking and appraisal of our strengths. This period, wonderful in so many ways, has also its dangers.

The bishop asked that his letter be kept confidential to those who had signed the letter to him.

No Junior College for Chatham

The provincial government had already, on August 10, 1965, set up a committee to decide what use to make of St. Thomas's former buildings in Chatham. After several meetings in Fredericton and Chatham, it was finally decided on November 30 that the best use was a provincial "upgrading centre" for school dropouts in the sixteen-to-nineteen-year age group. The cost of running the program would be \$170,716. To the great disappointment of many, Chatham would have no community or junior college. St. Thomas had left an empty hole.

Second Year in Fredericton, 1965–66: Enrolment Up, Budget Tight

Meanwhile, down in Fredericton, classes opened for the second year on the new campus. On September 24 Duffie reported to the bishop that student enrolment was 375, a 28 percent increase over the previous year. Of those, 285 were from New Brunswick, including 71 from Northumberland County, a 16 percent increase. He must have been pleased that the numbers bore out his prediction that English-speaking students from the Miramichi would continue to come to St. Thomas, wherever it was located. For the time being, by way of appeasement, St. Thomas was offering extension courses in rented rooms in Chatham in the evenings, although the number of offerings was small.

The budget was tight, however. The cost of the first three buildings was \$2.2 million, which so far had been met by loans from the diocese, although government reimbursements were starting to arrive. Bids for construction of the women's residence had only just been called, so for a second year St. Thomas women would be housed in UNB's Maggie Jean Chestnut House, for which St. Thomas

paid rent. The university purchased a house on Windsor Street adjacent to the campus, but at a pinch it could house only six paying female students. The residential east wing of Holy Cross House was completed, and the chapel and refectory were open, but construction had only just begun on the residential west wing. Duffie intended to use it for thirty-six regular undergraduate male students. It was scheduled to open the following fall, September 1966.

Duffie reported that he spent a lot of time during the summer of 1965 travelling around the country, to Montreal, Toronto, and elsewhere, raising money for “The St. Thomas University Program.” He visited head offices of the Bank of Montreal, Sun Life Assurance, Royal Trust, Bathurst Power and Paper, Royal Bank, DuPont, Imperial Tobacco, and Consolidated Mining and Smelting. He said “they were all very cordial and sympathetic” and he had high hopes of financial assistance. He was not wrong. Contributions to the fund began arriving during the year, including \$25,000 from the Bank of Montreal in November.

Faculty Still Short

The obvious consequence of increased enrolment was that Duffie had to find more qualified teaching staff, and soon, because classes were crowded. For the fall of 1965 he added three young and promising full-time professors to faculty. The priest Ed Casey had returned from his studies with his PhD in sociology, a subject now in increasing demand. Duffie added another young Catholic scholar, Noël Kinsella, to teach courses in philosophy and psychology. As we saw, Duffie first met Kinsella in early 1962 when the young student from Saint John accompanied the bishop and Duffie to their audience with the Pope. Since then, Duffie kept tabs on Kinsella while he pursued graduate studies in philosophy and psychology at Lateran and Angelicum Universities in Rome. Earlier in 1965, when he heard Kinsella had returned to New Brunswick and was willing to start teaching while completing his doctorate for Angelicum, Duffie jumped at the chance to hire him.

Duffie's third important addition to faculty in the fall of 1965 was in English. Murchland had told him about an acquaintance, Allen Bentley, who might be available. According to Murchland, Bentley, a budding scholar with a keen intellect and infectious enthusiasm for his subject, would make a fine addition to St. Thomas faculty. With an MA in English literature, Bentley taught in several high schools in Ontario and was presently studying for his MPhil at the University of Toronto under the direction of the noted literary critic Northrop Frye. Duffie contacted Bentley by phone, and sight unseen offered him a teaching position. Bentley, whose father was a Haligonian, was keen to return to his Maritime roots and, being Catholic himself, was intrigued with the idea of teaching literature at a Catholic university. He agreed to come to teach while completing his graduate degree in absentia. He recalls his first meeting with Duffie when he inquired about the details of his job. Concerning salary, Duffie asked him what he earned as a high school teacher in Ontario. Bentley told him \$10,000. Duffie said good, that will be your salary here. As for the courses he would teach, Duffie said to consult with Murchland and Burke—they would decide.

So for 1965–66, Bentley, Murchland, and Burke were the unofficial department of English—but a department without a head. Bentley remembers it as being wonderfully unstructured, the perfect introduction to university teaching for a young scholar imbued with Frye's "archetypal literary symbolism." He remembers scrambling from week to week to put together three new literature courses, yet like many other professors starting their university careers in these years, he also remembers the time as being immensely energizing. Murchland left at the end of the year to pursue doctoral studies, but Burke and Bentley remained at St. Thomas throughout their careers, becoming fixtures for generations of students.

With an administrator's fondness for organization, Duffie was less keen on the idea of a free-wheeling faculty and curriculum. As he later admitted in a letter to a friend, he found the lack of structure in the early years more negative than positive. Henceforth he would strive to create actual

departments run by actual department heads. Yet, ironically, his authoritarian penchant for running the university's practical affairs on his own without consulting others produced—unusually for a Catholic university, unusually for St. Thomas itself—a decided lack of structure in academic offerings.

Dedicated young teachers found this inspiring. Duffie was reputed to be a poor teacher himself, but he respected others who had the teaching gift. He hired teachers impulsively and trusted them to get on with the job without interference from him. It turned out to be an effective way to build a university. Duffie was the autocrat of the breakfast table when it came to running the university's affairs; his professors could be autocrats in their classrooms.

Stories of Duffie's autocratic behaviour were rife. Bentley remembers approaching him for a raise in salary during his first teaching year. Salaries, as well as pensions, were a strictly personal matter, decided by the president. Duffie said he had heard good reports of Bentley's teaching. What did he have in mind for a raise? Bentley, hesitantly, suggested \$500. The president fell into one of his characteristically prolonged silences, so Bentley left the meeting without a resolution. Duffie summoned him a few days later to say he originally considered raising his salary by \$1,000, but as he was satisfied with \$500 then \$500 it would be. Bentley could only shake his head in dismay—but nevertheless was pleased to know that Duffie had heard good things about his teaching.

The Third Year in Fredericton, 1966–67: Taking Shape

Duffie agreed that there should be only one summer school on campus, administered by UNB but in which professors from St. Thomas were invited to teach. When Mackay held his annual “tea party” for the summer school faculty in July 1966, he was, as he wrote his friend John Deutsch, surprised and pleased that five St. Thomas faculty members were involved in the program. He was also pleased to report that Fr. Kandathil, who taught chemistry at both STU and UNB, received a grant of \$4,500 from the National Research Council. “This,” he wrote, “is an indication of the form of development which

you had hoped might follow the move from Chatham to Fredericton.”

The campus was taking shape. By the start of the third year, September 1966, Vanier Hall, the women’s residence, was finally ready for occupancy. This was the fourth Larson building on campus, at a cost of \$385,000. Situated to the east of the Administration Building and mirroring the men’s residence to the west, Vanier Hall provided accommodation for 102 women. The cornerstone had been laid on May 18 the previous spring at a ceremony attended by the dedicatee, Pauline Archer Vanier, wife of Governor General Georges Vanier. Elsewhere on campus, the residential west wing of Holy Cross House was ready for another 36 men in November, bringing campus accommodation for men to 234.

On November 9, 1966, Duffie wrote Deutsch to inform him of the progress during the two years since the move. In his opinion, most people were

now satisfied with the wisdom [that] the science courses, athletics, and the provision of maintenance facilities [had] all been fully integrated with UNB. All are working out very well. The UNB maintenance department is looking after all the needs of St. Thomas at regular costs plus a 10% service charge. St. Thomas students are taking science courses at UNB. Fr. Kandithal is teaching a mixed class of UNB and St. Thomas students. A number of students are also taking specialized undergraduate courses at UNB, and students from UNB are attending Latin classes at St. Thomas.

As for library resources, he and Mackay agreed that UNB would look after “administration and maintenance of the library for the next five years,” while St. Thomas would be responsible for purchasing books for the library for its own courses. Duffie had been appointed a member of the UNB Academic Council, which had proved important for “drawing up the same regulations in regard to all matters academic.” Meanwhile, there had been useful interchanges between the two arts faculties as well as “frequent exchanges of opinions and considerations of the future.” Two committees from the universities met last year “in regard to further future integration.” Regarding nonacademic aspects of the campus, in athletics the intramural leagues had been integrated from the start, although some duplication existed in intercollegiate athletics, as St. Thomas and UNB had their own teams in football

and hockey. St. Thomas students were involved in UNB's Winter Carnival. Although the student councils remained separate, St. Thomas students agreed to share the costs of the proposed student union building.

In the same letter to Deutsch, Duffie expressed the opinion that St. Thomas's first year in Fredericton had been

a lost year as far as precedents were concerned—uncertainty of numbers, some tension as regards the move, and facilities unfinished until Christmas with the taking over now of one service, now of another—which left little in the ten month period by which to judge academic or financial structures.

By contrast, the second year had been better, indeed “very successful,” although staffing problems were a constraint. Beginning the third year, the faculty was continuing to expand; Duffie's major concern now was to develop a proper university administrative structure. Part of the problem was that St. Thomas was much smaller than UNB. The entire administration consisted only of himself as president, Fr. George Martin as registrar, a business office consisting of a bursar and an assistant clerk, an athletic director, and the residence deans. There was no senate, no faculty council. There were only two official academic departments, philosophy and English. Philosophy existed since 1964 and was headed by Fr. Brien Waugh, who had teaching experience as a graduate student at Notre Dame but no administrative experience. The newly created department of English was headed by Richard (Dick) Kennedy. Formerly an instructor at St. Thomas More College in Saskatoon, with an MA from the University of Western Ontario, Kennedy arrived in September 1966. Like Waugh, he had little administrative experience.

Duffie admitted that although he was “reluctant to delegate responsibility to untested persons, either faculty heads or other members of the administration,” he felt he had little choice in the matter. He intended shortly to create two more departments, namely sociology and psychology. As with the two existing departments, neither of the candidates—Casey and Kinsella, respectively—had experience

running an academic department. All the same, the faculty had nearly doubled, from seventeen in 1964, to twenty-one in 1965, to thirty-one in 1996. It was “a vastly improved staff,” one that would allow St. Thomas “to more easily face future problems.” The new department heads would have to learn on the job. One reason Duffie wished to form proper departments, he admitted, was to enable their heads to do the recruiting and relieve him of the task.

“Terrifying Changes”

The new buildings and the new faculty merely disguised some longer-term problems that lay just over the horizon. Duffie wrote Bishop Leverman on November 21, 1966, that he had recently returned from meetings with the Central Advisory Committee in Nova Scotia, a committee made up of university presidents and education department representatives from the Atlantic provinces. There he had learned about certain advances and changes occurring that were “simply terrifying.” Different types of degrees were being introduced, and some institutions were starting to use television in the classrooms. UNB’s junior college in Saint John (UNBSJ), for example, was planning to experiment with televised courses because of their inability “to get sufficient qualified professors.” The delegates were warned that university enrolments in the 1960s across North America were expanding rapidly, with a consequent shortage of qualified professors in Canada and “a deleterious effect on curricula.”

New Faculty

Given that he had built a faculty from scratch, Duffie understood the problem better than most. From the moment he took over, he had to scramble to recruit teachers. He had little hope of attracting established scholars; consequently he put considerable effort into locating promising young scholars. In order to preserve and enhance St. Thomas’s religious character, he naturally preferred to hire Roman Catholics, such as Ferrari, Alexander, Burke, and Pidhainy, whom, as we saw, he attracted to the faculty

in Chatham and who moved with it to Fredericton. In the university's first two years in Fredericton he recruited a few teaching priests to join Frs. Donovan, Poole, Kandathil, and Harrington already on faculty: Frs. Waugh in philosophy and Murchland in English arrived with the Holy Cross contingent; Frs. Ed Casey and W. J. Nugent came to teach sociology; Fr. Roger Belanger for Spanish; and Frs. MacDonald and Wilfred Murchland (Bernard's brother) for theology. Finding other Catholic priests with suitable academic credentials, however, was becoming extremely difficult. He therefore turned to young lay Catholic scholars: Bentley in English, Kinsella in psychology and his wife Anna Maria Kinsella in French in 1965, and in the following year Dick Kennedy and his wife Judy Kennedy (also an English literature scholar, with a graduate degree from Oxford), Ted Daigle in French, Harry Rigby in classics, and Frank Cronin in philosophy.

Duffie had long been concerned to build a strong philosophy department. He brought Leo Ferrari with him from Halifax in 1962; Ferrari became one of Duffie's strongest internal supporters for moving St. Thomas to Fredericton. With a doctorate from Laval and as a promising scholar of St. Augustine, Ferrari became a leading member of the faculty in its new location. After the move, Ferrari and Waugh formed St. Thomas's first official academic department. It was strengthened in the summer of 1966 by the addition of Frank Cronin, PhD candidate at Fordham University. As we saw, the agreement between UNB and St. Thomas allowing the latter to offer a philosophy course at UNBSJ had caused concerns. Cronin, however, was accepted by both sides. (Cronin remembers Duffie warning him "to go easy on Aquinas down there," which Cronin—with his primary scholarly interest in Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, paleontologist and unorthodox Catholic theologian—assured him he would do). Both Cronin and Duffie hoped student enrolment in Saint John might soon warrant offering two or even three courses there, which explains why Cronin, who was from Saint John, decided for the time being to live there and commute to Fredericton (at the time a two-hour drive) to teach two courses at St. Thomas. Like Waugh and Ferrari, Cronin would remain teaching philosophy at St. Thomas for his

entire career, a pillar of the faculty until his retirement in 2001.

Thus under Duffie's personal intervention and direction a new St. Thomas faculty was taking shape in 1966. One newcomer was Ted Daigle, a graduate of the teacher's program at the Université de Moncton and a specialist in teaching French by *la méthode directe*. Until his untimely death in 1983, Daigle electrified his students in French as well as onstage in drama productions. In the same year, Duffie assigned Harry Rigby, whom he hired in 1965 as dean of men, to teach Latin. Rigby founded the still-active big band, The Thomists, instructing generations of students in voice and instrumental skills. Daigle and Rigby, like Duffie's other appointees—Ferrari, Waugh, Cronin, Burke, Bentley, Noël Kinsella, and the Kennedys—remained at St. Thomas for their entire academic careers, helping define the core faculty of St. Thomas as it carved a permanent niche in Fredericton.

Fourth Year in Fredericton, 1967–68: Changing Character?

By September 1967, all St. Thomas students—including the seniors, members of the class of '68—had known university life only in Fredericton, nothing of Chatham. Frs. Win Poole, Vince Donovan, George Martin, and George Harrington represented the old St. Thomas of Chatham, but year by year, as more new teachers joined the faculty, the university was losing its Miramichi character and becoming a provincial university alongside UNB. The pressing issue now, though, was not geographic but spiritual—not about St. Thomas's Miramichi character but about its Catholic character. Looking back, we can see that the process of educational secularization began after the war years, when students and faculty began demanding “modern” facilities, in particular for their science courses. The lure of better science and library facilities on the UNB campus played an important role in securing support for moving to Fredericton.

Modern facilities are one thing. More worrisome from the Church's point of view was the diminishing presence of priests on faculty. Fewer priests were teaching courses or available to advise

students on spiritual matters than was the case in Chatham. Frs. McGrath, McKendy, Troy, and Higgins had not come to Fredericton. Of the new priests, Frs. Wilfred Murchland, Bernard Murchland, Nugent, and Walsh had all left; Fr. MacDonald said he was next. To date Duffie had been able to attract young Catholic lay scholars to the faculty, but their courses had little religious (much less Catholic) content. A secular frame of mind was taking shape among both faculty and students.

