

CHAPTER 7

TURMOIL ON THE MIRAMICHI: ST. THOMAS 1960-1962

The Worried Bishop

The next two years, from 1960 to 1962, proved to be crucial for the institutional development of St. Thomas, including its physical location. Bishop Leverman may have hoped to keep St. Thomas in Chatham and avoid “prejudice, rivalry or competition,” yet events conspired to confound those hopes.

In the summer of 1960 he was becoming concerned about the number of projects going on simultaneously in his diocese. As he wrote in July to Oscar Schneller, auditor for the diocese of Saint John, he had done a lot of thinking about a plan of action. The whole undertaking, including the planning for St. Thomas, “was much too heavy with the present resources.” It was time to establish priorities. He confessed that he worried that his stock was still “not too high” on the Miramichi. Before doing much more he wanted to see what would come out of the diocesan canvass. He also needed a report on the alumni canvass for funds for the new chapel.

He was particularly annoyed by the continued delay in getting the amended Act of Incorporation through the legislature. In fall 1959, the board set its next regular annual meeting for May, but by July it still had not happened. Leverman worried that if the board did not meet soon, he might appear to be going ahead with new construction without consulting them, which, as he explained to Schneller, “would not be wise, especially when it is a question of such extensive development.” He was pushing Rector McFadden to meet with the priests at the university to find out how they felt about things generally, but he had to leave that to the rector’s discretion. He was especially concerned with “the psychological factors,” meaning the latent negative attitudes on the Miramichi that he sensed

toward him and his work. It was due, he suggested, “to a rather long isolation and non-recognition.” As he related to Schneller, referring to Bishop Patrice Chiasson’s actions in 1938,

A previous bishop, before the one in Bathurst, took up his bag and baggage and just walked out from Chatham and established himself in Bathurst. The people and priests have never forgotten that. This coupled with the fact that little was done for years caused them to be cautious and more determined to retain what they have retained for so long a time and with no small measure of sacrifice. In the meantime, there was no leadership to do something for the college, which was the symbol and heart of the district.

He was, therefore, “determined on a policy of over-all view and integration.” He moved priests around as a method of bringing the diocese together. He moved one priest from Saint John to St. Thomas and three from the Chatham area to Saint John. He told Schneller of his plan to send two or three more St. Thomas priests to study at other universities. This would not only improve their qualifications but also “change their mentality and give them a broader outlook,” since he felt there was “a need of breaking up a click [sic].” The priests, he felt, were responsive to the idea. In spite of there being “a bit of attitude between the clergy of that area and those of the College,” it was “a question of division within division,” which could be regulated gradually. He was in great need of more information, however, before he could make known his ideas at a formal meeting of his consultants in Saint John and “make definite decisions.”

All these worries weighed heavily on Leverman, who had never been a particularly effective organizer. Schneller did his best to calm the bishop and tell him his work in the diocese and especially at St. Thomas was admirable.

Halloween Board Meeting, 1960

Bishop Leverman finally called a special meeting of the St. Thomas board for October 31, 1960, to bring the members up to date on what had happened since the last meeting the previous November. Some changes, such as closing the high school, had already been effected. All high school boarders

were gone; the only ones left were in grade twelve. They would be the last high school class to graduate from St. Thomas. Six classrooms had been rented to the Chatham School Board. Three faculty members who were teaching high school had been sent to graduate school. Plans for the future included hiring more faculty, especially priests, if the university was to conduct classes in Saint John. Leverman explained that he had hoped to be able to start classes there in September. He blamed the delay on the government's slowness in ratifying the amended Act of Incorporation. The diocesan financial drive had produced \$319,000 to date, with a total of at least \$450,000 expected. It was enough to start construction. A government grant was a possibility, although not assured.

At his request, the board passed a motion belatedly approving the plans for the new buildings, namely the residence (which was already underway) and the new administration building, both of which were to be connected to the already finished classroom building. The new construction would start in spring 1961. The board also approved the recent renovations to the kitchen and dining room, as well as the chemistry room and conversion of the temporary chapel into student rooms. The present administration building would be converted into more student rooms. Some board members suggested that the old residence for arts students might be turned into a "ladies' residence," as there were as yet no accommodations for women on campus.

The face of the new campus was rapidly taking shape, although the bishop was worried about securing the necessary funds. He exhorted board members to do all they could to help: by influencing the businesses they were involved with; by encouraging students to enrol. The varsity hockey team was showing its mettle, having won every contest so far; students, faculty, and alumni were sure to applaud a perfect season. The board approved a notice prepared by the bursar, Fr. Henry McGrath, director of the alumni association. Entitled "A Clarion Call to the Alumni," it urged them to contribute to the building of the chapel at "the new St. Thomas," which would "stand as a perpetual Memorial to the love and appreciation of all those who attended a College that has survived the multiple hazards of time

and circumstance.”

The Halloween meeting concluded with a discussion about the board itself and the merits of having a constitution that spelled out the duties of its members.

Not Enough Priests

For all the bishop’s optimistic talk of finding more priests to teach at St. Thomas, McFadden saw things differently. After the board meeting, he wrote to complain to the bishop that the “scarcity of priests is keenly felt” in the Miramichi area, especially at St. Thomas. All his priests were “taxed to the utmost” to carry on their duties. At St. Thomas they had to conduct two separate masses on Sundays, “one for the help and one for the students.” They were constantly getting requests to help out in the parishes. As he told Leverman, “Most everyone (including the priests) have a day off a week. I hate to ask them to accept extra duty for if we have just one more priest incapacitated we will really be in an impossible situation.” He pointed out that he was writing this letter on a Sunday, when he was the only priest left on campus. “They are all away doing legitimate and necessary work. Some of it in connection with college work but mostly it is parochial.” Fr. Win Poole had three masses that day and Fr. George Harrington was needed in Loggieville, both filling in for the local pastors who were on vacation. Fr. George Martin was away leading a retreat. Fr. Ed Casey was at an athletic meeting in Bathurst. Fr. Thomas McKendy was filling in at the church in Blackville, Fr. Gratton at Barryville, and Fr. McGrath at the airforce base. “In all truth they are not loafing.”

But Leverman was less than sympathetic. He wrote back to suggest that perhaps he should not have released three priests at one time for graduate studies. Concerning supplying priests to help out in parishes, the bishop advised the rector as follows:

Once you know your limitations, then you must refuse to supply for several at a time. So, if one priest can be reasonably supplied, then if another comes he must be told that he will be accommodated when the absent returns. At the present time you are supplying “the Station” (the

Air Port), for Loggieville, Blackville, as well as other permanent assistance. This is too much and a rule must come into effect to control it, but these things I cannot do without a clear understanding with the staff.

As for obtaining more priests, Leverman was “at a loss to know what to do.” One possibility was to recall one of the priests presently studying at Fordham in New York and let him finish some other time. Another possibility would be to bring in Msgr. Donald Duffie from Halifax at the beginning of the new year, although that “would require consultation.” He pointed out to McFadden:

You have had a number of priests to depend on for a long time and that is why a shortage appears to be more acute than it may really be....We are it is true in a tight spot but we must not get upset. There is always a solution, but that requires discussion, and, I think, a few regulations.

Perhaps they should arrange a meeting to straighten things out. As if to prove McFadden’s point, shortly after this correspondence, in late 1960, Leverman lost another priest in the Chatham area due to a stroke. He wrote McFadden to say he would have to “trust in the generosity and kindness of the priests of the college” to fill in until “things find their course.”

The advice was of no help to the beleaguered rector. With hindsight, he would realize that the shortage of priests, while pressing for the church, was crucial for St. Thomas. Indeed, it determined its very future. The bishop needed pastors merely to minister to parishioners; the university needed academics, intellectual shepherds for a flock of ever more educated students eager to find places in the secular world. Could the priesthood provide those academics? The powers that be at St. Thomas attempted to do so by encouraging some of its teaching priests to attend graduate school, at places such as Fordham and St. Louis University, to earn MAs and PhDs. An easier course was to hire more lay academics: while they should certainly be practising Catholics, they would be dedicated to teaching in the academic world rather than ministering to the faithful. As we have seen, St. Thomas had hired lay teachers in the past. Some filled in temporarily but others became full-time, successful professors, such as Dr. Phonse Campbell, hired in 1949 and in 1960 still St. Thomas’s professor of English literature.

Should more people like him be hired? What if these professional academics happened not to be practising Catholics? If so, might St. Thomas thereby lose its character and essential purpose as an institution run by Catholic priests, whose purpose was not just to provide academic training but to produce candidates for the priesthood?

Lack of Consultation

Relations between Leverman and McFadden, never smooth, became progressively more strained during the winter of 1960–61. The problem ran deeper than a lack of priests. While McFadden may not have understood the broader implications of improving St. Thomas’s academic credentials, Leverman had no understanding of the philosophy behind academic learning. As a result, the bishop and the rector did not see eye to eye on how to run a university. McFadden, although a disciplinarian as far as student behaviour was concerned—stories were legion about his perching at the top of the stairs at night in order to nab students who stayed out too late—was content to allow professors to teach as they saw fit. Leverman, however, viewed such intellectual leniency as inexcusable laxity. When he took over as chancellor of St. Thomas, his goal was to “protect it and see that the main and necessary welfare of staff and students be guarded.” To that end, he recommended regular meetings of the teaching priests, “so they could come to some understanding.” He learned that McFadden was not fond of meetings and so rarely called them; he did not even attend if the faculty met on their own. This made Leverman concerned with “the running of the house,” which he considered haphazard. The rector, he felt, should be firmer and more consultative:

As you know, too many have come to depend on the College and take a number of things for granted. This is what I want to get at but I cannot do it without sessions and mutual understanding.... I did not want to make hard and fast regulations at once but hoped that we could get together from time to time and come up with rules which I could sanction.

Admittedly, McFadden was not the easiest person to get along with. In nearly thirteen years in the position, he showed a natural reluctance to share decision making with others, although he

occasionally sought the advice of Frs. Henry McGrath and the late Arthur Scott. Ever since the diocesan transfer in 1959, however—partly in umbrage at Leverman's having kept him needlessly in the dark about it—McFadden resented what he considered Leverman's overbearing paternalism. Differences of opinion were becoming more common.

They were stretched to the breaking point when the issue of moving St. Thomas to UNB again reared its controversial head. Before the end of 1960, the bishop learned from President Mackay at UNB of a royal commission to consider restructuring higher education in the province, possibly involving moving St. Thomas in its entirety to the UNB campus in Fredericton. As we shall see, Mackay had decided such a commission was the only way to force the issue, since the bishop was blowing cool on his plans to bring St. Thomas to UNB. Leverman, in spite of his recent persuasion that St. Thomas could profitably remain in Chatham, was not incapable of changing his mind. Yet he was well aware of how McFadden felt about moving St. Thomas out of Chatham, not to mention some others among the college's faculty. If Leverman was going to change his spots over the issue of St. Thomas's future in Chatham, he would need an articulate, politically able lieutenant to help him—someone with a suitably thick skin.

McFadden To Be Replaced

The government finally in December 1960 amended St. Thomas's Act of Incorporation retroactive to April 2, 1959, naming the bishop of Saint John to the university's board in place of the bishop of Bathurst. Although not specified in the Act, by tradition the diocesan bishop was recognized as the university's chancellor and chair of the board of governors. Leverman now decided to replace the president, Rector McFadden. Technically McFadden's term had expired the previous spring, but nothing was done by way of reappointment, and he continued by default. The bishop felt he had to act quickly. He had a perfect candidate in mind. His choice was the man who advised him a year earlier to

remove the high school from the university and, ironically, to build up St. Thomas as an independent Catholic university on the Miramichi, Msgr. Donald Duffie.

Duffie was a man of the cloth and a scholar and also a member of a well-known New Brunswick family with powerful connections to the Liberal party. The Liberals had come to power the previous summer under Premier Louis J. Robichaud, replacing the government of Hugh John Flemming. Duffie's brother William was in the cabinet as minister of youth and welfare. Another brother, Ted, was a member of the New Brunswick legislature. Although Donald Duffie spent much of his adult life in Nova Scotia, he was born and educated in New Brunswick and ordained in the Saint John diocese. It would have been difficult to find another person with similar qualifications. He had the appropriate academic credentials. He knew his way around government offices and was comfortable with politicians. He was articulate. He had shown Leverman he was in favour of taking decisive actions to meet modern requirements. He lacked previous university administrative experience, but so had every other rector at St. Thomas.

In early December 1960, Leverman, without discussing it with the St. Thomas board and therefore with dubious legality, offered Duffie the presidency. He had actually given his choice away in his earlier letter to McFadden when he mentioned the possibility of bringing in "Msgr. Duffie from Halifax at the beginning of the new year." Duffie accepted. They agreed that the appointment would not be announced until May 1961, after which Duffie would arrive to take up his responsibilities in June. Leverman notified McFadden of his removal and replacement. To soften the blow, apparently unaware of the insult, he appointed him "vice-chancellor" (previously there had been no such officer), with "responsibility for the supervision of construction." The move was unfortunately typical of the bishop's *modus operandi*. It did not make for a pleasant situation.

An attentive board might have questioned the appointment of the new president on the grounds not only that legally it was their collective responsibility to elect a president but that he was not a local

priest familiar with the situation in Chatham. In Leverman's eyes, however, that was one of Duffie's strong points. It was precisely the Chatham connection, which he too lacked, that was giving him trouble. In any case, the appointment was never referred to the board for discussion or approval. In fact, no meetings of the board took place between October 1960 and September 1962, during which time the fate of St. Thomas on the Miramichi was decided. Nor were the priests on the faculty given the opportunity to state whom they wished to see (or not see) manage St. Thomas, as had been the case in earlier years. Duffie was less a "man for all seasons," like Thomas More under Henry VIII, and more like that same monarch's Thomas Cromwell. He would be the strongman to carry out the decisions of the Deutsch Commission.

The Deutsch Commission

Duffie was correct to point out that in the 1950s the number of high school graduates going on to universities in the Maritimes, as part of a Canadian and indeed North American trend, was increasing at an unprecedented rate. Low tuition and low entrance requirements also brought in students from outside the province. New facilities and new faculty were expensive, so all New Brunswick educational institutions were facing severe financial problems. UNB, for example, by 1960 was unable to balance its books and had to be bailed out by the provincial government.

Robichaud's government was aware of the financial crunch. UNB's deficit was growing ever larger. The other provincial universities and colleges in the province—Mount Allison in Sackville, St-Joseph in Memramcook, Sacré-Coeur in Bathurst, and St. Thomas in Chatham—were all demanding more support. In fact, they banded together and presented a brief to that effect. W. B. Sawdon, a member of the board of regents of Mount Allison, drafted the brief. In a letter to Robichaud, Sawdon suggested that while the government had issued a blank cheque to UNB, "no offer was made to help any of the other universities in the province insofar as their debts were concerned." Robichaud knew

something had to be done.

Mackay, too, was aware of the requests from the other universities for a share of the pie. That was one of his reasons for wanting to bring St. Thomas to the campus in Fredericton. Furthermore, like Leverman, he learned of a proposal by a group of businessmen in Saint John to establish a college in that city. Mackay acted to forestall such a development. After consulting William F. Ryan, the dean of the law school, he met with Robichaud on January 28, 1961, to discuss the problem. He urged the premier to set in motion a study of higher education in New Brunswick, and he relayed Ryan's recommendation of a suitable person to carry out such a study—John J. Deutsch. Deutsch was an experienced federal civil servant and presently vice-principal for administration and professor of economics at Queen's University. Robichaud accepted Mackay's recommendation.

Mackay then convinced the UNB senate to pass a series of resolutions calling on the government to conduct a study of higher education. He wanted to put on hold any granting of charters for new universities until the study was completed. He aimed thereby to head off the group in Saint John. Ever since his appointment as president of UNB eight years earlier, with the help of his patron Beaverbrook, Mackay had dedicated himself to expanding UNB from a small provincial university to a university with national aspirations. As we have seen, he had long been trying to persuade St. Thomas to establish a presence on the campus—following the examples of St. Michael's College at the University of Toronto and St. Thomas More College at the University of Saskatchewan—to make it more attractive to the province's many Catholic students. He had also had his eye on bringing the Normal School, with its many Catholic teachers-in-training, from downtown Fredericton to the UNB campus. Now that the Deutsch Commission was set up, the plum was ripe for the picking.

Mackay had been apprehensive about Leverman's building plans for St. Thomas in Chatham. In order to forestall those plans, in late 1960 he informed Leverman about what he was planning to propose to the premier. He urged the bishop once again to consider moving St. Thomas to the UNB

campus. Naturally, that placed Leverman in a bind. How was he to defend his recent and effusive assurances to Miramichiers about St. Thomas's expansion on the Miramichi? No one was likely to believe he had acted in good faith.

Duffie, his president-delegate, urged him to accept Mackay's suggestion, as it made good sense in the long run. Leverman must have felt hot coals under his feet. In early January 1961, he made "a quick trip to Rome" to seek the Vatican's advice, but the members of the Congregation of Studies and Seminaries offered him little help. They told him to proceed as he saw fit. He returned to New Brunswick on January 29, the day following Mackay's meeting with Robichaud. That day he wrote in obvious distress to his financial adviser Schneller—a long, rather inarticulate letter about all his problems, including those involving St. Thomas:

University Problems: That is a hot one. You can imagine the thought and concern that is going into this. I fear that I am faced with an issue and that is to preserve what we have and save it for the future. It is completely against what I had first in mind. It may be that Providence wishes us to see the whole question in an entirely different light. It may be that we should be on the offensive and not on the defensive as we appear to be for a long time. You may be sure that this matter must be regarded in the cool light of objectivity. I'm afraid that some in the Miramichi area will not see it that way, although I do not think there will be much difficulty unless things suddenly blow up. They have not and even now do not support the place as they should. All students in that area who have received scholarships or have money attend UNB or St of X. I notice that most of the professional men in the town are not St. Thomas men. The few notes I sent you as observations are not too far off with the present developments. I do not think there will be any difficulty with the Congregation of Studies and Seminaries at Rome. The economic question is there and it is forcing us to seek assistance. I shall discuss the question with you when I have an opportunity. We are not to lose our College but to change the locale. We are not taking proper care of the whole situation and we may lose what we have if we do not make a proper judgment.

Schneller replied that he was inclined to agree that "due to the peculiar circumstances prevailing in that area," a move to the UNB campus was inevitable. University costs were increasing everywhere. Although he deplored "the trend towards state universities with its materialism and potentially more dangerous connotations," referring to Robichaud's government, he could not see "where a Catholic institution of higher learning can exist independently in an isolated area within the confines of a

welfare state.” Given a highly qualified staff, Leverman might have been able to create in Saint John the sort of small Catholic institution of higher learning that had been successful in parts of the United States, but not in Chatham. Chatham was isolated. It was in a bilingual area where English was the minority. Under the circumstances, he believed, Leverman had no choice “but to go along with the University of New Brunswick especially when they are in a mood to be generous.”

The Key Players

When Leverman informed Mackay of his plan to install Duffie as the new head of St. Thomas, Mackay immediately recognized that Duffie, with his political connections, would be a powerful ally. Indeed, if Mackay was the prime mover behind the establishment of the Deutsch Commission, Duffie became a key player throughout its deliberations. The two met at the start of 1961. Duffie warned Mackay that “the government may give in to Saint John and set up a seventh university.” Mackay responded that that was precisely the genesis of the commission. It had prompted his visit to the premier, following which the premier had called Deutsch at Queen’s, who agreed to take on the task.