The primary concern for the faculty, however, was less the spiritual nature of the university than its relationship with UNB. Could St. Thomas maintain its independence, and if so, how? If not, could it maintain its special character? Perhaps more important, what *was* its special character?

The last question would bedevil thinkers and policy-makers at St. Thomas for a long time to come; indeed, it continues to do so today. The other questions, however, dealt with issues that were more practical than philosophical. UNB for its part had already been addressing them during the previous year. On January 1, 1967, the "Committee on the Future of the University" released its report. It was commonly referred to as the Bailey Committee, after its chair, Dr. Alfred Bailey, a long-time advocate for bringing St. Thomas to the UNB campus. Section 5.2 concerned St. Thomas:

The Commission is of the opinion that closer relations be established with St. Thomas University. It believes that St. Thomas should continue as a separate institution and should thus retain its individuality and its own traditions. Nevertheless, in addition to sharing such facilities as library, gymnasium, student union building, etc., and in addition [to allowing students to continue] to take the UNB science courses, and any others that seem desirable to both bodies, there should be a closer relationship between the Arts faculties of the two institutions. Separate departments should be maintained, but in each case the work of the departments concerned should be dove-tailed so that each functions as a single department. The standing committee on relations of the two institutions should be continued and, in addition, each Arts Faculty should appoint members to a joint committee to work out programs to the best advantage of the students of both institutions.

The report caused a stir up the hill at St. Thomas. At a meeting of the general faculty shortly after classes began in September 1967, members of faculty asked the president, who was attending although not presiding, to establish a special "Committee on the Future of St. Thomas University" to address the issues raised by the Bailey Committee. The committee would invite briefs from all faculty

members, either as members of a department or individually. Duffie agreed, and appointed Ed Casey from sociology to be its chair.

Over the fall of 1967, the St. Thomas committee received written submissions from many faculty members. There was no consensus. Some (e.g., Waugh) expressed no opinion about the issue of remaining independent from UNB, only that St. Thomas should remain small and Catholic, although he did not attempt to define what made it Catholic. Some (e.g., Dick Kennedy, Noël Kinsella, and Oleh Pidhainy, speaking for English, psychology, and history, respectively) were in favour of remaining independent of UNB, but stressed that there should be maximum coordination and minimum duplication of courses. Others (e.g., Cronin, Rigby, Donovan, and Casey himself) were in favour of amalgamation with UNB, suggesting that only by becoming a college of UNB could St. Thomas keep a distinctive Catholic curriculum; in Donovan's words, "providing a Catholic witness in higher education." This, Donovan continued,

would require acceptance by the authorities of St. Thomas that Theology and [Scholastic] Philosophy are the areas wherein it differs from UNB and are the areas wherein it can make a special and peculiar contribution in the sphere of higher education. Consequently, these must be the course areas which would receive preferential consideration as to faculty appointments and qualifications, money allotments, allowances for library acquisitions, etc.

If St. Thomas remained independent, however, it would inevitably lose its Catholic character. Even Fr. Bill White, the athletics director, suggested that—except perhaps for hockey—the athletics program at St. Thomas should be entirely amalgamated with UNB's.

Duffie was willing to continue working closely with UNB, but neither he nor the bishop would even entertain a proposal that St. Thomas become a college of UNB. Doing so would be to give up its identity (although they were unwilling or unable to define what that identity was). They were not swayed by such examples as the long-standing federation of relatively independent colleges within the great English universities of Cambridge, Oxford, and London, or even the evidently successful Canadian cases such as St. Thomas More at the University of Saskatchewan or St. Michael's at the

University of Toronto. They preferred a loose “affiliation” to a unified “federation,” because federation implied amalgamation and integration: St. Thomas would give up the right to offer its own degrees. Besides, there was a personal dimension. Both Duffie and Leverman had lost several layers of hide bringing St. Thomas to UNB. Integration would mean that the bishop of Saint John was no longer chancellor, the president no longer president, of their battle-scarred university. (People in positions of authority seldom give them up voluntarily.) As Vince Donovan and others maintained, as a federated college within the institutional framework of UNB, St. Thomas might well have kept its Catholic character. In reality, as an independent, affiliated university, many would argue that over the years it would lose that character until it became another small, undergraduate university, indistinguishable from, say, Mount Allison, and ever more vulnerable to government efforts to “rationalize” when money became tight. Whatever the future held, however, at the moment it seemed preferable to maintain St. Thomas’s independence and to hope for the best.

Mounting Expenses

Duffie was more concerned with the financial than the spiritual health of the university. In January 1967 he wrote Deutsch that the hiring of staff had substantially increased the university’s operating costs, and the increase promised to continue for the near future. As examples, he mentioned three requests for additional staff from the “head professors” of philosophy, English, and psychology. He understood that the teachers might be ideal and “relatively necessary” in order to reduce overcrowded classes, although Duffie did not believe they needed to be “reduced as drastically as suggested.” They certainly could not be hired all at once. He also knew the university needed money for sabbaticals, travel, and equipment, but he would not be able to provide what the heads were asking for.

Regarding the philosophy course St. Thomas offered at UNBSJ, Duffie explained to Deutsch, there was not enough work for a full-time professor, so Prof. Cronin was teaching in Fredericton and

Saint John. (Cronin recalls driving up to Fredericton three times a week from 1966 to 1969 to teach two and sometimes three philosophy courses, until he moved to Fredericton for good in 1970 when it appeared that St. Thomas had more students interested in philosophy than UNBSJ.) According to Duffie, having Cronin teach on both campuses meant “an extra cost of about \$1,500 a year for travel costs, the same rate as UNB pays their professors who teach courses at UNBSJ.” (Cronin remembers being paid at most \$900 per academic year.) As for the extension courses in Chatham that St. Thomas was also trying to maintain at extra cost, four courses were offered the previous year, 1966–67, and his intention was to continue doing so “for the next years.” Other expenses were incurred by St. Thomas students participating in UNB cultural activities, although he claimed that was working out satisfactorily. St. Thomas also had its own cultural activities now, including drama with Ted Daigle and music with Harry Rigby’s “highly reputed band.” Both were asking him for money, and he was sympathetic: “The monies allotted to us should not be so tight that we cannot provide them with some money out of regular funds.”

Capital costs, however, were increasing. It had become evident that St. Thomas needed another building in order to provide more classrooms and more office space for faculty. Construction of a new academic building, another Larson design containing a much-needed auditorium along with rooms for classes and offices, was scheduled to begin in the fall of 1968 to be ready for September 1969. The diocese was providing \$50,000 a year for capital costs, and the New Brunswick government still owed St. Thomas \$300,000 for its Chatham buildings. But although Deutsch Report recommended the government give St. Thomas “a \$25,000 transitional grant for five years,” they had paid that amount for only three years. After that, the minister of education said the money would go to students, not to the university. The university was also finding that interest payments on money borrowed for capital expenses were high. This was primarily because “the government payments on Chatham properties” were “running behind by two years,” and it was hurting the university’s financial situation.

The five diocesan priests on staff were paid salaries “according to their degrees, competency and experience,” which cost the university “around \$35,000 to \$37,000 per year.” In case of deficit, that money would have to come from the diocesan allocation for capital costs.

Duffie may have thought that financial concerns were his primary worry, yet it was administrative structure that would cause him the worst headaches. Now that he had created modern facilities for the university, he realized that it had to have a similarly modern administrative structure, or at least one similar to that of other universities. Thus he created several new departments, headed by faculty members, who were given authority to recruit new faculty. His experience in dealing with recalcitrant—indeed occasionally outright hostile—faculty members on an individual basis made him reluctant to encourage the faculty to organize themselves. By its fourth year in Fredericton, however, the faculty was emerging as a well-qualified and self-assured body of academics. Thus, at the start of term in the fall of 1967, he let the faculty know that he would not object to their holding regular meetings. Naturally he planned to attend such meetings—he did teach a course after all and was pleased to have himself listed in the calendar as a bona fide member of faculty—but, in his black suit and monsignor’s fuchsia socks seated at the front of the gathering, there would be no mistaking who was in control. Ironically, he would come to regret the *esprit de corps* that emerged when the faculty, led by its free and critical spirits, eventually turned against him, as his authoritarian *modus operandi* ensured that it would.

Fifth Year in Fredericton, 1968–69: A Senate Is Born

As president of St. Thomas, Duffie was a member of UNB’s Academic Council (its academic senate). He understood that it was incumbent on him to “draw up the same regulations [for St. Thomas] in regard to all matters academic.” When it came to implementing some of UNB’s regulations, however, Duffie had reservations. St. Thomas of course had a board of governors representing the wider

community. In the fall of 1968 it consisted of eighteen members and had just lost its chairman in September when the chancellor himself, Bishop Leverman, resigned because of ill health. The board exercised final legal responsibility for running the university, although in fact Duffie, as president and the board's vice-chairman, could and did use the board (as St. Thomas's rectors had long been used to doing) as a rubber stamp for his decisions. Since the members were not on campus or part of the university's daily life, they could hardly intervene. But now that St. Thomas was dramatically enlarged—and enlarging every year in number of students and faculty—academic matters such as the vital one of curriculum (the courses being offered in any one year as well as those being planned for future years) and such related matters as departmental responsibility for those courses, had expanded beyond any possibility of the president's personal direction. Duffie expected department heads to manage the expanding curriculum, in spite of their lack of experience, and he was planning to authorize more. But now he needed to build those academic units into a governing structure. In modern universities, such a structure is the academic senate.

Thus, on November 30, 1968, Duffie established the St. Thomas senate. It consisted originally of ten persons, with himself as president and chair, George Martin as registrar, the four existing department heads (Brien Waugh, philosophy; Ed Casey, sociology; Dick Kennedy, English; Noël Kinsella, psychology), and four new persons representing the interests of the remainder of the faculty. Those four new senators were described as “Elected to represent Group Areas,” in effect acting department heads but without the title. They were Robert Kelly, “representing Anthropology, Political Science, and Economics”; Ted Daigle, “representing Modern Languages”; Fr. Lou Kingston “representing Theology”; and Bill Spray (newly hired in the summer of 1968 to replace Oleh Pidhainy who had forcibly resigned) “representing History, Classics, and Latin.” None of them, including Duffie, had any experience as members of a university academic senate.

St. Thomas's first senate meeting took place at 7:00 p.m. on December 4, 1968. The first item of

business was whether or not meetings should be open to non-members. The meeting concurred with Duffie's suggestion that they should be closed. Should minutes, it was asked, then be kept confidential or could they be circulated to staff? Again, the body concurred with Duffie's recommendation that they should be confidential, at least for the time being. Some bold senators voiced complaints that "the administration" appeared to be favouring certain departments over others, at which suggestion Duffie adopted his usual method of maintaining an uncomfortable and ominous silence. No one made any specific proposal regarding that issue, so it was left hanging. The meeting soon adjourned with none of its members clear as to what precisely senate was supposed to do. As little as possible, no doubt, in Duffie's mind, witnessed by the decisions to keep the meeting closed and deliberations secret.

New Bishop, New Chancellor

As mentioned, in September 1968, due to failing health, Bishop Leverman resigned as bishop of Saint John and thus as chancellor of St. Thomas. At a meeting of the board on May 12, 1969, the members "noted with satisfaction" what he had done for the university. Fr. Arnold Toner, representing Holy Cross and now on faculty teaching theology, was instructed to convey "a vote of deepest thanks" to Leverman for his "great work with St. Thomas University." In his subsequent letter to the bishop, dated May 23, 1969, Toner wrote:

The members [of the Board] noted with satisfaction that enrolment had increased from about 200 five years ago to over 700 for this September; that there are over three million dollars' worth of buildings on the St. Thomas campus, yet the debt is only about four hundred thousand dollars; that the academic standing has improved; and that campus decorum, especially the relationship between faculty and students, the general layout of the buildings, and the appearance of the grounds, are commendable. The Board showed deep satisfaction in appraising the common shared facilities such as the new library [the Harriet Irving Library opened in 1967], labs, student centre, arena, gymnasium with its Olympic-sized swimming pool, and general maintenance service. There seems to be good reason to believe the Dear Lord is blessing St. Thomas University. Would this not be due in part to the courageous suffering on the part of many, especially yourself? The members of the Board join with you in thanking God for his blessing and guidance. May God give you improved health and reward you richly for the help you have been to St. Thomas University.

Leverman responded that his part in the success of the university was

only minor and very insignificant. The accomplishments of the University up to date, which you list in pardonable pride and joy, are the results of the farseeing fiscal policy and academic administration of the President, Msgr. Duffie, and the wise and able advice of the Board of Governors. My earnest hope and prayer is that St. Thomas will remain always true to its original concept and ideals as a Catholic College.

In spite of the board's warm wishes and Toner's expressed sentiments about Leverman's sufferings on behalf of St. Thomas, we might wonder how much Leverman actually did to keep the university "true to its original concept and ideals as a Catholic College." In commending Duffie for his "farseeing fiscal policy and academic administration," however, Leverman was certainly right to suggest that it had been Duffie who was responsible for St. Thomas's present existence in Fredericton. Yet his "academic administration" had begun to create rumblings of discontent. At the same board meeting, on May 12, the board set up a "Constitutional Committee" to look into that administration.

It would be several months before the committee would report with some pointedly critical conclusions. Meanwhile, from the time of Leverman's resignation as bishop of Saint John on September 7, 1968, until June 1969, the diocese was without a bishop and St. Thomas without a chancellor. Duffie ruled supreme.

The Presidential Style

Duffie's methods of hiring (and firing) faculty tended to be abrupt. In 1967, for example, Oleh Pidhainy, a Ukrainian Catholic teaching history at St. Thomas since 1964, verbally threatened to leave the university if Duffie did not give him more money to purchase books for the UNB library. Duffie at first did not respond. Pidainy repeated his demand, including his proffered resignation, this time in writing. Duffie again gave no response but placed Pidhainy's letter in his desk drawer. On investigation, Duffie discovered that most of the very large number of books Pidhainy had ordered so

far for the library, using scarce funds, were in Ukrainian. It upset Duffie because obviously St. Thomas students could not read them. When Pidhainy gave Duffie yet another ultimatum in the spring of 1968, Duffie called him in, retrieved the unfortunate professor's letter of resignation from his desk, and told him he was accepting it, effective immediately.

Duffie had to find someone to take Pidhainy's place. A faculty member in the history department at UNB heard about the forced resignation and passed the word on to Bill Spray, at the time working for the provincial government and teaching part-time at UNB. With a recently completed PhD from the University of London in imperial and maritime history—completed thanks to a Beaverbrook scholarship—and coming from Chatham where he had attended St. Thomas High School, Spray thought he might enjoy teaching at the new St. Thomas. He approached Duffie about the recently vacated position. The interview that took place in June 1968 was as strange as it was brief. Spray began the discussion by informing Duffie that he was from Chatham but was not Catholic. Duffie's response: "Can you teach history?" Spray: "Yes, I think I can." Duffie then asked Spray how much he was making working for the government. Spray told him, to which Duffie responded: "I guess we can pay that. You're hired." Since Spray had been included in the government's pension plan, he inquired about the university's pension plan. After a long pause Duffie replied that yes, there was a plan. Spray asked if he could be included in it. After another long pause, Duffie said yes, he would be included. Spray soon discovered that only those who asked about a pension were included. He supposed then that the idea of pensions was unfamiliar because it was not needed for teaching priests, as the Church looked after its priests' material needs throughout their lives. Even so, for lay members it seemed there were no standards for perquisites. There was no discussion about what history courses Spray would teach. Instead he was told to discuss it with the "acting head of Political Science and History," Oscar Pudymaitis.