According to Mackay, it was Duffie who triggered the move of St. Thomas to Fredericton. That was misleading. Mackay had already pressured the bishop to consider such a move, and it was Mackay who set in motion the Deutsch Commission. In any case, Duffie soon got to work on Leverman. Despite the fact that a year and a half earlier, Duffie had encouraged the bishop to expand St. Thomas in Chatham as the provincial Catholic liberal arts university, now he set out to convince the bishop of the importance of moving St. Thomas to Fredericton. Admittedly, in 1959 he had been in Halifax, not Chatham, looking at St. Thomas as an outsider. Besides, that was theory; this was practice. He told Leverman that if they did not move St. Thomas to Fredericton, Mackay would ask the Basilians—if need be, over the bishop’s objections—to set up a Catholic college at UNB, as they had done at the University of Saskatchewan.

Duffie's manipulations fanned the fires under Leverman. He did not want the Basilians to open a college in his diocese, certainly not on the Fredericton campus. If there was going to be a Catholic presence at UNB, he wanted it to be his doing. This may have been the key consideration that made the bishop agree with Duffie to move St. Thomas. Alternatively, perhaps Leverman simply desired to be respected by the province's power brokers. Whatever the case, as with so many other private arrangements among the Church hierarchs, the agreement between Leverman and Duffie remained secret. At St. Thomas's convocation that spring, in the presence of the outgoing rector McFadden, the bishop turned the sod for another building on the Chatham campus, and blessed the recently completed residence. Students and alumni were in a festive mood. The campus was beautified and the 1960-61 St. Thomas hockey team, coached by Vance Toner, had a brilliant season, capturing the Maritime intercollegiate championship. Leverman had no wish to detract from the euphoria. He gave no inkling that a seismic shift in the political ground had taken place. Although the Deutsch Commission had been announced, it was not at all obvious how it would deal with St. Thomas, or that the new president, whose name had been announced but who had not yet appeared, would act in any other fashion than to keep the status quo.

Outside the Miramichi, Leverman would find wide support for his new direction. On May 5, Justice Ritchie, relieved at the bishop's change of heart, wrote a supporting letter. He doubted that "measured by present day standards, it is possible to build St. Thomas into a worthwhile institution," thanks to the mounting costs of running a university. He referred the bishop to some articles explaining how a number of small Catholic colleges were affiliated with large provincial universities; namely, St. Michael's College, St. Thomas More College, Assumption College, Canterbury College, and Essex College, which he thought might be of interest to Leverman in light of the Deutsch Commission being set up. He also informed the bishop about his conversations with some Basilian Fathers in Toronto. It seemed, reported Ritchie, that

the Basilian order, if offered the opportunity, would be willing, notwithstanding their present policy of consolidation, to take over the UNB Newman Club and conduct courses in Scholastic Philosophy, and that under such an arrangement, one or more Basilian priests could be appointed to the UNB faculty.

He thought this might be better than continuing to support St. Thomas in Chatham.

“There Is Much To Be Done”

Although Leverman had never been keen on bringing the Basilians to Fredericton, he sent a copy of Ritchie’s letter to Duffie in Halifax, who was preparing to move to Chatham and St. Thomas. Leverman wrote that he was not going to answer Ritchie’s letter until the matter was thought out more carefully.

He was tempted to contact the Basilians to see if what Ritchie said was correct, adding:

It is strange they never brought the matter to my attention altho there seems to be feelers out from time to time. As you know the Justice [Ritchie] is a strange person and not too Catholic minded on some matters, altho seemingly well disposed.

As for the imminent official announcement of the Deutsch Commission, Leverman warned Duffie that because “this will be a turning point in this whole educational problem,” they should start preparing a brief. Duffie must have been puzzled by Leverman’s next remark: “It seems to be in the minds of many that free education will be the final result. This could mean secular education and with our own institutions out in the cold unless we tie in to their satisfaction.” As Duffie was going to the United States for a brief visit before moving to Chatham, Leverman suggested that he “sound out the situation and see the trend and way of thinking down there.” He asked Duffie to supply him with “further knowledge and assistance in guiding this vital and serious responsibility of caring for the spiritual and moral and intellectual training of our people.”

Leverman, clearly out of his depth, was relieved to be turning things over to Duffie. He concluded, “There is much to be done and I think it is providential you are coming.”

The Powers That Be

It is interesting to observe that the men who decided the future of higher education in New Brunswick were from Fredericton, Saint John, Halifax, Newfoundland, and Ontario. None had knowledge of or first-hand experience with St. Thomas or life on the Miramichi. The only person in the circle of authority who might have contributed such an understanding was the province's lieutenant-governor, Leonard O'Brien, a native of South Nelson, near Chatham, and former member of the St. Thomas board. O'Brien, however, was not consulted. The Church might have insisted on more consideration being given to the education of English-speaking Catholics in northern New Brunswick, but the Vatican left it in the hands of the bishop of Saint John.

For his part, Leverman was willing to give up the quest to keep St. Thomas in Chatham, particularly if it meant an institution of higher education in his home city of Saint John. Nothing, however, came of his hopes for Catholic higher education in New Brunswick's port city; he would have to make do in 1964 with an extension of UNB (to be known as UNBSJ). As for Duffie, not only was he not from Chatham, he was a city boy and unlikely to appreciate the rural attractions of the Miramichi. He had lived in Saint John, Halifax, Oxford, and Quebec City. Chatham in 1961 must have seemed on the outer edge of civilization. No wonder his personal preference was to live in a place like Fredericton, the provincial capital. It would have been surprising if, given the opportunity to engineer the move from Chatham, he had not worked to bring it about.

With hindsight, therefore, we can see that St. Thomas's fate was sealed by January 1961, even though it would not become public knowledge for another eighteen months. By June 1962, its future was officially fixed in the modern educational galaxy centred on Fredericton.

Mandate of the Deutsch Commission

On May 9, 1961, the premier's executive council officially announced the appointment of a "Royal

Commission on Higher Education in New Brunswick,” to be chaired by Prof. John Deutsch of Queen’s University. Deutsch was a highly competent administrator. He had a reputation for bringing people together to solve complicated administrative problems. J. Francis Leddy, president of the University of Windsor from 1964–78, knew Deutsch well. He said that Deutsch

had a most unusual gift, which always fascinated those of us who heard him analyzing a contentious problem, the answer which escaped the rest of us. He sorted out all the components, good or bad, with calm impartiality, and then charted the best way out of the puzzle, offering a solution that carried immediate conviction....His advice was always good. We often wondered, how did he do it? In retrospect, the answer must be that he possessed common sense, raised to an uncommon degree.

M. C. Urquhart, writing in *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, gives a similar evaluation, claiming that Deutsch’s versatility was

largely due to his capacity to recognize immediately the core of the problem, to sort out the essential from the non-essential. He had a most unusual ability to sense the heart of the problem at once. To all of these problems he brought a fine measure of plain common sense.

From the government’s point of view, Deutsch was an excellent choice for sorting out New Brunswick’s higher education. The other members of the commission were all from the Maritimes: Judge Adrien J. Cormier of Moncton, a prominent Acadian; Robert W. Maxwell, former director of the Carleton County Vocational School; and James O’Sullivan, who had spent a year working with the Treasury Board in Ottawa and was now completing graduate studies at UNB, and who was named the commission’s secretary.

The Deutsch Commission was asked to study “the Province’s resources in the field of higher education and their future development and utilisation.” It was also mandated to:

indicate how the future requirements of the Province in the field of higher education may best be met by the various institutions, and the role which the said institutions should play in meeting those requirements, so that the available resources of the Province can be used in the most efficient manner, and including, but in no way restricting the generality of this reference, the following matters:

(1) The financial relationship between the Provincial University of New Brunswick and the Government of New Brunswick, the relationship between the various Church supported

universities and the Government of New Brunswick, and the relationships which should develop between the University of New Brunswick and the various church supported universities keeping in mind the role which these universities must play in the development of higher education in both the Province and in the Atlantic region.

(2) The need for an institution of higher learning in the Saint John area, the kind of institution required, if any, and the relationship which such an institution, if required, should have to the other institutions of higher learning in the Province.

(3) The method of dealing with student loans and scholarship programs and the role which these programs should play in the future development of higher education in the province.

(4) Any other related matter which the Commission feels should be brought to the attention of the Government.

The fly in the ointment for St. Thomas was that none of the commissioners or their chief consultants were prepared to consider the view from the Miramichi. But now that the commission was finally in place, President Mackay got to work to ensure that he and UNB got what they wanted. He had three main concerns: to prevent St. Thomas from expanding in Chatham; to establish a Catholic presence on the Fredericton campus; and to prevent the creation of an independent educational institution in Saint John.

His friend and adviser Ritchie was especially interested in the second point, establishing a Catholic presence in Fredericton. In a letter dated May 23, 1961, he informed Mackay that he had “a fantastic talk” with Bishop Leverman at a dinner for the governor general in Saint John. Because “tongues were buzzing” and he wore “a hearing apparatus,” he could not guarantee that his recollections were “wholly accurate,” but nevertheless he was passing on what he thought he heard. He said the bishop told him that two or three years earlier, “before the enlargement of his diocese, and when the situation was less difficult than now,” he gave Mackay the green light to put the Basilians on the UNB campus. The bishop said that Mackay did not follow up on Beaverbrook’s offer to provide housing funds, and, in any case, the Basilians would not have come since according to the bishop, no vocations for the priesthood ever came from UNB’s Catholic students. When Chatham was transferred

to the Saint John diocese, Ritchie remembered that the bishop said the door was still open. Yet he apparently forgot all about that subsequently. Ritchie therefore now suggested to Mackay that he contact Leverman to see if some arrangement could be worked out with the Basilians. He admitted, "I find the Bishop difficult to carry on a conversation with," and furthermore, as Leverman seemed to have trouble remembering what was said, Mackay should contact the bishop by letter so that he would "have on record something concrete to which to refer." Ritchie closed his letter by telling Mackay, "It is your baby now. Try to find the time to bring it to a head."

Mackay replied on May 29, saying he was "astounded to hear His Excellency's [Leverman's] interpretation of their earlier meeting." He told Ritchie he would check his recollection of what the bishop said with Miss Lynch, who accompanied him at the meeting. At the moment he was extremely busy, but would write the bishop as soon as possible.

Whatever the situation regarding the Basilians, Mackay was eager to have St. Thomas come to the UNB campus. He needed to assure Duffie that funds would be available for construction of buildings. By now it was clear that UNB's and St. Thomas's erstwhile benefactor, Beaverbrook, was not interested in sponsoring new buildings, so Mackay investigated the possibility of securing federal loans. He informed Ritchie on July 12 that he had assurances that if St. Thomas were to move to the UNB campus, they would be eligible for federal loans for new buildings. That, he wrote, should help to persuade Leverman of their cause, since the bishop was always in need of cash for his diocese.

By summer 1961, the commission was hard at work. O'Sullivan remembers that they saw three main problems: postsecondary education in French, finding something for Saint John, and St. Thomas's plans to become a much larger institution in Chatham. Duffie, he remembers, was the sole negotiator for St. Thomas.

Indeed, while Duffie did keep Leverman informed about what was going on, he appears to have made most of the decisions himself. Leverman rarely questioned what he was doing. The commission's

deliberations, of course, remained hidden from everyone else at St. Thomas and on the Miramichi.

President Duffie

Duffie was comfortable operating in a twilight zone, especially where he held the only torch. That *modus operandi* was familiar to anyone working within the Catholic hierarchy, yet it struck a particular chord in Duffie's character. Now that he was St. Thomas's president, it showed in his style of governance. We might have expected him to begin his tenure by convening the board of governors, but sharing decisions with a board was not Duffie's style. It explains why he did not convene a board meeting until fall 1962, fully a year and a half into his presidency, and well after the Deutsch Commission had issued its final report.

As for the St. Thomas faculty, whether clerical or lay, they were neither members of the Church hierarchy nor leaders of the outside community. Thus Duffie had no obligation and indeed no intention of consulting them or sharing decision-making responsibility with them. It is true that McFadden had not been a model of consultative management, despite the bishop's occasional urgings. But McFadden's reluctance to share appears to have been based on a lack of self-confidence. Duffie, on the other hand, brimmed with self-confidence. He knew what he wanted for himself and for the university, and in steadfast executive fashion he carried on.

He arranged to meet the faculty on August 8, 1961, but the minutes of the meeting read more like a list of marching orders than a discussion of academic concerns. Duffie announced that he had appointed a committee on admissions composed of himself and six faculty members to "review and decide on candidates for admission to whom special consideration may be given." He announced that Bishop Leverman requested members of faculty who were priests to carry out their retreats on schedule and without fail, and that the bishop wished to receive notice in each case when retreats had been completed. Although expected, such accounting had rarely been enforced. Duffie informed faculty that

“the auditors of the University” (that would have been news to bursar McGrath) had set up a budget for the academic year 1961–62, and “the budget must be adhered to.” If anyone foresaw any extraordinary expenses they had to give notice now. Regarding vacations, “the President requested the members of the faculty to submit the dates of their vacation and the approximate place they might be. This applies particularly to the priests who are members of the Faculty.” Again, such accounting had not in the past been widely observed.

Duffie announced at the meeting that he was establishing an education department, to be headed by Fr. Edmund Casey, who was “to make a study of the facilities available and those able to be added in the immediate future.” Such new facilities for training teachers, he suggested, would bring many additional students to St. Thomas in 1962. What Duffie did not announce was his knowledge of Mackay’s and Deutsch’s plan to move the provincial Teachers’ College to the UNB campus, with the intention of allowing St. Thomas’s education students to transfer to and from it.

Finally, Duffie informed the meeting that “the Royal Commission on Higher Education” (the Deutsch Commission) would be visiting St. Thomas on August 21, “for informal discussions” and “inspection of the premises.” While faculty members were not asked to alter their plans, their various departments were to be “available for inspection.” There was no discussion of the commission’s work to date, despite Duffie’s knowledge that the commission was already intending to recommend moving St. Thomas entirely to Fredericton. He must have been nervous at the thought of an errant faculty member asking awkward questions or, worse, receiving disturbing answers from the commissioners. To guard against any such unwelcome exchanges, he would accompany the visitors and not let them out of his sight.

No other meeting of faculty took place for the next three years, until after St. Thomas had moved to Fredericton. Duffie preferred to deal one-on-one with the faculty.

Duffie Negotiates with the Commission

Each New Brunswick university was asked to submit a brief to the commission. Duffie prepared the one for St. Thomas. There is no evidence he consulted anyone other than Leverman in its preparation.

On November 22, Duffie sent Leverman a draft memorandum that commissioner Cormier had asked him to prepare concerning his understanding of the details of the potential agreement between St. Thomas and UNB. The agreement could be “further clarified and completed if we agree to negotiations.” Duffie told Leverman the accompanying draft contained what “Dr. Mackay’s Board of Governors” had agreed to as a basis for negotiations. According to Duffie, Deutsch “ordered” Mackay not to mention setting up a junior college in Saint John, although he, Duffie, told Cormier they were willing to negotiate the matter.

Leverman replied a week later, saying that what Duffie sent him appeared to be a “good foundation for negotiations.” He added: “The more I reflect on the matter, the more it seems to me, taking conditions into consideration and all the prospects of the immediate future, that we should make the move.” The bishop was still in his preferred position, sitting on a fence, while Duffie took the lead. Leverman concluded by expressing his appreciation for all Duffie’s efforts, which he was sure were “sincere and carefully weighed.” But he had chosen well. Duffie did not shrink from responsibility. So long as he had the bishop’s support, he was clearly in control of St. Thomas’s future.

The commission moved quickly to finalize a general memorandum of understanding concerning affiliation between St. Thomas and UNB, including a memorandum signed by Duffie and Mackay setting out the details. On December 1, 1961, O’Sullivan forwarded copies of these to Duffie and Mackay for their final approval at a meeting scheduled for December 14. Before that meeting could take place, O’Sullivan organized a meeting on December 5 between UNB’s Mackay and Ryan (dean of law) and St. Thomas’s Leverman and Duffie, to iron out details of the “junior college” in Saint John. Deutsch was concerned that he had given Leverman the wrong impression that the college in Saint

John would be a joint operation between St. Thomas and UNB, “St. Thomas having people teaching Philosophy and so on.” The commission, however, did not wish to see a facility in Saint John where university courses were conducted “in line with certain of the high schools where one wing is exclusively Protestant and one is exclusively Roman Catholic,” since that could create “considerable tension and conflict.” While the precise details remained to be worked out, O’Sullivan relayed Deutsch’s admonition that “the matter of standards must be controlled by UNB.”

There was also some concern in the commission as to whether or not St. Thomas should continue with the title “university” rather than “college” when it moved to the UNB campus, although it was prepared to live with the former if St. Thomas insisted. O’Sullivan wrote Mackay in his note about the meeting:

I think it is fair to say students will not pick St. Thomas (either university or college) in preference to St. Francis Xavier or St. Mary’s because it is St. Thomas, but largely because of the possible academic benefits which can derive from an association with UNB. I think that St. Thomas will become attractive only if their students are allowed to take quite a bit of their work at [UNB]. This comment is based on the assumption that St. Thomas is going to have considerable difficulty in strengthening the caliber of its faculty since a teaching Order is not running it.

As it turned out, O’Sullivan misjudged Duffie’s ability to attract both students and qualified new faculty once St. Thomas opened in its new quarters. For the moment, the issues of a junior college in Saint John and St. Thomas’s name were sorted out at the meeting on December 5—UNB would run the college in Saint John; St. Thomas would retain the title university.

On December 12, Deutsch paid a quick visit to the St. Thomas campus in Chatham. Duffie travelled with him back to Fredericton. On December 14, 1961, at ten o’clock in the morning, the commission met with the premier and presented him with the proposed agreement. In the evening of the same day, the commissioners met with the representatives of UNB (Mackay) and St. Thomas (Duffie) at the Lord Beaverbrook Hotel and put their signatures to the agreement.

Affiliation Agreement with UNB

The legal basis of the “Agreement of Affiliation between St. Thomas University and the University of New Brunswick” rested on the Acts of Incorporation of the two universities. Section 73 of the University of New Brunswick Act stipulated that “any college or university in the Province may be affiliated with the University, upon such terms and conditions...as the Board may think fit,” and that any such affiliated university shall have “the right...to make such provision in regard to religious instruction and religious worship for its own students as it may deem proper.” On St. Thomas’s part, section 1(b) of its Act of Incorporation allowed it “to affiliate with...any other college or university in any department...and to make such rules and ordinances for such affiliations...as from time to time may be deemed advisable.”

For the time being, the “agreement” was only a memorandum of understanding. Although duly signed by both parties—the presidents of the two universities—it could come into legal effect only after the Deutsch Commission published its final report and the government accepted its recommendations. Thus both Duffie and Mackay, as well as the commissioners and other members of the small circle of those in the know, had to keep mum. Nevertheless, since the agreement did eventually come into effect a year and a half later, it is worth looking at its provisions more closely.

The agreement determined not only St. Thomas’s legal status but also its physical appearance. In return for UNB’s agreement to lease some of its land—“as shown on the plan hereto annexed,” with “additional lands” as they may be required in future (these eventually included the entire southwest corner of the UNB campus)—St. Thomas agreed that the buildings it would construct on the property would “conform with the architectural design being developed by the University of New Brunswick for its own buildings.” This referred to Mackay’s adoption in 1957 of the Larson plan for new buildings at UNB. Devised by the noted American university architect J. Frederick Larson, the plan provided for an “academic village” of Neo-Georgian, red brick buildings, similar in design and overall placement to

those recently constructed at Colby College in Waterville, Maine, and Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire, as well as some recently constructed buildings at StFX in Antigonish.