After agreeing with Pudymaitis on what courses to teach, namely, Canadian and British

imperial history, Spray began hurriedly preparing lecture notes for the coming year's classes. At the end of August 1968, just before classes began, Duffie called him into his office to inform him that Pudymaitis had left the university "in unusual circumstances" and another member of the department (Peter Toner) had left to do further graduate study, which left history with only two members, Spray and Lew Morgan, a recent UNB graduate with a BA in history. Duffie informed Spray that he was now the acting head of history and should quickly find people to teach the necessary courses. With the help of Spray's colleagues in the UNB history department and some of their graduate students, he managed to cobble together a program of courses for the year. It meant giving up some of the courses he had agreed to teach and had begun to prepare for and preparing some new courses. Life was hectic in his first year of full-time university teaching. In the meantime, Duffie instructed him to find two new full-time historians for the department for the following academic year to replace those who had left. Spray advertised for and proposed to the president hiring Juergen Doerr, a specialist in German history, to teach European history, and Herbert Goltz, a specialist in North American Indian and frontier history, to teach American and Canadian history. Both were completing their doctorates at U.S. graduate schools. Duffie accepted Spray's recommendations, and the two young scholars arrived in the summer of 1969 to join the growing band of professors.

In September 1969, the handsome new Larson-designed neoclassical building, called for want of a better name the Academic Building, was ready for occupancy. The faculty, new and old, finally had spacious offices. Paul Morrissy, newly hired to teach anthropology in 1968, remembered the controversy agitating the faculty during that year regarding the specific assignment of new offices. The most desirable offices were the eight corner offices. Of those, the most desirable were the four that had magnificent views overlooking the city and the hills across the river. Although at the very start there was some grousing about who was "senior" to whom and thus had claims to the best offices, Duffie settled the disputes with his usual light hand. Nevertheless, it was the beginning of St. Thomas's office

allocation system, unusual among universities (including UNB), determined by seniority of university service rather than by department membership. An Office Allocations Committee was established to oversee this annual exercise of musical chairs, sending out a notice every winter listing the faculty offices that would be vacated the following year and therefore available for new permanent occupancy. Applications would be decided on the basis of seniority. Future visitors to Edmund Casey Hall, as it would soon be named, were surprised to see the departmental mix of offices, an anthropology professor next door to a history professor, English next to psychology. Somehow, it suited small St. Thomas and encouraged communication across the disciplines.

St. Thomas–UNB Cooperation at Department Level

Also in the fall of 1969, Duffie asked Spray to hire three more faculty for what was now a bona fide history department. He considered a departmental complement of six full-time members a proper size. Relations with the UNB history department had always been good, and mutually they had allowed and even encouraged students to take courses on the other campus. Such cooperation had been envisaged in the original terms of affiliation between St. Thomas and UNB. Duffie insisted from the beginning that it would be policy to allow a student on one campus to take up to two courses a year on the other campus and have those courses count for full academic credit at the home university—with the sole exception of theology courses. The members of the St. Thomas history department were all also mindful of the urgings of the Bailey Commission that

There should be a closer relationship between the Arts faculties of the two institutions. Separate departments should be maintained, but in each case the work of the departments concerned should be dove-tailed so that each functions as a single department.

While Spray doubted the two departments could ever function as a single department, he was happy to institutionalize as much cooperation as possible. So, after consulting with colleagues in UNB history, one of whom, Francis Coughlan, had recently been teaching history at St. Thomas, the St.

Thomas department proposed hiring qualified academics in fields that would complement UNB history's areas of specialization. Everyone agreed that St. Thomas would hire in three areas of history not presently covered at UNB: Latin American, Russian, and medieval and church history. After extensive advertising during the winter, Spray recommended hiring Dan Gleason and Tony Rhineland, who were completing doctoral degrees in the U.S., and Fr. John Jennings, who had already completed his licentiate at the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies in Toronto. Duffie approved, and the three arrived in the summer of 1970 to begin their own career-long teaching at St. Thomas. The history department was now complete with a cohort of young teacher-scholars and a policy of cooperation with its sister department at UNB in place. To cement the relationship with UNB and comply as far as possible with the Bailey recommendations, each history department agreed to invite a delegate from the opposite one to attend its meetings. More important from the students' perspective—and based on the understanding that most students will try to avoid walking an unnecessary distance (especially up a steep hill)—the two departments also agreed to a yearly mutual exchange of courses, whereby one professor from each department would offer a course on the opposite campus. The administrators agreed that such courses would count as credits at the university at which they were offered, and the practice of course exchanges rotating among the members of each department became an annual curricular opportunity. At the departmental level, the cooperative agreement proved to be fruitful and long-lasting. At the time, the historians hoped their example might become a model for St. Thomas's other departments. Although there were many instances of cooperation and cordial relations among faculty members from the two campuses, none of the other corresponding departments at St. Thomas and UNB, for whatever reason, established the historians' level of course exchange and collegial cooperation.

The President's Writ

The work of building an entire department from scratch at the same time that he was developing new courses to teach, however, left Spray feeling exhausted and as “acting head” somewhat unappreciated. He asked Duffie either to make him full department head or to appoint someone else to run the department. Duffie immediately sent Spray a letter officially making him head of the history department, promoting him to the rank of associate professor, and granting him tenure. As with pensions, tenure—an indefinite contract with the university, one that does not need regular renegotiation—was another aspect of modern university governance unfamiliar to St. Thomas’s Catholic educational tradition and not yet institutionalized. At the time, Duffie tended to treat it, like pensions, as a personal favour, to hand out when necessary, as when he wished to keep a desired person on staff. He handed out promotions the same way.

In the same vein, there was no regular salary scale at St. Thomas. That was perhaps to be expected. Throughout St. Thomas’s institutional history, salaries had been minimal, unstandardized, and determined personally by rector and chancellor. Non-priests, of whom more and more had been appointed to faculty during the 1960s, needed higher and more standardized salaries than priests. Those salaries had to be relatively competitive, in order to attract qualified candidates. Duffie exercised his authority in many cases to award quite generous salaries. Yet among faculty no one was supposed to know what the others were paid. For example, when Rhineland was hired in 1970, he was offered a salary of \$10,000, which was reasonably competitive for someone with minimal teaching experience and a still uncompleted doctoral degree. Because he was in the final stages of the PhD, however, he asked if his salary would be increased when he actually received the degree. Duffie assured him that his salary would be increased by \$500, along with promotion to the rank of assistant professor. True to his word, six months later, when Rhineland produced the coveted sheepskin, Duffie raised his salary to \$10,500, and threw in assistant professor status and permission to join the pension scheme. Rhineland had no idea what salaries others in his position were receiving. That lack of transparency was one of

the issues that would finally drive the faculty to defy Duffie's magisterial style.

Many other such extra-professional, ad personem arrangements obtained during the early years in Fredericton. One professor remembered going to Duffie on several occasions to say he was contemplating a better-paying job elsewhere. Each time Duffie offered him a salary increase. There was no objective salary scale, only Duffie's personal disposition. Fortunately for St. Thomas in these crucial building years, Duffie appreciated academic quality. He just wanted to be the one in charge of quality control. It was this controlling quality that constituted Duffie's feet of clay.

Feet of Clay: I. The Board

The board of governors met infrequently before 1969. It had an executive committee that made decisions between meetings, composed of the president, the vice-president (Harrington), and the registrar (Martin), but Duffie made most decisions without consulting anyone. As we saw, even when he created a senate to deal with academic matters, he managed to keep final decisions in his own hands. As we also saw, however, the board set up a Constitutional Committee in May 1969, although it would not report for several months, and even then to the president. Nevertheless, Duffie's style of governance began to run into obstacles that summer.

On June 24, 1969, Joseph MacNeil, from Sydney, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, was ordained bishop of the diocese of Saint John. MacNeil immediately picked up the reins as St. Thomas's new chancellor and notified members that he was calling a meeting of the board for August 11. At that meeting, reflecting some of the discontent that MacNeil and other board members had heard about, the board over Duffie's objections passed a motion to amend the university's bylaws by increasing the size of its executive committee from three to five. The executive had the power to act in the board's name, although the board had to approve those decisions at its regular meetings. The president would of course be a member, but the bishop was chair and appointed the other three.

At the August meeting, MacNeil asked the board to turn its attention to the future of the university. As we have seen, many faculty members had grievances about Duffie's style of governance. Yet the board had no member specifically representing faculty. One member, Arnold Toner, happened to be a member of faculty (teaching theology), but he was there representing the Holy Cross Fathers. Nevertheless, as we saw previously in his private remarks to the apostolic delegate, Toner had reservations about Duffie's style of leadership. He undoubtedly relayed some of those reservations to other board members. In the event, his concerns were superfluous. The board still contained many of Duffie's old opponents from Chatham. Judge Thomas Troy from Campbellton, Fr. Bernard Broderick, Fr. Henry McGrath, and his old nemesis, Fr. Lynn McFadden, were all still board members. They all attended the fateful board meeting in September 1962 at which, thanks to Duffie's and Leverman's manipulations, their opposition to removing St. Thomas from Chatham was dubiously but effectively overridden. They were sympathetic to a recent request from the faculty for official representation on the board. Duffie fought against the idea, but in the end could do little but acquiesce to the new and unfamiliar spotlight being shone on his work.

The board's Constitution Committee met on January 14, 1970. It concluded that the administrative structure of St. Thomas was "out-dated." After "considerable discussion on pertinent matters to be contained in the new constitution," the committee instructed Duffie to draft proposals for a new constitution and submit it to the board. He agreed, but said it would take considerable time and would likely be summer before he could complete the task. Meanwhile, two members of the committee, Frs. Brien Waugh and Lou Kingston, set about gathering the constitutions and charters of several universities and drafting a preliminary constitution. At the board's annual meeting on May 11, 1970, Duffie reported that he was still working on a draft. He informed the board that he had received a formal request from the faculty, dated October, 28, 1969, asking "that there be communication" with them "with the view of discussing faculty representation on the Board of Governors." He awaited the

board's decision as to whether or not to include such an item in the new constitution. Then, in an extraordinary replay of his earlier board packing, Duffie made a series of motions to reappoint certain members of the board due to retire for three-year terms and also to add certain "members emeriti" to the board. The board, however, did not accept his motions.

Feet of Clay: II. Faculty

Later that summer of 1970, Duffie issued a long, upbeat report for the provincial government's Higher Education Committee (NBHEC). Enrolment had continued to grow in 1969–70: 785 students, up 22 percent over the year before, but as a consequence the university was suffering growing pains. Classes were crowded and the faculty was expanding rapidly, with fifteen new professors added to staff for 1970, seven with PhDs. He appointed Fr. Edmund Casey head of a new Department of Social Sciences, combining the subjects of sociology, economics, political science and anthropology. As for relations with UNB, he reported that several departments, including English, philosophy, psychology, Latin and classics, history, and mathematics, had established "a good interchange" with their UNB counterparts. There had been "frequent exchanges of opinions and consideration of the future," and committees from the respective universities had met during the year "in regard to further integration." The two history departments and the two English departments, he reported, were getting along particularly well. The historians were exchanging courses with one another. One of the major events in 1969 was, on the initiative of Prof. Judy Kennedy, the joint hosting by St. Thomas and UNB of an international Spenser colloquium, "which brought in some 100 scholars from England, the United States and Canada to Fredericton." Concerning student activities, in 1969 the St. Thomas rugby team won the McNair Trophy for the province.

Thanks to such glowing reports Duffie maintained good relations with government officials and with administrators at UNB. As in a Greek tragedy, however, he was blind to the signs of his own

approaching demise. His biggest challenge was an inability to share power. In deciding policy, he did not consult even his own administrative staff, much less the faculty. He was deaf to growing discontent among faculty. He was unable to deal with representatives of the faculty as a whole to discuss hiring policies, sabbatical leaves, or money for research. Instead he dealt with faculty and staff only on an individual basis, made decisions only according to his own lights. He had favourites among the faculty, from whom he received advice both good and bad. It was his way of trying to maintain control by keeping everyone at St. Thomas atomized, and it naturally caused morale problems among both faculty and staff. Although the senate was in place since 1968, Duffie often ignored its recommendations. One of his extraordinary tactics at meetings when a matter came up that he preferred not to discuss was to turn his chair around, remain silent, and ignore those present. He did the same thing in his office when dealing with individual faculty members. Cronin, having previously received the cold-shoulder treatment, recalls taking a book with him when he went to see the president about salary parity with UNB. When the president refused to talk to him about it and turned away, Cronin opened his book and remained sitting and reading until Duffie finally turned back and offered a compromise.

Concerning the issue of sabbatical leaves, it was generally agreed among faculty that, as was normal at other universities, such leaves were due after six years of full-time teaching. Yet Duffie was unwilling to admit to a general policy. As a result, when a faculty member applied for sabbatical, Duffie would often stall. A sabbatical leave, he would say, had to be approved by the board, which had not yet made a decision in the particular case. As it often turned out, he never brought the application to the board. Such behaviour made it extremely difficult for faculty to arrange to study elsewhere, to make travel and accommodation arrangements for family, and so forth. Spray recalls applying for a sabbatical but hearing nothing from Duffie for several months. He was trying to finalize plans to rent accommodations in England. He approached Duffie again, who told him the board had not yet made a decision about his sabbatical. A little later he asked Duffie yet again; again he was told the board still

had made no decision. Finally Spray lost all patience and demanded an immediate answer. Duffie responded, "I can fire you if I want to." In good Miramichi fashion, Spray replied, "Good. Try it!" and stormed out of the office. The following day a letter appeared in Spray's mailbox: "The Board of Governors has granted you a sabbatical leave." There had been no meeting of the board. Duffie was willing to have normal university regulations and policies theoretically in place; in practice, he followed or ignored them as he wished.

Feet of Clay: III. Administration

Duffie's refusal to consult with his administrative officials, in particular the registrar, George Martin, also led to problems that eventually surfaced to his disadvantage. In 1969, after his ordination as bishop, MacNeil invited the priests in his diocese "to declare their will in respect to change of appointment." Martin responded that although he was not discontented where he was, he "would be willing to enter parish work if there was a need for my doing so." A year later, Martin decided that leaving St. Thomas might be a good idea. On September 26, 1970, he wrote the bishop a long letter in which he offered to resign from his position at St. Thomas. He did not feel that his talents were appreciated. The president had sidelined him and he felt generally useless. If the bishop agreed, he would be willing to take up parish work. In his words:

My own instincts would lead me to suspect:

- that I would be better in a town than in the country
- that I would be better with someone else than alone
- that I would not be very good with teenagers
- that I would probably be inclined to become involved in civic or community affairs
- that I would not be a fixer, renovator, or constructor of church buildings
- that I would be more interested in what went on inside the church than the church building itself.

In seeking parish work I would be willing to try anything.

Martin was feeling his age (he was forty-six), and in poor physical condition:

Given my age, the fact that I have been overweight for years, and the history of early deaths

from heart attack in my father's family, I am not a good risk for a long life. Despite the fact that I am overweight, never exercise, and live a completely sedentary life—all of which are admittedly bad—I believe I have more than ordinary energy and capacity for work. I have no hobbies, I play no games, and this I recognize as being a weakness.

He told the bishop about his having quit graduate studies at Fordham. In typically self-deprecatory fashion, he wrote: “My failure was more of a personality deficiency than an intelligence failure. If I had been more of a fighter I would have got the degree.” Living in New York was an important experience for him:

New York City itself changed me from a green boy into a person with a fairly wide and open outlook on life, religion, society, politics and books. I suspect I was something of a know-it-all before I went there, but I came back much wiser, more mature, if somewhat sadder.

Martin wrote the letter on September 26, typed it on September 28, and added an “appendix” on September 29. The appendix is worth quoting in full, particularly in light of Martin's replacement of Duffie as president a few years later, as it details his views about the nature of St. Thomas and more specifically his grievances about Duffie's presidency:

An additional reason for leaving my present work is that I suspect I will be forced out before many years go by. Aside from Fr. Harrington I have been longest associated with St. Thomas and I represent the old St. Thomas which is almost completely gone now. Given past history, what more logical than that they get rid of the last vestige of the old days, namely me.