In other matters, the agreement shows a concern by UNB to treat St. Thomas fairly in terms of its physical setting on the campus. (It also, of course, reflects Duffie's negotiating skills, for he knew well Mackay's eagerness to bring St. Thomas to UNB.) St. Thomas could make use of UNB's facilities and services, such as its "central heating, street lights and snow removal," at "mutually agreed upon costs." St. Thomas would also have the use of the UNB library, book store, student centre, gymnasium, and other facilities.

In academic matters, the agreement crucially affected St. Thomas's powers as an independent university. It would continue to set its own student admission regulations and "to control the content and administration of its programs." It would also continue to grant its own degrees "at the baccalaureate level in arts and education"—although not in physical education. St. Thomas, however, agreed "to hold in abeyance its other degree granting powers given by its Act of Incorporation and amendments, with the exception of honorary degrees." This refers to St. Thomas's previous authority when in Chatham to offer postgraduate degrees of "Master and Doctor in the several arts and faculties." After the move, in other words, St. Thomas would become a separate but strictly undergraduate university.

In other academic matters, the two universities agreed to "cooperate in the development of summer school and extension courses." What that would mean in practice was that St. Thomas continued, for a time, to offer some extension courses in Chatham, and that St. Thomas faculty could propose and offer courses in UNB's summer school and extension programs.

The agreement effectively put an end to Bishop Leverman's thoughts of establishing a junior college in Saint John. Mackay's determination to control postsecondary education in the port city was reflected in the article of the agreement that granted St. Thomas "the right to offer its courses through

the facilities of the University of New Brunswick in the City of Saint John” (soon to be called UNBSJ).

The wording of the agreement also subtly reflects Mackay’s—and indeed Duffie’s—doubts about the scholarly qualifications of St. Thomas faculty. Students enrolled in either university might take courses at the other, but “the crediting of such exchange courses towards degrees shall be subject to the approval of the University in which the student is enrolled.” “Roman Catholic and other students” at UNB would be “permitted to take philosophy and religion courses at St. Thomas University for credit,” but only “with the approval of the University of New Brunswick.” Furthermore, St. Thomas could offer courses for UNB credit in “medical ethics and psychology” to “Roman Catholic students enrolled in the Bachelor of Nursing program” at UNB, but only “provided such courses are given by professors whose qualifications are approved by the University of New Brunswick.”

Regarding student activities, St. Thomas students were promised “the use of all athletic facilities available” at UNB. They were to be charged the same fees as those for UNB students.

Concerning matters of university governance, both universities agreed to be responsible for their own business and financing. But in all other matters the two universities undertook “to develop full liaison with one another in the exercise of the powers, rights and privileges conferred upon them by their separate Acts of Incorporation.”

The final agreement, which became effective on July 1, 1963, would “continue in force and effect until such time as St. Thomas University either surrenders its charter or forfeits or surrenders its leasehold interest in the lands of the University of New Brunswick.”

Post-Agreement Concerns

Duffie naturally kept Bishop Leverman fully informed about the negotiations with UNB and the tentative agreement as it took shape. Although it had to be kept tightly under wraps, just knowing it was there made Leverman feel secure. He began making plans. For example, on December 27, 1961, he

wrote Duffie:

The Mother General [of the Sisters of Charity] is willing to build a residence for girls. This would solve a general problem—place for the nurses, Catholic girls taking courses—a place of their own. Sisters taking courses. I hope this will fit in the present plans.

Duffie meanwhile had heard directly from the Mother General, indicating that her organization was indeed willing to contribute funds toward a residence for Catholic women at St. Thomas. The residence would be built in Fredericton, not Chatham, but that detail would be withheld until St. Thomas's move was made public.

Leverman thought he should tell Beaverbrook about the plan to move St. Thomas, as his lordship had once offered to construct a building for St. Thomas students on the UNB campus. Could he be persuaded to build a men's residence for the new St. Thomas when it moved to Fredericton? Leverman made plans to stop in London on his way to Rome, where he and Duffie were headed for a visit to the Holy See, this time for an audience with the Holy Father himself, Pope John XXIII. He wrote Beaverbrook to inform him that the royal commission "has been working diligently" and that it was "possible that the future of St. Thomas University will be very different." He said he was aware of Beaverbrook's "keen interest in the Miramichi and the University" and wanted to acquaint him "with the possibilities ahead." If it suited His Lordship's schedule, he and Duffie, who would be accompanying him, could meet him in London on January 8, 1962.

Beaverbrook was in France at the time, but agreed to meet Leverman and Duffie in England "if urgent." The bishop responded that it was, so the meeting took place. The Rome-bound churchmen informed Beaverbrook of the recommendation that they knew to be forthcoming from the Deutsch Commission. After his return to New Brunswick, Leverman thanked Beaverbrook for his "gracious and warm hospitality," for his "kind understanding of the problems" that faced them, and for his "encouragement." It seems that financially the visit was a waste of time. Beaverbrook did not offer money to assist in the move. Eighty-two years old and unwell, Beaverbrook was no longer interested in

building a residence for Catholics on the UNB campus—if indeed he ever truly had been. His major project in New Brunswick now was his eponymous art gallery. Leverman had lauded Beaverbrook’s “keen interest in the Miramichi,” yet it was precisely that interest that attracted Beaverbrook to Chatham’s St. Thomas and its small band of dedicated teaching priests. It was precisely that interest that led him to befriend McFadden and accept an honorary doctorate and that persuaded him to build a hockey arena for St. Thomas there. It is doubtful that Beaverbrook received the news with equanimity that his only alma mater was to be removed in its entirety from the community of his youth. Mackay was not surprised that Beaverbrook made no financial commitment to the self-appointed clerical envoys, writing with some bitterness to commissioner Cormier that “so far he has given UNB only \$10,000” during his presidency. He was, however, pleased that they had gone to see him, since it would “alleviate any criticism, if such ever arose in the future.” Deutsch also was “not disappointed or even surprised” at Beaverbrook’s lack of enthusiasm or willingness to donate, as he wrote Cormier. Indeed, he was pleased because he could now tell the government, “and the government would be satisfied that there was no [alternate] financial means to move St. Thomas from Chatham to Fredericton.”

Duffie and Leverman Meet the Pope

In January 1962, Leverman and Duffie prepared for their audience with the Pope. They were escorted by a student from Saint John, twenty-two-year-old Noël Kinsella, who was in Rome after graduating from the National University of Ireland in Dublin studying theology at the Pontifical Lateran University and philosophy at Angelicum (the Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas). Kinsella remembers escorting the prelates to the papal apartments and helping prepare their official dress: the fuchsia sash of a papal chamberlain for the junior monsignor (Duffie) to wear around his black cassock (with red buttons) under a black cloak; the same outfit for the bishop (Leverman), but with the addition of the fuchsia neck band and fuchsia silk cloak of a residential ordinary. (Throughout his career,

Leverman was known to be fond of the trappings of his office. Students remembered their chancellor's dramatic fuchsia silk cloak at convocations in subsequent years.) The bishop entered Pope John XXIII's apartment first; toward the end of the audience, Duffie was ushered in. Kinsella, of course, had to wait outside.

Kinsella remembers the two men discussing the Deutsch Commission and the affiliation agreement between UNB and St. Thomas in the car both to and from the audience. We do not know, of course, if Leverman discussed the matter with the Pope, but if he did, it is likely that Pope John advised Leverman that as bishop of the diocese he was in charge, but to be sure to keep his apostolic delegate, the Vatican's representative in Canada, informed. We do know that Leverman, while in Rome, composed a lengthy report for Archbishop Sebastiano Baggio, the apostolic delegate of the Holy See in Ottawa. The report attempted to explain what was going on with respect to St. Thomas and the Deutsch Commission. Leverman wanted to ensure that church authorities would not present any future obstacles, and there is little doubt he sought Duffie's advice in composing the report.

The bishop described for Baggio the remit of the Deutsch Commission, whose members had carried out "a painstaking examination" of the various postsecondary educational institutions in New Brunswick. Fortunately, he wrote, there were "two Catholics on the commission who are concerned about the welfare of our college." He reminded Baggio that the Saint John diocese had taken possession of St. Thomas in 1959 and that he, Leverman, had started "to build up the place, which was in extremely poor physical condition." It had become clear, however,

that we were labouring in vain for we cannot compete with the modern level of education and the costs. The result is that students, and even from that area, are going either to a more recognized and equipped University or to the neutral universities....I had hoped and dreamed of my own college, but it came to a point where I could not cope with the developments of the years. I do not mean that we shall lose our college but it will have to be placed under different circumstances in order to save what we have and do the best for the many instead of a few.

The solution, he said, was to join with another university. Dr. Deutsch was convinced that unless St.

Thomas did something like that, it could not survive. Leverman explained that a tentative agreement had been drawn up, which the government appeared inclined to accept. The details of the agreement were confidential at present, but Leverman had consulted his priests “of known prudence and judgment, and they agree that we must make this move,” although for diplomatic reasons—with the exception of Duffie—none of the priests at St. Thomas had been consulted. He further explained that “a ‘sine qua non’ is that the Government must be prepared to compensate us for the buildings we have already on the campus of St. Thomas University. We would not engage in another project without this understanding.” The report of the royal commission, he wrote, was expected in late March or April.

Baggio, at least for the moment, was persuaded. He replied to Leverman:

Since it seems to be a matter of survival for your college, and as the conditions being given are favourable, I would personally have no objections to the transfer of St. Thomas College to the Campus of the University of New Brunswick.

He promised to send a favourable recommendation to the Sacred Congregation of Universities and Seminaries in Rome.