Another argument: besides being registrar I also perform part of the function of Dean of Arts or Academic Vice-President, but I don't have the title or the authority. I have heard comments like this at a general faculty meeting during the past academic year: “This just shows our need for a really qualified Dean of Arts.” Also it was suggested to me by Msgr. Duffie about six years ago that he and Bishop Leverman had agreed that I should have more authority. I took this to mean that I would be promoted to Dean of Arts or something equivalent. Nothing was ever done. I can only conclude that for one reason or another Msgr. Duffie does not want my promotion. I would not be surprised if some of the lay people on the faculty are eyeing the job for themselves.

St. Thomas University is very much a one-man show. Until a year ago there was no Bursar, there is no Dean of Arts, there is no Dean of Women (the present incumbent is a young student working on her BA.). It is frustrating working in a system where lines of authority are not clearly drawn and where one man does nearly everything. One result is that some necessary things, like planning, never get done. Another is that there is no sense of accomplishment. No sense of being on a team working together for clearly defined goals.

That meeting we had yesterday afternoon [referring to an executive meeting concerning students' demands for visiting rights in the residences] was typical of how Msgr. Duffie works. He did not speak. He didn't open his mind to us on the topic at hand. He didn't even describe

the background of the situation: his meetings with students last year, and this about open rooms, [or] his discussions with SRC. He didn't attempt to share knowledge. In the past he has always solved problems with students alone. I hear that the present problem has been solved, but I don't really know how and I probably never will know.

In sum, I find Msgr. Duffie a difficult man to work with, and I suspect he finds me the same. This is an additional reason for seeking other work.

Feet of Clay: IV. Students

Three weeks later, on Saturday, October 17, 1970, at 10:30 a.m., the bishop called to order a board meeting in the faculty lounge on the second floor of the Academic Building. After dealing with normal business, including approval of the graduation list of sixty-six names, MacNeil reviewed briefly "the crisis situation" that occurred on September 28, to which Martin referred in the letter quoted above. The issue concerned allowing members of the opposite sex to visit student rooms in the residences. Some students had proposed taking over the administration of the residences of the university and declaring a policy of "open rooms." The president responded by calling a meeting that afternoon consisting of himself, the bishop, "administrative personnel," and some "senior faculty members," and yet, as Martin pointed out, Duffie did not handle the matter with suitable transparency. By way of admonishing him, MacNeil now asked the board to agree that "there be encouraged open dialogue with the students and with their elected representatives, and that the existence of a good faculty-student committee, which would spend time exploring all the aspects of this question, would be invaluable in this situation."

The board agreed. It also agreed with the bishop's suggestion that a joint committee of faculty and students be formed "to study the aims of the University." The new chancellor was obviously anxious to sort things out at his university. He could not have known how dramatically, thanks to his benevolent but persistent intervention, the situation at St. Thomas would evolve over the next few years.

A Personal Structure

Duffie was not entirely satisfied with the way he had allowed the university's academic departments to take shape. In Chatham, faculty taught disciplinary subjects but there were no departments. Henry McGrath taught chemistry, but he also taught religion and education. In 1953, George Martin taught French; now, in 1970, he was teaching a course in linguistics for the English department. Starting with philosophy in 1964, Duffie established a department specifically for the Holy Cross Father, Brien Waugh. In 1966, he brought in Dick Kennedy to establish a department of English and Noël Kinsella to do the same for psychology. But these were personal domains, so to speak. Many professors remained outside "departments": Win Poole taught mathematics; Oscar Pudymaitis, political science; Vince Donovan, classics; Harry Rigby, Latin; Roger Belanger, Spanish; Ted Daigle, French. In 1965, Ed Casey was asked to teach sociology. The next year he was asked to head a department of sociology, and later still to gather together into his "department" other social sciences: economics, political science, and anthropology. When Duffie appointed Bill Spray "acting head" of history, it was a personal appointment to take over from the "acting head of History and Political Science" and to form a dedicated department of history. In his first few years of building the new St. Thomas University, Duffie of necessity put individuals first and worried about structure later as it became necessary to be (or to appear) "organized." Departments grew organically rather than according to any preconceived plan.

Thus at the same October 17, 1970, board meeting, in an attempt to organize the administration of academic affairs, the board at Duffie's suggestion officially recognized six academic departments. Yet it still preserved the old notion of personal direction. In its ruling it did not recognize them as departments per se, but as groups of like-minded professors "headed" by individuals. Ed Casey was recognized as "head" of the social sciences department. Similarly, Dick Kennedy, Lou Kingston, Noël

Kinsella, Brien Waugh, and Bill Spray were “heads” of, respectively, English, theology, psychology, philosophy, and history. The issue would reappear a few years later in the context of faculty unionization: was a department head an authorized manager with authoritarian power (and therefore to be excluded from the proposed faculty labour union), or a “chairman,” first among equals, *primus inter pares*? Were faculty members part of a hierarchical structure or of a flat one? Modern university professors do not have “bosses” for their instructional activity in the classroom or in their research. Should they have bosses for the management of their academic affairs, to tell them which courses to teach, whether and when to take sabbaticals, when to show up for work each day? These were serious wrinkles that would have to be ironed out if St. Thomas was to call itself modern. For the moment, the board was content to recognize and “regularize” the personal structure of the administration of academic affairs, even if the present arrangement left many faculty members outside a department. Depersonalizing and institutionalizing the academic structure would come later.

The board turned to the apparently more tractable issue of the drafting of a new constitution. As we have seen, Duffie had been instructed to begin work on such a draft. He now reported that he hoped to have something for the board regarding regulations for faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure. He drafted a proposal as long ago as the previous February 16, but the faculty and the senate still had not finished with the document so he had nothing to present. The board, evidently exasperated by Duffie’s unwillingness to move, passed a motion that the board’s executive committee study the current “Senate Regulations on Appointments, Dismissal, Tenure and Promotion” and report back by June 30.

Death of Fr. Harrington

Later in the fall of 1970, the St. Thomas community grieved the death of Fr. George Harrington. Born in Loggieville in 1906, ordained in 1931, earning an MA in sociology from the Catholic University of

America in 1936, Fr. Harrington taught courses in sociology (as well as in religion and philosophy) at St. Thomas in Chatham. In 1961 a stroke limited him to part-time teaching. He had been the university's registrar and dean of studies in 1945, its vice-rector from 1958 to 1961, and officially its vice-president since 1962, although in practice it was an honorary position. He was awarded an honorary LLD in 1964, and continued to offer one course in sociology until 1966, when he turned the subject over to Ed Casey and stopped teaching altogether. In that year he became St. Thomas's first professor emeritus. It would be thirty-two years before the second such title would be awarded, to retiring professor Leo Ferrari.) Since coming to Fredericton, he lived in a suite in the men's residence, where he was much visited by the students. Immediately after his death, George Smith, proctor of the men's residence, wrote the board of governors requesting that their residence be named in his honour: "The students have come to know and love Fr. Harrington and we want him to be remembered and extended the honor he deserves." The board's executive committee accepted the request at a meeting on December 17, 1970, recommending that the residence be officially renamed Harrington Hall. To some it was reminder of St. Thomas's Chatham legacy; to others it was simply a recognition of a kindly academic and spiritual mentor.

New Administrators

The Chatham legacy was growing ever thinner. Toward the end of 1970, as we saw from his letter to the bishop, Martin was considering leaving his position as registrar. The bishop appreciated Martin's abilities and common sense and did not wish to lose him. He wrote Martin to say that instead of reassigning him to parish work he had decided to appoint him "Executive Vice-President and Registrar" and that he was authorized to hire an assistant registrar.

As luck would have it, shortly thereafter Martin received a letter from a former student, Larry Batt, asking for advice. Batt graduated from St. Thomas High School in 1965 in Chatham (where his

father was in the Canadian Air Force), attended St. Thomas in Fredericton, where he was editor of *The Aquinian*, and graduated in 1969 as valedictorian of his class. He had gone on to study English literature with a Canada Council grant in the graduate program at Dalhousie University in Halifax. Now, in January 1970, he was working on his MA thesis. His quandary was whether or not to continue on for a PhD. Like many others, as an undergraduate Batt had come to know and admire the wise and approachable Martin. He told his mentor now that he wanted to work in a university context but not necessarily teach in one, and he knew that a PhD really prepared one only for teaching. What did Martin advise?

Instead of replying by letter, Martin got in his car and drove to Halifax. He advised Batt to give up his PhD plans and come back to St. Thomas to be assistant registrar, at a yearly salary of \$7,500. Batt accepted the offer. He finished his MA and in July 1971 arrived at St. Thomas, where he remained to become one of the university's longest-serving employees with over forty years of service. When Martin became president in 1975, Batt became registrar. Over his career, Batt took exceptional care of the university's internal clockwork—advising and registering students, scheduling classes and exams, arranging classrooms, keeping minutes for senate and general faculty, organizing recruitment drives around the province, and all the myriad other things a registrar must do to keep a university running smoothly through good times and bad—even putting up with practical jokes played on him by faculty from time to time, all with characteristic patience and aplomb.

“New Young Profs”

About this time, early in 1971, Martin received a letter from Oleh Pidhainy, whom as we saw Duffie had sent packing a few years earlier in a dispute over ordering books for the library. Since leaving St. Thomas, Pidhainy had been teaching history at Auburn University in Alabama, but was unhappy there and wanted to return to Canada, if possible to St. Thomas. His disagreement had been with Duffie, not

Martin, whom he liked and respected. Martin, knowing that the position in Russian history had recently been filled with a permanent appointment, wrote back to say he was sorry to say that nothing was available. With considerable insight, he went on to tell Pidhainy about the stress he was feeling at St.

Thomas at the present moment:

Enrolment is going down. It has been a hard year and I shall be happy to see the end of it. Part of the difficulty is that we have too great a preponderance of new young profs who think they know everything there is to know about running a university. They are inclined not to respect the traditions of the past, mostly because they are ignorant of them and they frequently don't belong to the tradition which is ours.

These "new young profs" who were so bothersome and perplexing to Martin, precisely because they had little appreciation for St. Thomas's traditions, were pressuring the board and its new chancellor to take their views into account and, in turn, to force the president to change the way things were run. Since the fall of 1969 they had been requesting representation on the board. As new faces appeared on the board—most significantly that of the chancellor himself—and older ones disappeared, their requests would finally be recognized. At the spring meeting on May 17, 1971, Msgr. Boyd was dropped from the board and two new members added: Paul Levesque and Philip Oland, both successful New Brunswick businessmen. The two henceforth played an active role in the operations of the board and proved to be sympathetic to the various demands, especially those from the faculty, to modernize the university's structure. At its spring meeting a year later, on May 15, 1972, the board considered a motion to accept as members two faculty representatives "to begin serving in October 1972." Duffie objected. To his extreme annoyance he was overruled, although the board did agree to a rider that any faculty representative had to have taught at St. Thomas for at least five years.

It was not an auspicious development for Duffie, now coming under increasing pressure at all levels within the university. His erstwhile supporters outside the university had publicly lent their weight to the relocation of St. Thomas to Fredericton, but organizing its administration was a different matter. Besides, he was losing those supporters one after the other. Leverman had resigned as bishop in

1968 because of illness. Duffie's brother Bill was no longer a minister in the government. In 1968 John Deutsch became president of Queen's University, where he had established an elaborate "tri-cameral governance structure" for that rapidly expanding institution, one far more responsive and responsible than anything at St. Thomas, so he had no time for Duffie's current problems. In 1969 Mackay retired from the presidency of UNB. Judge Ritchie had retired from the bench. Bob Love of the education department at UNB had been another of Duffie's supporters, as the following letter attests, but he too had recently retired, writing as follows to Duffie on August 11, 1972:

I have found that working with you has been a pleasure. Your even temperament and fairness have always impressed me and I had some hopes that you might take over this place. I guess age makes one a bit wise, but also maybe stupid in some ways. I find it difficult to agree with decisions being made here and am quite happy to be leaving and I am sure there are some quite happy to see me go.

I hope I will continue to see you on occasions and wish you the best of luck and good fortune in your work....As you probably know, I was one of the strong advocates of moving St. Thomas's here. I sometimes tell the Arts faculty that the daughter is eating the mother.

One has to wonder what Love meant by "you might take over this place." It stretches credulity to suppose he thought Duffie might have become president of UNB after Mackay. His impression of Duffie's "fairness" exemplified the gap between the view from outside and from inside. In any case, his wishes for "best of luck and good fortune" were out of tune with the times. Duffie's star was fading.

On September 29, 1972, the morning after a meeting of the board's executive committee, Martin sent Bishop MacNeil some "observations" about the matters discussed the night before. He admitted that his observations were "not refined" and "might raise more questions than answers," but he hoped that they might at least "serve as a basis for discussion," either between the bishop and himself, or between the bishop and the other members of the board. "The greatest problem facing the university," he wrote,

is that of inadequate administration. This is the cause for the question of salary raises being thrust upon the Board of Governors, and for FAUST [the Faculty Association] taking the initiative in planning administrative reforms and seeking and/or demanding structure where none exist....There is not a good spirit existing between the President and the faculty. In fact it

can be seriously questioned whether or not the President maintains his constituency within the university.

Martin listed specific signs that the president had lost faculty support: (1) his failure to deal with a serious problem in the English department (he was referring to complaints that students had voiced over the unprofessional behaviour of a particular professor); (2) “the contempt shown by the students” over the issue of open rooms, “and this by the female students, where his student support is strongest”; (3) the faculty’s frustration in attempting to deal with him; (4) the fact that one particular department head “in whose knowledge of academic affairs the President had inordinate confidence until he fell flat on his face, is no longer an ally”; and (5) “the fact that everybody seems to be pinning the blame on the president for all our problems.”

On the positive side, Martin told the bishop he was pleased to learn that

so many priests found satisfaction in the fact that they were able to help many students who would not have been helped were not St. Thomas here. I appreciate Msgr. Duffie’s wise observation that each priest’s personality and life-style are different and attract different people.

He added, however, that

this good-feeling aura arose from the pastoral role that the priests are filling. While this is an important role, it is not the primary one. The real role of the institution is an educative role. And when the question of the purpose of our existence is raised we must look to our role as educators to find justification for existence. With Fr. Waugh, I tend to locate it in the fact that we work out of a distinct Catholic tradition that does say something about the reality of human existence and does not limit reality to the material. And while Msgr. Duffie may be right in saying that after all the talks and discussions carried on at the highest level nobody can define a Catholic education, that fact may not be used as a reason for not grappling with the problem and not trying to create a kind of Catholic University at St. Thomas.

With his usual perspicacity, Martin put his finger on the reasons for Duffie’s gradual loss of authority. His support on the board continued to wane. At its next meeting on October 21, 1972, the board accepted the resignation of Henry Ryan, who had been appointed to the bench. Both Boyd and Ryan, as we saw, were strong Duffie supporters. And four more members, not Duffie’s nominations, were elected to the board to take their seats in the spring of 1973: Franklin Leger, of Saint John; Mrs.

Frank Hay, of Bathurst, the first woman to serve on the board; Gerald Gaudet, of Moncton; and Harold Stafford, of Saint John. The board's powerful executive committee also received three new members: Philip Oland, Frank Lenihan, and the recently appointed Leger. The faculty meanwhile elected two representatives to serve staggered two-year terms: for a two-year term, Win Poole (who now asked to be called Dr. Poole instead of Fr. Poole, a result of his decision to leave the priesthood, itself partly a result of his unhappiness with the direction the Church was taking following Vatican II), and Fr. Brien Waugh for a one-year term. Duffie would not have listed either of these two outspoken and widely respected men, particularly Poole, among his fondest supporters. He must have known the sort of opposition that was in store for him. He got wind of a move among faculty to ask for an increase in representation on the board from two to three. In a desperate effort to prevent it, immediately after the bishop welcomed the new members to the board, he moved "that the two [faculty] nominees be the full representation of the faculty on the Board in accordance with the decision made at the Board meeting of May 15, 1972."