Leverman stayed in Rome and Duffie returned to New Brunswick. He reported to the bishop that the commission had met with Premier Robichaud and his cabinet to inform them of the proposal to move St. Thomas to Fredericton, at the government’s expense. Duffie wrote that his sources relayed the premier’s immediate response: “This will cost a lot of money.” But thereupon he was reassured by the minister of finance, Lestock DesBrisay, that “it is a good financial deal and in the end it will save the Province money.” The premier, wrote Duffie, was reported to have replied “he supposed so,” and in that manner the finances for the move were secured. Duffie, a seasoned negotiator, warned Leverman not to repeat it,

not even to your closest advisers because I know from experience that the Premier, if he ever heard it repeated, would react differently than political men ordinarily react, and perhaps with some unfavourable attitude towards us—in other words, I know that the one who has to be handled with kid gloves in the present circumstances is the Premier.

Everything seemed to be proceeding according to plan. Leverman wrote Duffie on February 2, 1962, that “the whole picture is gradually coming into focus and it looks like the future is clear, unless something unusual turns up.” He had instructed McFadden, now the university’s vice-chancellor, to keep track of every dollar spent on renovations or new expenditures. As he explained privately to Duffie, it would all be paid back when they moved.

Deutsch and his commissioners met on February 19, 1962, at Queen’s University to begin writing their final report.

False Assurances for Chatham

Duffie, knowing the government intended to purchase some or all of St. Thomas’s buildings, was keeping close track of expenditures in Chatham. He was particularly worried about McFadden’s arrangements with William “Pop” Kerr, the contractor for the new administration building. As Duffie explained to Leverman, he had “a very definite impression” that Kerr was accepting less money than he was due, “with the idea of making a contribution to the College.” Although such an arrangement had worked in the past at St. Thomas—indeed had demonstrated the community’s support for the institution—it could prove expensive when it came time to ask for recompense, because if true “his contribution should be added to the costs.” McFadden got deals from other suppliers who, like Kerr, cut prices to help out. Consequently, Duffie worried that it would be difficult to give the commission the exact value of the buildings in Chatham. Nevertheless, “between the books and the bank,” they might submit a figure of “some \$700,000 to \$775,000.”

Duffie had to keep these estimates, and indeed everything about the move, secret. So far only he, Leverman, Mackay, and the premier and his cabinet were privy to the conclusions of the Deutsch Commission. O’Sullivan, the secretary, remembers the deal-making atmosphere:

All sorts of deals were worked out to get all the agreements that were needed to get support for

all the recommendations of the Commission. All the recommendations were made clear to all the important parties involved. Deutsch had a meeting with Robichaud and explained what was coming because he wanted a deal. He was going to all the people. In those days it was possible to get deals. I mean the Bishop could commit the Diocese. Colin [Mackay] could commit UNB. The Head of the Eudist order, and Saint Joseph's, they could commit. You knew there'd be open covenants openly arrived at. This was a deal for all the parties.

I think that Deutsch really believed that this was good for the people, the young people of the province, and for the province itself. And he brought those people [in Chatham] around. While they had their own ambitions and had given a lot of themselves, and a lot of money to go in certain ways, this was the way they should go. His bottom line was, I will make sure you don't get any money from the government if you go it alone. But, you know he never spoke in those terms, but no one misunderstood. If you agree with this I will recommend it to the government. You know, it was pretty clear. So there was lots of behind the scenes activity.

O'Sullivan also remembered the implications for the Chatham community, the bridges that the deal-making promised to burn:

The government bought the buildings in Chatham so that the government would own them. That did two things. One, that took them away from the university in Chatham. But secondly, it gave money for St. Thomas to build in Fredericton. And that was a lot of money....That was in his mind, the cost of building new buildings and so that meant you could [re]move the obstacle. Well, where will we locate? On the land UNB will give you. A nominal rent? That was in the report, that was agreed, you will have the money to build your initial buildings in Fredericton. But we're not going to give you a grant, we're going to buy those buildings. The government would find something to do with them, would find something to put in them so that they would not be empty and a source of continuing rancour. You used to have a college but it's gone. And in the end I don't think much was done with them. Some of them, parts of them, were torn down. One building was incorporated eventually into the new community college.

Bishop Leverman played his part well. His actions and comments during the winter of 1961-62 strengthened the impression that St. Thomas would remain on the Miramichi. He supported the construction of new buildings, the hiring of new faculty, and the plans to send priests to graduate school. With considerable sangfroid, he indicated on several occasions from the pulpit of St. Michael's Basilica that St. Thomas would likely remain in Chatham for the foreseeable future. He asked the clergy of the diocese to lend their support and prayers to St. Thomas.

Duffie's actions likewise suggested a solid future for St. Thomas in Chatham. On land owned by the university, houses were being built for lay faculty. One was completed and two more were under construction. On October 7, 1961, Bishop Leverman turned the sod for the new alumni chapel and

unveiled the cornerstone of the new classroom building. Duffie was planning to renovate the old “Bishop’s Palace,” which had contained classrooms and residence space for male students, and turn it into a residence for female students. He told eight or nine girls who had applied for admission that there would be a residence for them the following year. Leverman, when he learned of these plans, said he hoped it could be done “without serious expense.” Duffie assured him that it could be done “at practically no cost whatsoever” by using men who were working there in the summer, with materials that “we already have at hand.”

Thus the staff at St. Thomas as well as Chatham area residents were understandably full of expectations for St. Thomas. Construction was continuing; there was not the slightest indication that their university was in danger. On January 31, 1962, Duffie, without irony, informed the bishop that “University life seems to be moving along unruffled except for the enthusiasm of Winter Carnival.”

Duffie’s Finesse

In February 1962, Duffie received a letter of complaint concerning what was being taught in a particular English class. It is worth quoting the correspondence at length to illustrate Duffie’s quick defence of his faculty and his relatively liberal, literally “catholic” attitude toward education. The complaint came from Paul B. Lordon, a Miramichi lawyer who occasionally taught courses in law at St. Thomas. He was upset about *A Casebook on the Beat*, a book being used in a literature course his son was taking. It is little wonder Lordon père was shocked. *Casebook* is a collection of thirty-nine excerpts from members of the “beat” generation, such as Jack Kerouac and Allen Ginsberg, whose precise aim was to shock the complacent and straitlaced middle class. Lordon wrote Duffie:

It is not possible to describe the depravity treated therein nor would I wish to do so. I feel that a perusal of one or two of the works such as the one on “Marriage” would be all that is required to give one an idea of it. I wish to point out that I have no desire to pose as a censor of the books used in the various courses at the University, but in this case I feel that it is a matter of conscience to make known a matter which has quite obviously been overlooked.

Duffie deftly parried Lordon's thrust. He began by thanking him for his interest in the courses being offered at the university. He proceeded to demonstrate the intellectual authority of his faculty, including himself:

In my position I must assume responsibility for the University, and I do. However, I may state that I was unaware of the book you note. Perhaps more so due to my absence in Europe at the time....I have been well aware that it is necessary to have a Curriculum Committee. It has been necessary to provide for some things gradually, and I was hoping to get through this year without one. A Curriculum Committee in a Catholic University should have well qualified men in the sciences, a sound authority in Theology, Philosophy and Law. Fr. [Winfield] Poole with his doctorate in Theology and Fr. [J. Edward] Troy with his doctorate in Philosophy will be here in September, and with my own Canon Law we shall be able to establish a sound Curriculum Committee.

Duffie explained to Lordon that following receipt of his letter he had read the book in question and agreed with him about the work on marriage, but went on to demonstrate the importance of open-mindedness:

It and one or two others, like [Ginsburg's] "Howl," are quite unnecessary, undignified and frustrating. There are some works in the book which, though somewhat senseless, are unobjectionable, and I do not find some of the analyses and commentaries unenlightening. The difficulty in a book which attempts to serve as an anthology is that it is always the question of whether the benefits can be obtained without harm from the disadvantageous section of the book, and whether or not the student can put aside the items when necessary that he should not read. I am inclined to go along with you that the depravity contained in the objectionable items and the lack of dignity will outweigh the benefits that can be obtained, but I must say that I have submitted the book to competent authority, and there is an opinion for the other side also. I think we have to keep in mind also that the professor does not necessarily approve what is written, and that it can be beneficial for a competent Christian professor to analyse the thoughts, history and background of this small minority whom the younger people talk so much about, and in some instances, are far too much attracted to without any realization of what their real type and philosophy are. Perhaps it is unfortunate that this particular book found its way into the course. The professor is a very excellent, highly practicing Catholic, whose example has done much good to many students. There is another book coming in for the course soon. If there is any damage, it already has been done. I feel that more harm could be done right at the present time by anything that would draw attention to the matter; I don't find that any of the students, other than those in the class, have been affected in any way; there has been no discussion on the book. Any that I questioned prudently were unaware of the book's existence. When this particular section of English reappears in the rotating program, the book will not be around.

Thus Duffie in the end agreed to remove the book but in the process demonstrated his natural political

abilities.