Fred Roderick, another of Duffie's earlier appointees, seconded the motion. During discussion of the motion, however, Poole read a letter from the faculty requesting that they be able to elect three members. It became apparent that Duffie knew about the request beforehand and made his motion precisely to prevent increasing faculty representation. Such a procedure was typical of Duffie's style, and the board members were not impressed. "A lengthy discussion ensued," during which Duffie argued that two faculty members "on a comparatively small Board" and from a "fairly small faculty" constituted reasonable representation "in line with that of most Canadian universities," but his arguments fell on deaf ears. Following Bishop MacNeil's lead, the board decided that the matter of faculty representation "was not necessarily closed and that it could be brought up at a later date." Duffie had no choice but to withdraw his motion.

Poole also announced that the faculty were opposed to the board's requirement that faculty

members had to have been teaching at St. Thomas a minimum of five years. They proposed a minimum eligibility of two years. Again Duffie spoke against the proposal:

The people who have been here only two years are not as well qualified to interpret the spirit and traditions of the institution as those with the longer experience.... The five-year requirement is more in keeping with the practice and experience of Canadian universities generally, and... that with a young faculty such as ours the number of people eligible will be increasing year by year.

Here the board agreed with Duffie; the minimum of five years' eligibility was maintained. Paul Levesque and Judge Creaghan moved that the board "accept in principle the seating of one student representative on the Board and that we leave the details to the Executive Committee of the Board."

The motion carried, again over Duffie's nay vote. He was further displeased by another decision at that meeting that also promised to limit his freedom of action. It was determined that the senate's Academic and Campus Planning Committee had to be consulted before any decision could be made to discontinue or curtail courses or programs, or to terminate faculty appointments—decisions that in any event had to be approved by the board itself.

"An Atmosphere of Hostility and Confrontation"

Shortly after the board meeting and following a meeting of the executive committee on November 9, Martin sent MacNeil another "unrefined" document for discussion that he hoped might "clarify thought." His perspective appears to have shifted from the personal to the institutional, from the inadequacy of Duffie's administration to the threat his inadequacy now posed to the integrity of the structure of the university. He wrote:

FAUST [the Faculty Association] is spearheading a movement to force the administration to reform itself by creating new structures; e.g., seeking appointment of a Dean of Arts, appointment of an Academic Vice-President, appointment of a Budget Committee, appointment of a Salary Committee, review of department chairmen, review of the Academic Senate, review of the Board of Governors, review of the university act, and review of the terms and conditions of employment.

Evaluation: In this drive for reform FAUST is bypassing the administration and appealing

directly to the Board of Governors, involving them in decisions which are largely administrative in nature. There is an emotional overtone in many of their communications. They not only make requests of the Board but demand to be given reasons for Board decisions. They are pressing for a detailed financial statement, for information on salaries of each professor, as a matter of right. In a sense it seems that they want to run the university. Or at least they seem to see themselves as equal partners with administration in making decisions.

Response: The principle must be clearly established that the Board of Governors are the legal owners of the university and the final authority in the institution. It must be equally well understood by the whole university that it is the Administration that runs the university. The President of the university is the chief administrative officer. The Board is not equipped to deal with all the demands that FAUST has been making: they don't have the time, they don't have specific university experience. The demands concern day-to-day details of salaries, working conditions, etc. The Board's concern is with broad policy, while [it] has great power through the President and other administrators who act in its name.

Their argument as to why they have to take these matters to the Board would be [that] the administration does not want to be reformed, therefore the only way for [them] to accomplish anything is to appeal to the higher authority. It's not only the administration that they wish to reform, it's the whole university structure, including Senate and Board. By the nature of things, faculty concern is primarily with teaching and the quality of intellectual achievement. It seems this faculty wants to do the work of the administration. I wonder if they are using the same energy, zeal [and] strict standards in evaluating their own function as they are using on administration.

A week later, Martin followed up his earlier "discussion document" to the bishop with a further comment about the faculty and FAUST:

It seems that the democratization of the University is the real problem and it is aggravated by two major influences, (a) the attitude of the faculty as expressed in the activity of FAUST and (b) the attitude of the President as expressed in his frequent remark: "It won't be done while I'm president. I'll resign first."

FAUST is impatient, hyper-active; it may be naive in the way it pursues its demands and in the nature of the demands it makes. It may well be demanding more power in the decision-making process than it can possibly hope to have, but someone has to make a case against their demands, has to take them one-by-one and refute, temper, or rephrase them in terms that are acceptable. It is not enough simply to say No. If FAUST is ignorant of the way faculty should act, someone who knows has to educate them. And one of the problems is that nobody at St. Thomas seems to know. We have no history (therefore no experience) of shared power.

One must admit that the University is not well organized. There are many reasons for this including its rapid growth, its history of one-man rule, the personality of the President, who does not easily delegate authority. It would be less than candid to deny that the President is a large part of the problem. (The Vice-President may be a large part of the problem too, but one would have to seek information about that particular situation from a source other than this one.) For that reason alone it is not going to be easy to meet the challenge of FAUST.

Perhaps the best we can do is to agree that some new structures are required and to insist changes will be made but that they cannot be made hastily nor in an atmosphere of hostility and confrontation.

It was not a comfortable situation, and Martin was coming to realize that he was caught in the middle. The winter of 1972–73 saw historically heavy snowfalls. The weather seemed to portend the very atmosphere of hostility and confrontation at St. Thomas that Martin was sensing.

Search for Responsible Governance

The board's annual meeting on May 13, 1973, proved to be rancorous. There was no prepared financial statement. When asked to explain, Duffie replied that year-end financial statements through 1970 were available at the Harriet Irving Library. Most board members found that unacceptable, and passed this motion: "That the Board be provided with a copy of the summary financial statement for the last year for which one is available, then the current one, [as well as] the projected budget for the year to come." Then the chair of the board's Salary Committee reported that he had a positive meeting with the faculty association discussing salary negotiations. Duffie reacted vehemently. He was not happy with what was going on and warned the meeting of "the libelous implications of recent FAUST statements." The faculty representative Brien Waugh asked to read a letter to the board from FAUST. Duffie argued against it. That prompted Waugh to make a statement in which "he decried the lack of cooperation of the Board in its dealings with FAUST." He then moved:

That the board appoint a committee of two members of the board, Harold Stafford and Paul Levesque, to consider procedures for arriving at salary arrangements with the academic staff, including the procedures in effect at the University of Moncton, and recommend a procedure for St. Thomas University to the next general meeting of the board.

After lengthy debate, the motion was defeated. Instead, the board decided to add three more members to its Salary Committee.

Waugh once more introduced a motion to increase the number of faculty representatives on the board from two to three, which caused another "heated discussion" and ended in the motion being tabled. The board turned its attention to "the conflict existing between the administration and FAUST-

CAUT.” (FAUST is the faculty association at St. Thomas; the Canadian Association of University Teachers is the national umbrella organization.) Discussion focused on “the need for some kind of agency to bring about better relations between administration and faculty.” The board decided that “a small committee be struck by the Chairman to study the situation and report back to the Board.”

Discussion by this time had gone on for so long that the bishop called for adjournment. The following day, May 14, the board reconvened to discuss several more serious issues. The first was honorary degrees. Many faculty members had been opposed to Duffie’s decision to award an honorary degree to Dr. Laurie Cragg, president of Mount Allison University. The specific objection was that Mount A was presently under censure by CAUT. The general objection was that Duffie had made the decision by himself without consulting the board. The board then passed a motion that “the recipients of honorary degrees, as already disclosed by name in the media” would be approved to avoid any public embarrassment, but that in future, awards of honorary degrees must be approved by the board. Discussion then turned to “the Catholic character of the university,” and the funding that the university was receiving beyond the grant from the MPHEC (Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission) and student fees, although no specific recommendations arose from either discussion.

As evidenced by the board’s marathon May session, the winds were not blowing Duffie’s way. At the next meeting of the executive committee, on June 7, 1973, MacNeil opened with a list of what needed immediate attention: “Regular executive meetings, clarification of the responsibilities of the executive, malaise at St. Thomas, [and] administrative structures.” Consequently, the now-six-person executive committee, composed of Chancellor MacNeil, President Duffie, Executive Vice-President (and Secretary) Martin, Franklin Leger, Judge Creaghan, and Philip Oland, would meet “at least once a month for ten months of the year.” The full board would meet “at least twice a year, probably fall and spring convocation times.” It was also agreed “in principle” that the board would have standing committees which

would gradually gain expertise in specific areas of university affairs and would be able to make a valuable contribution to Board deliberations. Such committees will be encouraged to make interim reports to the executive committee, which in turn will pass on information by making minutes of the executive meetings available to all Board members.

The explicit aim was to ensure that board members would not come to meetings uninformed about the issues under consideration, “as happened at the last Board meeting,” noted the minutes wryly. The Salary and the Bylaws Committees in particular were directed to make interim reports to the executive committee.

Duffie was asked about the financial statement, which had been requested at the committee’s May 3 meeting. Duffie responded “that a summary financial statement would be ready by early August,” whereupon the board passed a motion establishing a Finance Committee. Members inquired about the committee the chair had set up in order to study “the conflict situation reported to exist at St. Thomas University.” Martin expressed deep concerns about the struggle taking place between the faculty and the president as evidenced at the last board meeting. Faculty wanted more say in what was going on and the president appeared unwilling to give in to their demands, but the committee was not ready to address these concerns. Further discussion was put off to the next meeting of the executive.

His Own Worst Enemy

As Martin understood, the faculty had lost patience with Duffie for trying to control virtually everything at the university and rarely consulting anyone, even his vice-president. In spite of preliminary talks with the board’s Salary Committee, there was still no standard salary scale and no formal process for conducting discussions. Faculty members were paid whatever Duffie decided, and it did not appear to be based on qualifications or experience, but rather on how well the president got along with the department head. Some faculty members were allowed to join the university pension plan, others were not aware it existed. A faculty member wishing to attend a conference or do research

had to apply directly to the president. The president made the decisions as to who got sabbatical leaves and when. There was no committee to determine the merits of the applications. Even minor details like approval for library book orders went through the president.

Duffie did not seem to understand that peremptory commands to faculty only raised hackles.

For example, on April 4, 1973, he had informed each department head:

It is very definitely an obligation of your professors to be at graduation. I shall take into account the 1972–73 performance in any 1973–74 contracts, promotions or salaries. If there is a legitimate exception, I expect a request for the same.

The same day he wrote Dick Kennedy, head of the English department, the following note: “I cannot say anything about sabbaticals now. They are hanging fire. Sabbaticals are not a right and there are priorities as well as finance.” Little wonder the faculty transformed their professional association, FAUST, into a vehicle to carry their complaints. Little wonder those complaints became exaggerated, as Martin observed, as a direct result of Duffie’s intransigence.

Two days after the May 1973 board meeting, on May 16, Martin wrote MacNeil to share another observation:

One dimension of the conflict that wasn’t so apparent to me in November [when Martin wrote his two discussion documents for the bishop] is this: the conflict is now not only between the President and FAUST but between the President and FAUST-CAUT. FAUST has involved CAUT in the problem on so many instances that even were there a new president and harmony were established between the new president and the local faculty association, there would still be this irritant occasioned by this outside influence. I write this simply to point out the further dimension of the problem as I see it. I may have other observations later.

FAUST and CAUT

Martin was right to be apprehensive about the influence CAUT wielded among the members of FAUST. In 1969, the St. Thomas faculty formed a faculty association, whimsically taking the acronym of FAUST: Faculty Association of the University of St. Thomas. It adopted a constitution and elected an executive. Duffie was not overjoyed at the birth of FAUST, but there was little he could do about it.

Faculty at UNB founded a similar association in 1956, AUNBT, and at this moment it was engaged in a battle with the UNB administration over its treatment of a radical professor named Norman Strax (what the papers were calling the “Strax-Mackay Affair”). Shortly after its founding, FAUST, following AUNBT’s lead, joined CAUT, the national umbrella organization for faculty associations, founded in 1951 with the specific aim of defending academic freedom. CAUT encouraged member associations to bargain with university administrations collectively to establish proper conditions of employment. CAUT offered advice and even legal assistance.

The influence of CAUT, stiffening FAUST’s resolve, grew stronger throughout 1973. The board was faced with a further complication. On July 2, it was announced that the university’s chancellor, Bishop MacNeil, had been appointed Archbishop of Edmonton. The executive committee met on July 9 at the bishop’s office in Saint John to congratulate him and say goodbye. It must have been a sobering moment for the board members, at least all those except Duffie, who no doubt was somewhat pleased by the turn of events. The committee had to agree that, until Saint John had a new bishop and St. Thomas a new chancellor, Duffie as vice-chair would preside at its meetings as well as at those of the board’s executive committee.

The Conflict Situation

The committee made one last request of MacNeil: to ask Judge Creaghan to be a one-man Study Committee in compliance with the motion made at their last meeting “to study the [conflict] situation and report back.” Meanwhile, the committee was determined to find solutions to some of the issues that were causing trouble. Its Salary Committee proposed the adoption of minimum salaries for each faculty rank, which was accepted. Duffie was directed to bring back specific recommendations for sabbatical leaves. Finally, the committee addressed the possibility of expanding academic programs. Oland suggested that they “might keep in mind the possibility of degree programs in library science and social

work, areas that seem to be largely unoccupied, and where costly equipment would not be required.”

A week later, on July 16, Archbishop MacNeil informed the executive that Creaghan agreed to “study the situation at STU,” but would not be able to do so until August 22, when he returned from taking a French Language Immersion Course in Quebec. MacNeil thanked Creaghan for taking on “this important and very delicate task”:

As I see the task, it is one of listening to various people belonging to the University community. Hopefully, through that process, you will help these people understand the situation better. Finally, we would expect you to offer some useful information to the Board at the Fall Meeting. I would not see that as a formal hearing procedure with written briefs and rebuttals. It could be a fairly quick procedure [taking] no more than a week. You could use the assistance of some resource people. Also, you may wish to associate one or two people with you during the listening sessions. Later, at a meeting of the Executive of the Board, the exact terms of reference could be clarified. You would be expected to attend the next meeting of the executive which would be scheduled following your return.

The executive committee met next, without MacNeil, on August 8, 1973. Because a new bishop had not been appointed—indeed, that would not occur until the following April—the executive committee decided, as a means of maintaining contact with the diocesan office, to invite its vicar capitular, Fr. Arthur Gilbert, to join both the board and the executive committee. Duffie had promised to present his summary financial statement at that meeting, but now informed them it would not be ready until September.

The executive committee turned its attention to preparing a background paper for Creaghan. The purpose of the Creaghan committee was “to find out for the Board of Governors the extent of Faculty dissatisfaction which is alleged to exist at St. Thomas University, and evidence of whose existence was revealed at the May 13 meeting of the Board.” Its first task was

to define the situation, attempting to discover its limits [but] quietly and with a low profile so that it does not add fuel to the problem being studied. It must be especially careful not to give even the impression that it is a committee to investigate the conduct of the office of the president as it is carried out by the present incumbent.

Its second task was “to assess the conflict situation. Is the situation normal for a university in 1973? If

the situation is serious, what solutions suggest themselves?" It should conduct its investigation only through informal meetings with individuals, avoiding meeting with the entire faculty or large faculty groups. It should "maintain the informality of the investigation" by not calling for or accepting written briefs; and it should make either a verbal or a brief written report to the full board.