Requiem for St. Thomas

By the end of 1961, Duffie was in the middle of his first year on the job. By rights he should have called a meeting of the board of governors. The board missed its usual annual meeting in 1961, having last met in October 1960. Momentous changes were in the works. But neither Duffie nor Leverman was eager to divulge the news about St. Thomas's imminent move to Fredericton and be required to answer difficult questions. Instead, Duffie prepared and made public a president's report on the 1961–62 academic year. That way, he could say exactly what he wished and no more. Considering what he actually knew when he composed it—in March 1962, on the eve of the publication of the Deutsch Commission's explosive report—Duffie's report was a masterpiece of deception. Everyone connected to St. Thomas must have felt heartened by his words. The report is worth examining in detail, for it gives a detailed picture of St. Thomas in its last years in Chatham. In hindsight, it constitutes a requiem for St. Thomas on the Miramichi. Duffie begins by thanking “all those who have unselfishly contributed time and thought towards the physical, academic, and financial expansion confronting St. Thomas University.” No one important is left out. He acknowledges the board of governors, faculty, staff, alumni, St. Thomas Altar Society, Hôtel Dieu Sisters, Holy Name Society, Knights of Columbus, Catholic Women's League, Catholic Youth Organization, diocese of Saint John, high schools of the area, the people of Chatham and the Miramichi, and “all the men and women who have contributed in so many ways to our needs at St. Thomas.” He writes that he “would be remiss” if he did not acknowledge the university's debt to the mayors and councils of Chatham and Newcastle, the warden and councillors of Northumberland County, and the provincial and federal governments. He gives special thanks “to the various media of communications which have devoted space to St. Thomas University during the past year.” He adds:

To make mention of the growth of St. Thomas in these years without saluting the spirit and vision of those who preceded us in advanced education would be as ungracious as it would be unjust. Limited means have made necessary the slow growth of St. Thomas, but the sacrificial efforts of a devoted personnel and their friends have made possible the continuation of an institution of higher learning through the last decades.

He goes on to mention four men who died during the past year who contributed much to St.

Thomas: Bishop James Hill, rector, 1927–45; Rev. Charles O’Hanley, rector, 1945–48; Rev. Thomas Barry, professor, 1932–34; and Mr. F. Herbert Barry, former president of the St. Thomas alumni. Duffie also praises his predecessor, “Very Reverend A. Lynn McFadden, who completed his tenure as University president.” During McFadden’s term,

Considerable strides were made in improving the quality of the teaching staff by providing its members, both lay and clerical, with increased opportunities for graduate studies; the university library was reorganized and enlarged; existing buildings were repaired and the grounds improved and beautified; the Beaverbrook Arena was built; and the present expansion program was commenced. All of these projects were realized largely because Fr. McFadden took the initiative and pursued them to completion with keen persistence.

Next Duffie discusses the present state of affairs at St. Thomas. The high school program has been eliminated (as we saw, his idea). The last high school class graduated the previous spring, allowing the university henceforward to devote all its efforts to postsecondary education. Construction has begun on the new residence and administration buildings, which will be attached to the Scott Memorial Building, completed two years earlier. The residence will accommodate some 225 men in the coming academic year, a hundred more than lived in the old facilities. The old arts residence will be converted into a residence for “some thirty young ladies for the opening of the autumn semester” in 1962.

Concerning curriculum, Duffie continues, St. Thomas in the past conferred Bachelor degrees in arts, education, and science (nursing), as well as providing courses for the first year of engineering. In the new year the university will be adding a Bachelor of Teaching degree. The university has upgraded its division of academic subjects, minimum passing marks in examinations, requirements for

supplementary exams, and honours courses. The new program will be introduced in the coming summer school and fully operational by September 1962.

Concerning enrolment, Duffie mentions the recent rapid increase in St. Thomas's student body. In the present year (1961–62), there are 163 arts students, 96 in education, 27 in engineering, and 3 in science (nursing), for a total of 289. Thirteen others are taking part-time courses and 109 are taking evening classes, for an overall total of 411. The graduating class of 1962, he boasts, will be the largest ever to receive degrees from St. Thomas.

Furthermore, in February 1961 the university sponsored a community leadership course under the direction of Fr. Bernard Broderick, director of extension, in which 125 students participated in subjects such as community organization, discussion techniques, credit unions and cooperatives, forestry, and farming. The summer school program is also growing. In 1960, under the direction of Dr. Phonse Campbell of the English department, 95 registered; in 1961, some 111; even more are expected for the coming term, especially now that residence facilities are available for both men and women.

In the current year, *Tom Tom*, the first student poetry magazine, was published. University blazers, jackets, and crests have been standardized, and the first, "very successful" winter carnival was held.

Had he ended his report here, Duffie might have received public accolades, but it would shortly have been followed by widespread astonishment and incomprehension at the announcement of St. Thomas's relocation. Thus, perhaps to allow himself later to defend the removal of such a successful institution, he modulates from congratulation to caveat, releasing a flight of stormy petrels. Even though the new administration building will provide much-needed office space,

It will be possible only by considerable understanding to get through the next year or two with the present dining room and cafeteria facilities, and laboratory space is at a premium, not to mention the necessary scientific equipment which should be added.

Concerning problems with academic life at the university—with his inner eye fixed on the lure of the

library at UNB—Duffie warns that St. Thomas’s library facilities are “totally inadequate and, to keep abreast of present day requirements, the library holdings need to be immeasurably increased.” He is, of course, especially pleased with the “steady and continued improvement of academic standards” among the St. Thomas faculty. In the past year the university hired Dr. Leo Ferrari, who studied philosophy at the University of Sydney and Laval University; John Brander, who studied economics at UNB; and Pierre Sallenave, with postgraduate degrees “from three different French universities.” Furthermore, he writes, when classes resume in the fall of 1962, Rev. Dr. Winfield Poole, Rev. Dr. J. Edward Troy, and Rev. Vincent Donovan will all have returned from studies in the United States and Europe, “bringing with them a total of thirteen degrees in addition to their twelve years of Theological studies.” Replacements, however, are still to be found for two lay faculty members, Sheldon Currie, leaving to pursue doctoral studies, and Charles Dugas, leaving the staff permanently. And yet, he warns, improvement in the academic qualifications of St. Thomas’s faculty through graduate studies and additional hirings must continue whatever the cost if the institution is to maintain its status, much less advance, in the academic world.

Duffie concludes the report with the warning that St. Thomas University’s achievements have come at a high cost. The previous academic year (1960–61) ended with a sizable deficit; another is expected for the present year. In a final ironic and ominous twist, he ascribes the “brevity” of his lengthy report to the fact that he does not wish to “trespass in any way on matters now before the Royal Commission on Higher Education in New Brunswick.”

Rome Agrees to the Move

On March 7, 1962, Baggio wrote Leverman to say he had just received a letter from the cardinal prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Universities and Seminaries saying that “in his view of the difficult situation in which St. Thomas University finds itself, he has no objection to

the proposed solution of federating with the University of New Brunswick.”

While acknowledging “the many benefits that would accrue to St. Thomas by the federation,” His

Eminence, Cardinal Pizzardo, had

seen fit, nevertheless, to stress certain accompanying dangers that cannot be overlooked. Steps must be taken to assure that the beneficent influence to be exercised by the Diocese of St. John on the secular campus be not acquired at the price of allowing Catholic students to become lukewarm in matters of faith and doctrine. Moreover, the greatest care must be taken to see that the University of St. Thomas be not involved in local politics.

In fact, the University of St. Thomas was already deeply involved in local politics. But whatever the meaning of the obscure last sentence, Leverman expressed himself pleased with the response and assured Baggio that “the admonitions and counsels” of the cardinal would be observed. He added that “the very reason we believe we should go on the Campus is to off-set lukewarmness and indifference to Catholic faith.”

The Plot Finally Disclosed

By the spring of 1962 rumours were spreading that the recommendations of the Deutsch Commission were not by any means going to guarantee the future of St. Thomas in Chatham. Duffie himself had been forced to mention the move to some of his faculty. As he informed Leverman, the athletic director, Vance Toner, had been offered the same position at Dalhousie University, where he had been promised “three assistants and a secretary” and the rank of associate professor in the department of education. Toner agreed to stay on at St. Thomas on the understanding that he could have a year off to study for his doctorate in education, beginning in the fall of 1963, whereupon Duffie had to tell him of the “possible move” to UNB. Toner was against the idea but agreed to stay as athletics director for at least two more years. Duffie asked Toner not to talk about the move, but, he told the bishop, it was unlikely the latter would keep from discussing it with others. Duffie also wanted the bishop’s permission to send Fr. Edmund Casey, who was teaching courses in education and sociology, back to St. Louis University

to upgrade his MA to a PhD in sociology. Fr. Harrington previously taught the sociology courses, but, as the result of a stroke, could not do so again and certainly not if the university relocated. Duffie explained to Leverman the importance of having academically qualified priests for the move to Fredericton. He mentioned that Casey, a native of Chatham, understood the situation and was willing to undertake the study. On April 25, Duffie wrote Leverman to inform him of the “fair amount of discussion” in the Chatham area on the subject of a possible move. Dr. Edward Carten, who would receive an honorary degree at convocation and was scheduled to teach education courses at the summer school in 1962, had been appointed to a senior position in the Department of Education in Fredericton where, according to Carten, people were speaking openly about St. Thomas’s move to UNB. Others in Chatham reported similar rumours to Duffie, which, he told the bishop, he had neither confirmed nor denied.

Leverman also received an angry letter from McFadden, former rector and now “vice-chancellor” in charge of construction. He, too, had heard rumours about the recommendations of the Deutsch Commission and did not like what he heard. He made it clear to Duffie and now to the bishop that he was firmly opposed to any move to Fredericton. He demanded to know what was going on and what had been agreed to by the commission and the government. Leverman replied as soothingly, and as evasively, as possible. In a letter dated April 25, 1962, intending to stop McFadden from causing trouble, he counselled “calmness and objectivity.” In his most obfuscatory fashion, he wrote that there was no need to go into any details, since he had already explained “so many things.” He wrote that “you cannot discuss these questions with all the world,” and he was “not ready to discuss definite decisions. Telling half a story is telling nothing, and there are many who will talk.” He continued:

No definite decisions have been made, and nothing can be done until the Holy See permits it. There is a possibility of saving the College and enabling it to do the greatest good for the largest number of Catholic youth. It can retain its identity, receive assistance and take the offensive in Catholic thought and action.