The executive committee met again on October 9. Fr. Gilbert attended, having been invited "as an interested party." A formal motion was made to recommend that he be made a member of the board and its executive committee. Then the members got down to work. First was a recommendation from senate that March break, which at present was only three days, Wednesday to Friday, be extended to the entire week. The students were taking off the whole week anyway, and faculty were tired of having to teach to empty classrooms. In an apparent effort to show a new sensitivity to faculty concerns, the members accepted the recommendation, which was to take effect the coming spring. Along the same lines, remembering the heated discussion at the board meeting the previous spring, the members of the executive decided that henceforth a Committee on Honorary Degrees consisting of the president and three members of the board would approve the honorary degrees. Another significant change was that the executive committee of the board, not the president, would set the agenda for board meetings.

The next item was less easy to resolve, reflecting the simmering controversy over the idea of collective bargaining by the faculty. Duffie was adamantly opposed. He told the members that St. Thomas was not alone. "Other Canadian and Maritime presidents are taking a stand against voluntary acceptance of the collective bargaining process in regard to faculty," he informed them; he was not willing to deal with them. It was a slippery slope leading to unionization, and a union was the last thing the university wanted. He argued that the university should take legal steps to prevent any such development. The members of the executive committee, no doubt frightened by Duffie's dire warnings, at least for the moment accepted his argument and instructed him to contact the university's lawyers if he thought it necessary.

The fall meeting of the full board took place October 20, 1973. Duffie opened the meeting as chair, as a new bishop had still not been appointed. Gilbert was welcomed as a new member of the board and was appointed, as proposed, also to the executive committee. After approval of the decisions taken by the executive committee since the last meeting, the board turned to the other items on the agenda.

The faculty were still unhappy about the fact that they had only two representatives on the board—Win Poole and the recently appointed Ed Casey—instead of three. Poole argued for changes in the regulations to “take into account the dissatisfaction existing among faculty with these regulations.” He also reminded the board that its bylaws referred to three-year terms for board members, yet the present terms for faculty members were only two years and for the student member one year. This needed to be looked at. The board took no action at the moment and Poole did not press the matter, as the next item on the agenda was far more contentious: the issue of accreditation by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). The faculty association was pressuring Duffie to apply for membership on behalf of the university. So far he had refused, no doubt knowing that accreditation by that national body would involve examination of the university’s management and of its books. The board decided to postpone consideration of AUCC membership.

In other business, Duffie gave a verbal report of the university’s submission to the provincial higher education commission (NBHEC) for 1973, which he concluded by repeating that commission’s warning of an imminent and drastic drop in postsecondary enrolment across the province over the next three years. His remarks elicited a note of panic among board members—which may have been Duffie’s intention in order to head off discussion of faculty complaints. Some members suggested that if enrolment declined too much the university might be forced to shut down. Philip Oland more coolly repeated what he had suggested at the executive committee meeting earlier in July, that St. Thomas should look into instituting new undergraduate programs in order to attract more students. He

suggested some possibilities: a first degree in social work, a degree in library science, an adult-education teacher training program, or even a certificate program in secretarial arts. To the objection that the Deutsch agreement (in fact the Duffie-Mackay affiliation agreement) limited the number of programs St. Thomas was allowed to offer on the UNB campus, Oland suggested “that we go to the NBHEC and renegotiate in this area.” The board agreed that the issue of student recruitment should be the priority of a new Joint Board-Senate Committee to Study the Growth and Future of the University consisting of three members from each body. Duffie, Oland, and Poole were nominated to represent the board, and the senate was asked to nominate their representatives “without delay.”

The senate did elect its three representatives at a meeting on October 30, but the committee apparently did not meet. Instead, the board’s executive committee, at a meeting on January 26, 1974, recommended that the board approve an expenditure of “up to \$5,000” for “promotion (advertising) purposes.” It also agreed to pursue Oland’s suggestion of negotiation with the MPHEC in order to develop a social work program as a way of improving undergraduate enrolment.

Death of Fr. Casey

In the middle of the institutional crisis, on February 18, 1974, the university lost one of its most popular professors, Fr. Edmund Casey. He died of a stroke in the middle of a game of racquetball, a horrifying experience for his opponent and colleague, Fr. John Jennings. Casey’s death severed another link with Chatham. He taught at the high school 1953–58, and at the university in Chatham 1959–62. Then he went to St. Louis University to get his PhD in sociology, returning to teach in Fredericton, 1966–74. As we have seen, in the fall of 1967 he chaired the Committee on the Future. As head of a department in 1968, he was a founding member of the academic senate. Most recently he was elected to represent faculty on the board. The faculty at a general meeting and the senate at its next meeting recommended that the campus’s most recent (and, as it turned out, the last) Larson building be named in his memory,

a recommendation endorsed by the board's executive committee. At its spring meeting on May 12, the board concurred, and what had until now been simply the Academic Building became Edmund Casey Hall. At the board meeting, Martin read a tribute describing Casey as

not only an excellent teacher but someone who also gave freely of his time and energy to young people who flocked to him for counselling and help. His students, his colleagues, and his friends will remember him as a priest and teacher of humanity, warmth, and wit.

More FAUST Demands

The grieving for Casey could only be a brief distraction from the gathering storm clouds. The machinery had started up that would end in the certification of FAUST as a union. At the time, in early 1974, some member associations in other provinces were certified, but none in the Maritimes. FAUST would earn the distinction of being the first, although after its eventual certification in 1976 by the provincial Labour Relations Board, faculty associations at the other Maritime universities, including UNB in 1979, followed suit.

At the moment, the FAUST membership—which included all full-time faculty members—had elected a Collective Bargaining Committee (CBC) with Alan Mason, an outspoken anthropology professor, as its chair. In a last-ditch effort to avert unionization and to negotiate a written agreement over terms and conditions of appointment, the CBC approached Duffie to discuss the possibility of the university agreeing to voluntary recognition of FAUST as the bargaining agent for all faculty. Duffie gave the CBC a frosty reception. He would not accept FAUST as the bargaining agent; he simply refused to negotiate.

As Martin observed, Duffie's obstinate refusal led FAUST to approach the board directly, bypassing the administration, and forcing the board to deal with narrow issues of governance instead of broader issues of policy. Having got nowhere with Duffie, Mason asked to meet with the board to discuss the voluntary recognition of FAUST as bargaining agent. Mason indicated the offer was good

only until July 10, 1974.

New Chancellor for St. Thomas

On June 19, 1974, Fr. Arthur Gilbert—previously, as we saw, vicar capitular for the Saint John diocese—was ordained bishop. On June 25, the board’s executive committee welcomed him as the new chancellor, replacing Duffie as its chair. Fortunately, Gilbert had been attending board and executive committee meetings since October, so he had some awareness of the situation. According to all who knew him, he was a kind and gentle man who did not seek the spotlight. He landed in his new position at St. Thomas in the midst of considerable turmoil, but he exercised his authority as chancellor wisely. At the meeting on June 25, the executive discussed sabbatical leaves and the way they had been handled (or mishandled) by Duffie. The discussion concluded with a motion that the board’s secretary (Martin) gather other universities’ sabbatical policies and bring the information back to next meeting in July. As for FAUST’s ultimatum, nothing was done; the deadline passed without response.

At a meeting on July 23 of the board’s executive committee, Duffie repeated his earlier assertion that the other Canadian and Maritime presidents were opposed to accepting faculty associations in the collective bargaining process. As instructed, he had contacted the university’s lawyers so as to quash the issue. Then the Study Committee (Judge Creaghan) brought forward some specific recommendations. One concerned sabbatical leaves. “With a view to ameliorating some of the provisions of the present policy”—specifically, to make it easier for faculty to plan their sabbatical leaves—the executive committee agreed that henceforth the university’s policy was the following: “Those entitled to sabbatical leave be so advised by the end of September of the previous year, and that the percentage of salary they will receive while on sabbatical also be disclosed at that time.” It was clearly a policy that Duffie could and should have implemented long before.

In a further effort to improve the general atmosphere, the executive committee decided to raise

salaries. A year previously the committee decided, and the board later approved, to establish a minimum salary for each rank. Retroactively, as of July 1 of the present year, the salaries of all faculty would be increased by 5 percent of the minimum salary of their rank. In addition, and based on those new salaries, each faculty member was granted a further 5 percent increase. And in order to settle grievances about salary discrepancies, it was agreed that a committee of department heads, or a senate committee, or a combination of the two, be established “to come up with a formula or suggestion to determine a formula to be used in the future.”

Good gestures but too late, either to save Duffie or to forestall unionization. At the next executive committee meeting on September 24, 1974, Duffie announced that he had been informed that a “three-man committee” from CAUT would be visiting St. Thomas for “an informal discussion” on October 7. The wheels of certification were in motion.

Duffie's Demise

On October 19, 1974, fourteen members attended the fall meeting of the board. It was Bishop Gilbert's first meeting as chair. It turned out to be Duffie's last. The board welcomed its new members, including the Anglican bishop, Harold Nutter, and the new faculty representative replacing Ed Casey, Judy Kennedy.

Early in the meeting, under “business arising,” Kennedy brought up the issue of membership in AUCC, noting that at its last meeting in May the board put off a decision to apply. She described “the history, function, and the status of AUCC in the academic life of Canada, and gave reasons why St. Thomas University should seek ordinary membership in the body.” Duffie, who at the May meeting had argued vociferously against membership, was caught off guard. To gain time, he argued that it was not properly “business arising” because the decision then had been merely not to discuss the issue “at present,” so that it would have to be dealt with as “new business” later in the meeting. The meeting

agreed to defer discussion until later in the agenda, which gave Duffie a few moments to prepare a new strategy. When the meeting finally got around to the issue, Duffie was ready with his motion: “That St. Thomas University give high priority to the AUCC.” The board members must have realized that he was attempting to avoid the issue, for no one seconded the motion. Instead, Kennedy proposed a new motion: “That the Board approve in principle our seeking membership in AUCC and that the matter be pursued by the Executive Committee in the appropriate manner and at the appropriate time.” Her motion was duly seconded, and she repeated her earlier arguments in favour of seeking accreditation. Duffie argued against it. He “described some of the complex issues involved in attaining membership in AUCC” and “warned of the possible consequences should an unsuccessful application be made.” He was concerned that the AUCC would “not be impressed by some of the procedures and administrative structures of St. Thomas.” For its part, the board was not impressed by his arguments. The discussion brought out that it was precisely those inadequate procedures and structures that the faculty and some administrators were trying to change. The motion passed, and Duffie’s fate—he had threatened to resign over the issue—was sealed.

At the next meeting of the board’s executive committee, November 25, 1974, Duffie presented the financial statement for the previous academic year. It showed a surplus. Duffie suggested that it would be unwise to circulate that information to the full board and therefore the faculty at the present time, “until the application [by FAUST] for certification before the Labour Relations Board is finally disposed of,” as he was sure it would be. Duffie also suggested that the executive should not act just yet on the proposed application for membership in AUCC. The other members of the committee, however, had enough of Duffie’s tactics. Over his objections, and with the tacit approval of the chair, a motion was passed instructing the president “to prepare and circulate prior to the next meeting of the Executive a summary of the procedure to be followed in seeking admission to AUCC.” The executive also recommended that the university’s Finance Committee hire a qualified public relations officer to deal

with the AUCC application.

Time had run out for Duffie. He had no choice but to offer to resign. He may have hoped his resignation would be refused. If so, he was wrong. Bishop Gilbert, sensing the feeling of the other members, announced that it was “with great regret” that as chancellor of St. Thomas he would accept Duffie’s resignation. It is recorded in the minutes that the bishop “thanked him for his outstanding contribution to St. Thomas University and wished him well in the future.”

Cum Finis Est Licitus, Etiam Media Sunt Licita

The Duffie era had come to a close. It began when Msgr. Donald C. Duffie was brought in by Bishop Alfred Leverman to engineer the institution’s removal from Chatham, a move that had been discussed in many quarters for several years. As instructed, in spite of the brickbats thrown at him, maintaining a steely resolve and using his considerable political skills, Duffie essentially single-handedly prevailed. His methods were sometimes been less than democratic, but, as he might have said, in the real world of politics the end justifies the means, as the Jesuit theologian Hermann Busenbaum expressed it in 1650 when he wrote *cum finis est licitus, etiam media sunt licita*. Or, perhaps, as the American lawyer-poet John Godfrey Saxe expressed it in 1869: “Laws, like sausages, cease to inspire respect in proportion as we know how they are made.”

At any rate, with the battle decided and St. Thomas in its new home, one might have expected Duffie to have relaxed, been magnanimous in victory, softened his interpersonal dealings. But he did not. Sphinx-like, he maintained his inscrutable distance from everyone, holding tight to the reins of authority. In the end, it came down to a clash of attitudes. Duffie wanted the faculty to leave him alone to get on with the business of running the university; the young turks on the faculty—ironically the very ones he recruited—felt that the administration of the university was too important to leave to its president.

Appendices to Chapter 10

Appendix I: The Buildings in Chatham

The government was well aware of the demands for a junior college in Chatham but did not favour the idea. Yet, what to do with the empty buildings on the old St. Thomas campus? It needed to do something fast. Thus, on August 10th, 1965, they set up a special fourteen-member committee, appointed by the Premier “To Determine the Best Use that the Province May Make of the Facilities Purchased from St. Thomas University in Chatham.” The committee included six cabinet members and six high-ranking civil servants. Obviously the government wanted to get rid of the problem as quickly as possible

The first meeting of the committee took place on August 25. The chairman informed the members that the premier:

felt that the ‘Friends of the University St. Thomas’, including Mr Daniel Hurley, should be invited to present their views to this [committee]. Furthermore it was indicated that the committee should hold a meeting in Chatham when other interested people would be able to present their views.

The meeting with the Friends would occur in Fredericton and the public meeting in Chatham, to which various public bodies, such as school boards, town councils, and boards of trade would be invited.

Twelve members of the Friends showed up for their meeting with the committee on September 2, 1965. They suggested such uses for the former St. Thomas buildings as a trade school, a community College, a junior college, a regional library, and a guidance centre. They also suggested that the buildings should be considered “a nucleus of a larger development.” At the committee's next meeting in Chatham a number of submissions repeated the need for a trade and technical college, and a junior college affiliated with a Maritime university. The representatives of the town of Chatham felt that the best needs of the whole Miramichi area would be the establishment of a community college.

In a letter dated November 1 a group calling itself the Miramichi College Committee, chaired by J. P. McCluskey, informed the chairman that they had contacted four universities “with regard to the question of affiliation” and “indications of interest were expressed by the University of Moncton and by St. Francis Xavier University.” Then on November 11th Msgr. M. A. MacLellan, the president of StFX, wrote the Minister of Education that:

according to the communication I have received, an inter-departmental committee of the Government requested the Miramichi Committee to ascertain the views or interests of major institutions in the area. The University Council at St. Francis Xavier has discussed this request and wants to know the views of the New Brunswick government or the Department of Education. Some statement would be helpful to us if we are to give this matter any further consideration since we are aware of the re-organization of higher education that followed the Deutsch Commission recommendations, etc.

At the next meeting of the governmental committee, on November 30th, the minister of Education, Henry Irwin, shot down the notion of a junior college affiliated with a university. He pointed out that the Canadian University Foundation had to approve the facilities of a junior college, no laboratories presently existed in Chatham that were satisfactory even for high school purposes, and no New Brunswick university would affiliate with St. Thomas unless the buildings were brought up to standard. He also told the committee that a special committee would be reporting to the government before the end of 1966 on the five-year programme, and that this report should be considered before

any new colleges were established. Irwin also insisted that the establishment of new junior colleges be part of the “terms of reference for the new Committee or Royal Commission on Higher Education.”

The chairman of the committee stated that they had given the Miramichi College Committee two weeks “but one and a half months had gone by and no concrete proposal had been forthcoming.” He suggested that they write their report. He also said that when St. Thomas was operating in Chatham “less than 1/3 of the students came from the Miramichi area.”

Mr. Theriault stated that if the new Deutsch commission recommended that a Junior College be established in Chatham “then he felt the Government would have no alternative but to do so.” The Minister of Education pointed out that if that was to happen it would “require new facilities of an acceptable standard.”

The chairman then asked if there was agreement that at this time the committee cannot recommend the establishment of a Junior College at Chatham. Everyone agreed and it was decided that the committee would meet on November 30th to prepare a report.

In preparing their final report they agreed that “the committee could not recommend the establishment of a Junior college at Chatham at this time.” They pointed out that:

- 1) no Maritime University has expressed a definite desire to become affiliated with a Junior College in Chatham.
- 2) The cost of establishing university level training facilities in the Chatham buildings is excessive.”
- 3) “Prior to further study there has been not been shown a definite requirement for a Junior College in the Chatham area. (When St. Thomas was operating at Chatham less than 1/3 of the total body of students (210-220) came from the Miramichi area).

They also agreed that the best use for the St. Thomas buildings would be for the establishment of a “Provincial Upgrading Centre.” It would be used primarily for school dropouts in the 16 to 19 year age group. The cost of running the program would be \$170,716. There would be no community or junior college in Chatham.

Appendix II: Briefs Submitted to the 1967 St. Thomas “Committee on the Future”

Fr. Vince Donovan in his submission claimed that:

“The continuation of St. Thomas as an autonomous, degree granting school is unwarranted both academically and economically; it should become a college of the University of New Brunswick.” He pointed out that the removal of St. Thomas to the UNB campus had been recommended “in order to terminate needless duplication of educational facilities.”

He added that it made no sense to him to have “two schools in the same area offering the same type of education when this could be done by one just as efficiently and more economically.”

He added: “It seems to follow from this consideration, then, that unless some non-duplication, but at the same time peculiar or proper role can be found for St, Thomas, it must perforce cease operation as an uneconomic superfluity. It cannot be maintained that St. Thomas is providing an educational service to a community which would otherwise be deprived of such a service. (This would have been a valid argument, had St. Thomas remained in the Miramichi area of the province.)”

His point was that: “No one could seriously contend that the numbers of students attending St. Thomas could not be accommodated by the University of New Brunswick, if not immediately, then certainly in the near future. In this connection, however, it may be argued that, since the facilities and instructors are already available here, the basic courses should still continue to be offered. This is a reasonable proposition. The offering of these courses would be economically justified by the numbers of students in these courses. Duplication would not be unreasonable in these particular circumstances.

Furthermore, it may be argued that this school is fulfilling a needed witness of the Church in the realm of higher education in the English speaking area of this province. This would be a valid argument, if there existed convincing evidence that this role was taken seriously. But, it seems to me, the weight of evidence leans to the conclusion that the policy here (if indeed one exists) is to mimic the University of New Brunswick. The areas in which St. Thomas differs from the provincial university, namely Theology and, to a lesser extent, Philosophy, are regarded as the poor sisters of such a duplicative department as English, the very area, as a matter of fact, wherein UNB is reputedly strongest. On the other hand, it is true that in History an effort has been made, whether conscious or accidental, to complement rather than duplicate the offerings of UNB. This is a move in the right direction. But even in this case there has been a move to establish studies in particular areas of history which would be more appropriate in the context of a much more pretentious institution.”

He was referring to the fact that the offerings of the History Department included two Canadian History courses, one course in American History, one in Ancient History, and eleven in European history, including five on Eastern European history. The Eastern European course also required German or a major Slavic language (Ukrainian, Russian, Polish or Serbian). Somehow these courses had all been approved and included in the university calendar and the Head of the Department, had been allowed to spend most of the money, approved by the president, for the purchase of books on Eastern European history, many in languages which none of the students could read.

Fr. Donovan also pointed out that: “the University of New Brunswick makes no pretensions to espousing any particular ideology; the courses there are scrupulously non-sectarian. If it is the accepted policy of this school to slavishly imitate the courses being offered at the University of New Brunswick to the detriment of those courses which fall within the scope of St. Thomas as a Catholic institution, then, in my opinion, there ceases to be any supportable rationale on which the future operation of this institution could be based.”

Fr. Donovan continued: “if on the other hand St. Thomas were to accept the challenge of providing a Catholic witness in higher education, then there would exist a supportable rationale for its continued existence, which would necessarily entail an altered policy on the part of the faculty and administration toward the recognition and acceptance of the peculiar Christian aspects of this school. This would require acceptance by the authorities of St. Thomas that Theology and Philosophy are the areas wherein it differs from UNB and are the areas wherein it can make a special and peculiar contribution in the sphere of higher education. Consequently, these must be the course areas which would receive preferential consideration as to faculty appointments and qualifications, money allotments, allowances for library acquisitions, etc.”

This was not something the other departments would like to hear. Fr. Donovan suggested that: “St. Thomas might want to take under consideration the advisability of establishing a department of Religion in conjunction with UNB, a very significant innovation and contribution. Many of the great universities of America are presently establishing such departments. The university as such claims the entire scope of human knowledge as its sphere of action. Since religion is a fact of the human condition, it deserves recognition as an area of scholarly interest and a place in the courses offered by the university.”

He went on to say that: “this does not entirely exhaust the possibilities.”

He claimed that “in every school the size of UNB there exist in the various departments of knowledge weak areas, areas which are not adequately represented in the development of a particular programme. These are the areas where St. Thomas should endeavour to complement the courses offered at UNB.”

He was not proposing “that St. Thomas should undertake only the unpopular and uneconomic courses, courses which would appeal only to the few. That type of course could more reasonably be undertaken by the larger school. However, since I feel that a degree from UNB is more valuable to students than a

degree from St. Thomas, I have a better proposal, which is that instead of closing down St. Thomas it should become a college of UNB, which would entail the handing over to that university all degree granting rights and all that goes with those rights. The details of academic and financial administration I leave to the arbitration of both institutions.”

“To sum up:

“First, St. Thomas should become a college of the University of New Brunswick.

“Second, in that capacity it should specialize in instruction in Theology and Scholastic Philosophy, with the possible establishment of a new department of religion.

“Third, instruction in the basic academic courses should be continued.

“Fourth, efforts ought to be made to offer courses in the various departments which complement those being offered at UNB.

“Last, the teaching of Latin and Classics at St. Thomas should be discontinued. The numbers taking Latin are too few to justify continuing the courses, especially since they are already available at UNB. It is economic nonsense to employ teachers to teach Latin at St. Thomas when there is a well staffed department at UNB.”

Dr. Oleh Pidhainy, who was in charge of the History department, which had two professors at the present time, had his own plan for the future: he wanted St. Thomas to concentrate on Eastern European history and wanted to hire one new teacher a year until the department had eight professors, although “seven could be considered.” These courses should be complementary to UNB for an even closer relationship, but “must remain autonomous.”

Mrs Alicia Wood, the Dean of Women, suggested “rule changes which would perhaps add harmony and the spirit of loyalty to the Residence.”

She wanted to see monitors and proctors and an honour system, as well as more attention given to freshmen during orientation “so that the expected consistent application to academic work and the awareness of all university and student regulations would be fully recognized.” She recommended that the women’s residence be given a specific name, preferably “Vanier House.”

The submission from **Professor Richard Kennedy**, Head of the English department, recommended that “the university should be small, independent, Liberal Arts, Catholic, and Canadian. And Excellent. With fewer than 1,000 students. It should also remain administratively and curricularly independent, sharing only what is necessary. There should be no courses or degrees in Applied Arts, no degrees in physical science, and a reasonable balance should be maintained among the various disciplines in the liberal arts. The university should also retain its orientation. Since Canada is bilingual, St. Thomas should foster an atmosphere that encourages that bilingualism. It should hire and retain faculty who are excellent teachers and offer salary and promotional incentives for excellence in teaching before excellence in scholarly research and publishing. St. Thomas should also encourage the development of teachers by sponsoring research and investigation into the nature of the educational experience at the university level and by creating an atmosphere in which teaching problems are seen to be the primary concern of all the university.”

He also recommended keeping the university “small and intimate so students receive as much personal attention as possible.”

Frank Cronin favoured dropping the university charter and improving cooperation between the two institutions: “Let St. Thomas remain (or become) a Roman Catholic college within the University of New Brunswick. We have no right to university status. Let’s stop playing games. Do we have sufficient

reason to present ourself to the public as a Catholic institution of higher learning? Can't see it myself."

Fr. Brien Waugh of the Philosophy department felt that St. Thomas should be kept "a small, Canadian, Catholic, Bilingual, Liberal Arts College."

Fr. Ed Casey in his submission asked: "Did the move accomplish the aim of the Deutsch Commission: the economic streamlining of higher education in New Brunswick and the reduction of unnecessary duplication? This needs to be explored. Strengths and weaknesses of undergraduate departments need to be looked at, at both institutions, with a view to making available a balanced and coordinated program of studies, which would be a cooperative and non-duplicated program for liberal arts students."

He went on to say that "additional staff is needed. Using Sociology as an example, the student staff ratio (3 faculty for 237 students) is, I feel, unacceptable. I recommend that the Sociology departments at St. Thomas and UNB should be merged, with the aim of eliminating unwanted duplication of courses beyond the introductory, so an honours program could be developed to prepare students to go to graduate study. If a merger is not acceptable, then St. Thomas will have to do something to provide for student needs in the field of sociology."

Harry Rigby felt that "the first thing to do is to clearly define the reason for St. Thomas's existence. If we can't do that then we have no right to spend millions to establish a university here unless we can show we are offering students something which they cannot be offered elsewhere in this area.

As far as he was concerned, "St. Thomas is not offering students anything they can not get at UNB. The only possible justification is that they might get more attention, but many departments at St. Thomas are understaffed."

He also asked: "Why come to STU if you are a Catholic? The chapel on campus affords the UNB student exactly the same benefits as a student of St. Thomas. UNB students also have more choice in courses. Do we exist because there is a need, or are we endeavouring to find the need because of our existence?"

He went on to say that "There are complaints about the unsuitability of the residences. Rooms are too small. Poor acoustics. Inadequate space for a reading room. Inadequate lounge. No homey atmosphere. The environment is not enhancing intellectual activity."

He also hoped St. Thomas would not get too big. "1000 is enough, if that is economically feasible."

He was "very much in favour of our institution becoming a college of the University of New Brunswick. We could thus retain our identity and be assured of a full complement of students who would in time come to St. Thomas not because they would be not be admitted elsewhere, but because they want to enter here for what we have to offer them."

Fr. W.V. White, the Athletic director, pointed out that St. Thomas was getting excellent cooperation from UNB. "There are of course problems for a small university in trying to compete in intercollegiate athletics. St. Thomas should only try to compete in hockey at the university level.

He also felt that: "The ideal solution would seem to be complete affiliation with UNB at the Athletic level. This could be done even if the affiliation did not take place at the academic level, although St. Thomas would then lose its athletic identity while retaining its academic image."

Appendix III: Letter from Fr. George Martin to Bishop MacNeil

Letter dated 26-29 September 1970:

Today I wish to repeat that offer [to resign] and to add to it my suspicion that it would probably be good for me to have a change of job. When I say this I realize that there is some risk in changing jobs; specifically, I might find myself in a situation where I would be less contented, less secure than I am now. I have administrative ability and a lot of administration experience. If I were placed in a situation where this ability and experience were not called upon, would my life be empty and consequently unhappy? The risk of change does not deter me because I am convinced that if I were by temperament or personality unequal to a particular pastoral role assigned me I would at my request be assigned to another job for which I would be better suited. In seeking parish work I would be willing to try anything. I would not expect to start at the top. My own instincts would lead me to suspect:

- that I would be better in a town than in the country
- that I would be better with someone else than alone
- that I would not be very good with teenagers
- that I would probably be inclined to become involved in civic or community affairs
- that I would not be a fixer, renovator, or constructor of church buildings
- that I would be more interested in what went on inside the church than the church building itself.

One of the reasons I keep thinking of entering pastoral work is my age. I am now 46 years old and I have probably contributed all I am going to contribute in the field of Education. If I am going to contribute anything in the pastoral area I had better get at it before it is too late. Given my age, the fact that I have been overweight for years, and the history of early deaths from heart attack in my father's family, I am not a good risk for a long life. Despite the fact that I am overweight, never exercise, and live a completely sedentary life – all of which are admittedly bad – I believe I have more than ordinary energy and capacity for work. I have no hobbies, I play no games, and this I recognize as being a weakness. I drink every day, or to be more specific every night. I think I handle liquor fairly well, although I don't like the psychological dependence I have on it.

One final thing that should be mentioned: I believe I have superior intelligence, but I don't want to study for several reasons, but the least honorable one is that I am afraid of failure. I had one bad experience in that at Fordham, and that was enough for me. I don't know why I failed. It was probably a combination of reasons: I didn't have an adequate undergraduate preparation; I had always had a comparatively easy time with studies and didn't have the guts to cope with a hard situation – in effect I quit; the system was dishonest: in theory they said that graduate studies were designed to prepare scholars and in truth they were to provide a teaching-ticket; they said that to be successful you had to do certain things, but what you had to do was considerably less than what they proposed: you had to study for exams exactly like college kids must. My failure was more of a personality deficiency than an intelligence failure. If I had been more of a fighter I would have got the degree.

In this connection I must report that although I did not get a degree at Fordham I did receive an education during my two years in NYC. In fact, looking back over my life it was in New York that I began to grow up and got whatever education I possess. My contact there with such things as *New York Times*, *Commonweal*, *America*, *Catholic Worker*, *Cross Currents*, some books, the literature I studied, one or two of the professors, Augustian fathers, New York priests, New York City itself, changed me from a green boy into a person with a fairly wide and open outlook on life, religion, society, politics and books.

I suspect I was something of a know-it-all before I went there, but I came back much wiser, more mature, if somewhat sadder.

I have written all these things because I want you to know whom you are dealing with when you are dealing with me. I may have revealed to you more than I intended. So be it. As long as this helps you to know me better I will be satisfied. The better you know me, the better judgment you can use in appointing me.

Appendix, September 29, 1970:

I write this appendix to my letter of September 26 (typed September 28) subsequent to receiving comments of a colleague whom I had asked to read my letter dated September 28.

An additional reason for leaving my present work is that I suspect I will be forced out before many years go by. Aside from Father Harrington I have been longest associated with St. Thomas and I represent the old St. Thomas which is almost completely gone now. Given past history, what more logical than that they get rid of the last vestige of the old days, namely me.

Another argument: besides being registrar I also perform part of the function of Dean of Arts or Academic Vice-President, but I don't have the title or the authority. I have heard comments like this at a general faculty meeting during the past academic year: "This just shows our need for a really qualified Dean of Arts." Also it was suggested to me by Msgr. Duffie about six years ago that he and Bishop Leverman had agreed that I should have more authority. I took this to mean that I would be promoted to Dean of Arts or something equivalent. Nothing was ever done. I can only conclude that for one reason or another Msgr. Duffie does not want my promotion. I would not be surprised if some of the lay people on the faculty are eying the job for themselves.

St. Thomas University is very much a one-man show. Until a year ago there was no Bursar; there is no Dean of Arts; there is no Dean of Women (the present incumbent is a young student working on her B.A.). It is frustrating working in a system where lines of authority are not clearly drawn and where one man does nearly everything. One result is that some necessary things, like planning, never get done. Another is that there is no sense of accomplishment. No sense of being on a team working together for clearly defined goals.

That meeting we had yesterday afternoon [referring to an executive meeting concerning students' demands for visiting rights in the residences] was typical of how Msgr. Duffie works. He did not speak. He didn't open his mind to us on the topic at hand. He didn't even describe the background of the situation: his meetings with students last year, and this about open rooms, [or] his discussions with SRC. He didn't attempt to share knowledge. In the past he has always solved problems with students alone. I hear that the present problem has been solved, but I don't really know how and I probably never will know.

In sum, I find Msgr. Duffie a difficult man to work with, and I suspect he finds me the same. This is an additional reason for seeking other work.

Appendix IV: The St. Thomas Faculty in Fredericton, 1964-1975

[**bold type** indicates new appointment to faculty that year]

The St. Thomas Faculty in 1964-1965:

Hafeez Alexander, BA, MA, Cand PhD (Ottawa)

Anne Bradley, BA (Mt St. Vincent), BEd (STU)

Fenton Burke, BA (StFX), MA (UNB)

Political Science

Education

English Lit

J. Edward Butler, MA (STU)	History
Rev. Edmund Casey, BA (STU); MEd, Cand PhD (St. Louis U (on leave))	Sociology
Rev. Vincent Donovan, BA (STU), MA (Fordham)	Latin & Classics
Leonard Doucette, BA (London), MA (Brown)	Mdn Langs
Msgr. Donald Duffie, BA (St. Joseph's), BCL (UNB), BCL (Oxford), JCD (Laval)	Political Science
Anne Dunnigan, BSc (Dalhousie)	Biology
Leo Ferrari, BSc (Sydney), PhD (Laval)	Philosophy
Eugene Gaudet , BA (St. Joseph's), MS (Springfield)	Education
Rev. George Harrington, MA (Catholic Univ of America)	Sociology
Rev. A. J. Kandathil, BSc, MSc (Madras); BPh, LPh, BD, LD (Kandy); PhD (Notre Dame)	Chemistry
Rev. James MacDonald , BA (St. Joseph's)	Theology
Rev. George Martin, BA (STU)	English Lit
Rev. Bernard Murchland , BA (St. Joseph's), STB (U of Mtl), MA (Ottawa), Cand PhD (Buffalo)	English
Patrick Murray , BA (St. Joseph's)	Philosophy
Oleh Pidhaini , BA (Toronto); MA, PhD (McGill)	History
Rev. J. Winfield Poole, BA (St. Joseph's), BEd (STU), STD (U of Montreal), MA (Fordham)	Mathematics
Rev. W. D. Walsh, BA (STU), Cand MA (Fordham)	History
Rev. R. O'Brien Waugh , CSC, BA (SMU); MA, Cand PhD (Notre Dame)	Philosophy

Additions to St. Thomas Faculty in 1965-1966:

Rev. Roger Belanger , BA (U of Montreal)	Spanish
Allen Bentley , BA, MA, Cand PhilM (U of Toronto)	English Lit
Gerald Cyr , BA (St. Joseph's), LPh (U of Montreal)	French
Anna Maria Kinsella , HDip (Rome)	French
Noel Kinsella , BA (Dublin); BD, STL (Lateran); LPh, PhD (Angelicum)	Psychology
Rev. Wilfred Murchland , BA (St. Joseph's), STL (Angelicum)	Theology
Rev. W. J. Nugent , BA (STU), STB (U of Ottawa)	Sociology
Oscar Pudymaitis , BA, MA (Dalhousie)	Political Science

Additions to St. Thomas Faculty in 1966-1967:

John Brebner , BA (STU), MA (UNB)	English Lit
Francis Cronin , BA (SMU); MA, Cand PhD (Fordham)	Philosophy
J. Theodore Daigle , BA. BPed (Moncton)	French
Gillian Davies , BA (U of London)	French
Judith Kennedy , BA, MA, BLitt (Oxford)	English Lit
Richard Kennedy , BA (Windsor), MA (Western)	English Lit
Rev. Louis Kingston , BA (Moncton); BTh (Montreal); STL, STD (Angelicum)	Theology
Harry Rigby , BA (Moncton), Bth (Montreal)	Latin

Additions to St. Thomas Faculty in 1967-1968:

Robert Campbell , BSc (StFX), MA (UNB)	English Lit
George Haley , BA (StFX), MA (UNB)	English
Ronald Johnson , BA (MtA), MA (UNB)	Psychology
Robert Kelly , BA (Acadia), MA (UNB)	Economics
James Reither , BS (St. Cloud State College Minn)	English Lit
Claudia Whalen , BA (Sacré Coeur), MSc (McGill)	Psychology

Additions to St. Thomas Faculty in 1968-1969:

Arun Datta , BA, MA (Calcutta), PhD (Buffalo)	Psychology
John Deely , BA, MA, PhD (Aquinas Inst)	Philosophy
Russell Hunt , BA, MA (Wayne State); Cand PhD (Northwestern)	English Lit
Sr Elizabeth Legere , BA, MA (UNB), PhD (CatholicUofA)	Education
Marguerite Michaud , BA, MA (StFX), PhD (Montreal), EdD (Moncton)	French
E. Paul Morrissy , BA (StFX); BA, MA (U of the Americas)	Anthropology
Marion Owen , BA (Michigan State)	English Lit
Katherine Robinson , BA, MA (UNB)	French
William Spray , BA, MA (UNB), PhD (U of London)	History
G. Thambidurai , MA (Madras)	Psychology
Rev. Arnold Toner , BA (St. Joseph's), STL (Montreal)	Theology
Peter Toner , BA (STU), MA (UNB)	History
Rev. William White , BA (St. Joseph's)	Education

Additions to St. Thomas Faculty in 1969-1970:

Walter Avis , BSc (Alberta), MA (Calgary), PhD (Toronto)	Psychology
Roland Carty , BSc (UNB), BA (Oxford)	Political Science
Francis Coghlan , BA, BSc (U of London); MA (Notre Dame); PhD (Bryn Mawr)	History
Juergen Doerr , BA (Saskatoon); MA, Cand PhD (Oregon)	History
Herbert Goltz , BS (Carthage), MS (U of Wisconsin), Cand PhD (W Ontario)	History
Rev. Joseph Higgins , BA (St. Joseph's), STL (Gregorian)	Theology
Lewis Morgan , BA (UNB)	History
Edward Mullaly , BA (Windsor), MA (UNB)	English Lit
Patricia Pacey , BA (UNB), MA (McGill)	English Lit
Jonathan Rahn , BA (STU), MA (Toronto)	French
Rev. Richard Renshaw , BA (Notre Dame), MA (Toronto)	Philosophy
Thomas Simms , BA (MtA), MA (UNB)	Education
Nils Vikander , BA (Concordia)	Sociology
Charles Waddell , BA (UNB), MA (Western)	Psychology

Additions to St. Thomas Faculty in 1970-71:

Stanley Atherton , BA (Acadia), MA (Western)	English Lit
Audrey Cooley , BA, MA (UNB)	Psychology

John Gillis , BA, MA (UNB)	Psychology
Daniel Gleason , BA, MA (Southern Illinois), Cand PhD (Notre Dame)	History
Thomas Good , BA (Toronto), MA (Queen's)	Economics
Rev. John Jennings , BA (StFX), LMS (Pontifical Inst of Medieval Studies, Toronto)	History
Brian Kinsley , BA (Manitoba), MA (Alberta)	Sociology
Robert Lake , BA, MA (McMaster); PhD (Toronto)	Psychology
Robert Lewis , BS, MEd (Kansas), EdD (Maine)	Psychology/Education
Kenneth Marsh , BS (Juniata), MS (Delaware), PhD (Waterloo)	Psychology
Alan Mason , BA (Sacramento), Cand PhD (U of Calif)	Anthropology
Sidney Pobihushchy , BA (SMU)	Political Science
Anthony Rhineland , BA (Yale), BA, MA (Cambridge), MA, Cand PhD (Columbia)	History
Rev. Marc Smith , CSC, BA (UNB), STB (Gregorian), BTh (Ottawa)	Philosophy
Leroy Washburn , BPE, BA (UNB)	Education

Additions to St. Thomas Faculty in 1971-72

Maurice Boulay , BA (STU), MPs (Ottawa)	Psychology
Anthony Brennan , BA (Oxford); MA, PhD (McMaster)	English Lit
Wendy Brennan , BA (Manchester), MA (UBC), PhD (McMaster)	Psychology
Richard Costello , BA (Sacramento), MA (Stanford)	Anthropology
John Dreijmanis , BA (Suffolk), MA (Boston College)	Political Science
Nela Hidalgo , BFL (UNC, Argentina), MA (UNB)	Spanish
Gary Hughes , BA (United), MA, PhD (Manitoba)	Psychology
Nathan Kollar , BA (St. Bonaventure), STB (Lateran), MA (Notre Dame), STL, STD (Catholic U of America)	Theology
Françoise MacKenzie , CELB (Classiques)	French
Robert Monterio , BA (StFX), MEd (Maine)	Education
John Patterson , BA, MA (Toronto)	French
Ron Philipchalk , BA (Victoria), MA (UBC), PhD (Western)	Psychology
Rev. Robert Smith , BA (Sir George Williams), BTh, BD (King's), PhD (Exeter)	Theology
Kathleen Driscoll Strouch , BA, MA (Connecticut)	Sociology
Robert Strouch , BA, MA (Connecticut)	Sociology
William Vaughn , BA (California), MA (Washington)	

Additions to St. Thomas Faculty in 1972-73:

Joan McFarland , BA Thomas's New Administrators (Victoria), MA, PhD (McGill)	Economics
Roger Moore , BA (Bristol), MA (Toronto)	Spanish
Michael Vickers , BA (Western), MA (Carleton)	Political Science

Additions to St. Thomas Faculty in 1973-74:

Sandra Costello , BA (Sacramento), MA (Stanford)	Sociology
Elizabeth Goguen , BA(Moncton) MA(Montreal), BEd(Moncton)	French
Jerry Tossounian , BA, MA (California)	Italian
John Vast-Binder , BA (Michigan State), NA (Northwestern)	Sociology
Peter Weeks , BA (Carleton), MA (Toronto)	Sociology

St. Thomas Faculty in 1974-75:

Hafeez Alexander, BA, MA (Ottawa)	Political Science
James Asher, BA (STU)	Philosophy
Stanley Atherton, BA (Acadia), MA (Western)	English Lit
Judith Avis, BA (Queens), MSW (Toronto)	Psychology
Walter Avis, BSc (Alberta), MA (Calgary), PhD (Toronto)	Psychology
Allen Bentley, BA, MA, PhilM (U of Toronto)	English Lit
Maurice Boulay, BA (STU), MPs (Ottawa)	Psychology
Anthony Brennan, BA (Oxford); MA, PhD (McMaster)	English Lit
Fenton Burke, BA (StFX), MA (UNB)	English Lit
Richard Costello, BA (Sacramento), Cand PhD (California)	Anthropology
Francis Cronin, BA (SMU); MA, PhD (Fordham)	Philosophy
J. Theodore Daigle, BA. BPed (Moncton)	French
Gillian Davies, BA (U of London) (on leave)	French
Juergen Doerr, BA (Saskatoon); MA, PhD (Oregon)	History
Rev. Vincent Donovan, BA (STU), MA (Fordham)	Latin & Classics
John Dreijmanis, BA (Suffolk), MA (Boston College)	Political Science
William Dunn, BA (STU), MA (Toronto)	Sociology
Leo Ferrari, BSc (Sydney), PhD (Laval)	Philosophy
Daniel Gleason, BA, MA (So Illinois), PhD (Notre Dame)	History
Elizabeth Goguen, BA(Moncton) MA(Montreal), BEd(Moncton)	French
Herbert Goltz, BS (Carthage), MS (U of Wis), PhD (Western)	History
Thomas Good, BA (Toronto), MA (Queen's)	Economics
Wayne Grannan, Beng (NSTC), BA, MA (Dalhousie)	Philosophy
Nela Hidalgo, BFL (UNC, Argentina), MA (UNB)	Spanish
Rev. Joseph Higgins, BA (St. Joseph's), STL (Gregorian)	Theology
Russell Hunt, BA, MA (Wayne State), PhD (Northwestern)	English Lit
Rev. John Jennings, BA (StFX), STB (Laval), LMS (Pontifical Inst of Medieval Studies, Toronto)	History
Judith Kennedy, BA, MA, BLitt (Oxford)	English Lit
Richard Kennedy, BA (Windsor), MA (Western), BLitt (Oxford)	English Lit
Rev. Louis Kingston, BA (Moncton); BTh (Montreal); STL, STD (Angelicum)	Theology
Anna Maria Kinsella, HDip, DLIT (Rome)	French
Noel Kinsella, BA (Dublin); BD, STL, STD (Lateran); LPh, PhD (Angelicum)	Psychology
Robert Lake, BA, MA (McMaster), PhD (Toronto)	Psychology
Sr Elizabeth Legere, BA, MA (UNB), PhD (Catholic U of America)	Education
Robert Lewis, BS, MEd (Kansas), EdD (Maine)	Education
Kenneth Marsh, BS (Juniata), MS (Delaware)	Psychology
Alan Mason, BA (Sacramento), Cand PhD (U of Calif)	Anthropology

Joan McFarland, BA (Victoria), MA, PhD (McGill)	Economics
John McKendy, BA (StFX), MA (Toronto)	Sociology
Robert Monterio, BA (StFX), MEd (Maine)	Education
Roger Moore, BA (Bristol), MA (Toronto)	French & Spanish
E. Paul Morrissy, BA (StFX); BA, MA (U of the Americas)	Anthropology
Sr Margaret O'Neill, BEd (Western Wash), MEd (Seattle) PhD (Fordham)	Education
Marion Owen-Fekete, BA (Michigan State)	English Lit
John Patterson, BA, MA (Toronto)	French
J. Winfield Poole, BA (St. Joseph's), BEd (STU), STD (U of Montreal), MA (Fordham)	Mathematics
Jonathan Rahn, BA (STU), MA (Toronto)	French
James Reither, BS (St. Cloud State College), PhD (Oregon)	English Lit
Anthony Rhinelander, BA (Yale), BA, MA (Cambridge), MA, PhD (Columbia)	History
Harry Rigby, BA (Moncton), BTh (Montreal)	Latin
Katherine Robinson, BA, MA (UNB), Cert (Sorbonne)	French
Rev. Marc Smith, CSC, BA (UNB), STB (Gregorian), BTh (Ottawa), MA (UNB)	Philosophy
William Spray, BA, MA (UNB), PhD (U of London)	History
Kathleen Driscoll Strouch, BA, MA (Connecticut)	Sociology
Robert Strouch, BA, MA (Connecticut)	Sociology
L. Mulry Tetlow, AB, MA (Springhill), STL (St. Louis U), MA, PhD (Fordham)	Psychology
Patricia Pacey Thornton, BA (UNB), MA (McGill)	English Lit
Rev. Arnold Toner, CSC, BA (St. Joseph's), STL (Montreal)	Theology
William Vaughn, BA (California), MA (Washington)	Political Science
Leroy Washburn, BPE, BA (UNB)	Education
Rev. R. O'Brien Waugh, CSC, BA (SMU), MA (Notre Dame)	Philosophy
Peter Weeks, BA (Carleton), MA (Toronto)	Sociology
Claudia Whalen, BA (Sacré-Coeur), MSc (McGill)	Psychology

Sources, Chapter 10

For the material in this chapter, extensive use was made of the written correspondence of Bishop Alfred Leverman, Msgr. Donald C. Duffie, Fr. George Martin, and Bishop Arthur Gilbert, as noted in the quoted passages. Much of their correspondence is located in the archives of the Diocese of Saint John [ADSJ]; copies of some of it is located in the relevant funds of the Provincial Archives of New Brunswick [PANB].

Other sources used were:

Minutes of the Board of Governors of St. Thomas University, 1964-74.

Minutes of the Board's Executive Committee, 1964-1974.

St. Thomas College Calendars, 1964-74.

The Aquinian 1964-74.

St. Thomas University Connections, Fall 2010.

Contemporary accounts in the following newspapers:

The Chatham Gazette

The Fredericton Daily Gleaner

The Saint John Daily Telegraph

Personal information from the following:

-Registrar Lawrence Batt

-Professor Allen Bentley

-Professor Frank Cronin

-Professor Senator Noel Kinsella

-Professor Paul Morrissy

-Professor Reverend Marc Smith