Such equivocation only confirmed McFadden's worst fears. The remark about the Holy See was simply untrue, as the Congregation for Universities and Seminaries had already approved affiliation with UNB. And while it was technically accurate that "no definite decisions" had been made, in fact the ink was dry on the royal commission's report. All that remained was for the government to apply its stamp of approval. Leverman exhorted McFadden to

pray, cooperate and stand together. Interviews, with those studying the possibilities and unknown to the Bishop, can hardly be called cooperative and trusting. We must be careful that personalities enter not and cloud the issue. We must be careful lest loyalty (tinged with self) destroy the very thing we are trying to preserve.

In his letter, McFadden mentioned that some were accusing Duffie of being responsible for persuading the bishop to move St. Thomas to Fredericton. Leverman, his pride injured and obviously feeling guilty at the deception, took umbrage at McFadden's remark. He was the one, he protested, who made the decisions:

Let no one say that any particular person is pushing the Bishop. This I will not stand for. I am always willing to make and stand by my decisions and no one is making them for me. I do need help, advice and counsel, but the final word is the Bishop's, with the Holy See behind me.

If McFadden, continued Leverman, was truly interested in the future of St. Thomas, since he had "considerable influence," he was advised to display "calmness and objectivity." The bishop ended his letter with a veiled warning to keep quiet: "All the priests in the area must be one when a decision is made or we can ruin the real future of the College. All this does not prevent discussions and expression of ideas and opinions—that is important." Rumours naturally continued to spread. All that remained was to await the publication of the Deutsch Commission's report. With its release on June 21, 1962, all hell broke loose on the Miramichi.

To Arms

It confirmed the worst fears of the people on the Miramichi. On page 89 the report stated that the

commission understood “from officials of the two universities”—UNB and St. Thomas—that they had agreed to work out the details for a legally binding agreement of affiliation, with St. Thomas situated on the UNB campus in Fredericton. Bishop Leverman’s assurances that he would not take their university away were still ringing in people’s ears. It made little sense. A new building program on the campus was underway. Enrolment was up, new courses and programs had been announced, faculty and students had been promised a new and bright future. The future would be new for sure, but far from bright. Many felt betrayed by their bishop and by the new president, Msgr. Duffie. People all over the Miramichi region, including some faculty at St. Thomas, began voicing their opposition to the move and in particular to the actions of Leverman and Duffie. Duffie dealt with the opposition with the same steely resolve that he had shown during the covert negotiations.

Using the bishop’s imprimatur, Duffie replaced outspoken faculty. Fr. Thomas McKendy, teacher and librarian at St. Thomas for many years, received a letter from the bishop dated July 16 transferring him effective August 1 to the parish of St. Samuel’s in Douglastown as its pastor. Attempting to soften the blow, Leverman wrote that he did not want McKendy “to sever all connections with the University.” He was to consult with the president and “arrange for some teaching.” His appointment “could be reviewed” in a year’s time. His talents and experience were “too valuable to be dispensed with abruptly.” “I am confident,” added Leverman, “that you will be most willing to give some time to teaching, without interference with your essential duties as Pastor.” Leverman sent Duffie a copy of the letter.

In his obedient response to the bishop, McKendy thanked him for his “very generous” references to his teaching, adding:

If I have made any contribution I must always feel inadequate when I compare it to what St. Thomas has given to me. Those twenty-three years have had their hardships, their frustrations, and their disappointments, but above all they have been years of happiness and development in the companionship of priests and students and books. If your appointment calls me to another field of responsibility, it likewise engenders the hope of further priestly fulfillment and the

opportunity to try to put into practice some of the wonderful theory and liturgy with which it has been my privilege to be concerned during my years of teaching. I am very happy to be directed to continue some teaching duties as long as you may judge it to be suitable.

McKendy would in fact remain on faculty, teaching theology, until St. Thomas moved from Chatham.

Fr. Bernard Broderick was also relieved of his teaching duties and assigned to pastoral work elsewhere. For the moment, however, he remained on the board of governors, to Duffie's consternation.

In July 1962, Fr. Winfield Poole, who already possessed an STD (Doctorate of Sacred Theology) from the University of Montreal and had just completed his MA in mathematics at Fordham University, and Fr. J. Edward Troy, who had recently completed his doctorate in philosophy at Louvain University in Belgium, returned to find St. Thomas facing an uncertain future and boiling dissatisfaction among the faculty and in the community. Both Poole and Troy became outspoken critics not only of the move but also of Duffie and his *modus operandi*.

A community organization calling itself the "Friends of St. Thomas" formed specifically to prevent the removal of the university. On August 9 Leverman received a telegram with more than one hundred names calling on him to "Hold St. Thomas College" on the Miramichi. The signatories claimed that they had taken to heart "your previous public statements assuring us that St. Thomas University will remain in Chatham." Leverman forwarded the telegram to Duffie, commenting defensively that "in time things I pray will level out. If they had supported this place thru the years, this might never have occurred."

Premier Robichaud immediately called Leverman, Duffie, and Msgr. Charles Boyd, pastor of St Dunstan's church, to a special meeting with the treasury board and the minister of education. He informed them that his government was willing to implement the findings of the commission with regard to St. Thomas, but that it "would be done quietly and gradually to avoid all the disturbances the 'Friends of St. Thomas' were attempting to create." He referred to the statement he had sent earlier to all the university presidents that unless the universities accepted the findings of the royal commission,

they would get no provincial government monies.

The premier told the St. Thomas delegates to proceed with plans for moving the university. As Duffie wrote somewhat disingenuously a short while later, it was clear to him and Leverman at the meeting that as far as St. Thomas was concerned,

Unless it goes to Fredericton it will go out of existence. It is not a choice between St. Thomas existing in Chatham or existing in Fredericton: it is a choice between St. Thomas existing in Fredericton or not existing at all, any place.

Later that month, with resistance growing to the move in general and to affiliation with UNB in particular, Justice Ritchie wrote President Mackay at UNB suggesting that he put his public relations people to work so the newspapers could publish a series of articles describing the arrangement on campuses across Canada where Catholic colleges were successfully federated with provincial universities. Ritchie thought this might show the people of the Saint John diocese that the recommendations of the Deutsch Commission were not as radical as they thought. Mackay apparently took his advice. Early in October 1962, the Saint John *Telegraph Journal* published four articles about successful affiliations between church colleges and provincial universities, obviously attempting to demonstrate that the type of affiliation recommended for St. Thomas and UNB would be beneficial. But the demonstration was lost on the people of the Miramichi.

Ritchie also wrote that he thought Mackay should enlist Duffie's public support for the affiliation. Mackay replied on August 13 that he would talk with Duffie so that the two of them might "quiet the fears of any of the public who are apprehensive" over the report. The government, Mackay thought, was anxious to implement the report despite the fact that the cabinet "and everyone else" was wondering where the money would come from. "Off the record," he wrote Ritchie, the government was sitting on the horns of a dilemma, yet in the end it had no alternative but to implement the bulk of the report. If they mothballed it they would still have to pay UNB's operating deficit of nearly \$600,000 for the current year, as well as the deficit for the following year, which would be at least that much again.

In Mackay's opinion, the government was obliged to pay the deficits, and if they did they "could hardly refuse to give the other universities the funding recommended by the Commission."

Yet for political reasons the provincial government was reluctant to make a commitment, which meant that the objections of the Miramichiers continued to grow. On August 13, the executive of the Chatham unit of the St. Thomas Alumni Association sent a notice to alumni members. A reunion was scheduled for August 17–18. The executive asked those who wanted St. Thomas to remain in Chatham to attend a special meeting on Saturday, August 18, at 8:30 p.m. in the Arthur Scott Building. The plan was to "sponsor a resolution opposing the recommendation that St. Thomas move to Fredericton." Chief among the objections, according to the notice, was that "a Catholic university on [the UNB] campus, while not solving the 'Catholic problem' at UNB will add to the problem by making UNB seem safe for Catholics." Besides, Miramichi Catholics would "lose an advantage they've enjoyed for years without Catholic Education generally benefiting." At UNB, St. Thomas would be allowed to offer only BA, BT, and BEd degrees—no longer a BSc in nursing or a first year in engineering—and would have "no possibility of enlarging areas of teaching in future—no matter how great we grow."

The meeting took place as scheduled on August 18. According to the minutes, there was "full consideration" of the implications of moving the university. The consensus was that such a move

would not meet the requirements of the English-speaking Catholic population of New Brunswick for higher education in that (a) St. Thomas would eventually lose its identity as a Catholic university, in both a religious and academic sense; (b) over the years, St. Thomas has provided many vocations to the Catholic priesthood, this being in fact one of the prime purposes of the founding of the University by the late Bishop Barry, and we strongly feel that in another atmosphere there is a great likelihood that such vocations would fall off; (c) the entire Miramichi area and the Province of New Brunswick as a whole, would suffer a serious loss in its cultural life; and (d) we believe that any necessary improvements in the facilities of St. Thomas in Chatham could be made at a lesser cost than that entailed in the proposed transfer to Fredericton.

The resolution was passed unanimously and forwarded to Bishop Leverman. Copies went to Premier Robichaud, Minister of Education H. G. Irwin, and to the four MLAs for Northumberland. Shortly

afterwards, the municipal council of Northumberland County and Lillian Fleiger, president of the Chatham council of the Catholic Women's League of Canada, sent the government letters, with copies to Bishop Leverman, urging it not to support the removal of St. Thomas.

Damage Control

Leverman was greatly upset by what happened at the alumni meeting, no doubt because he understood that much of what they said would happen might well happen. Indeed the predictions proved accurate: over time St. Thomas in Fredericton would lose its identity as a Catholic university; its vocations would fall off; the Miramichi would suffer a serious loss in its cultural life. But the bishop was too deeply involved to withdraw now. He decided to use his episcopal authority to put a lid on the involvement of the clergy on the Miramichi in any activities designed to hinder St. Thomas's removal. On August 21, 1962, he sent the following proscriptive letter to every member of the Catholic clergy on the Miramichi:

In the light of recent events occasioned by the report of the Royal Commission on Higher Education in this Province, and by reason of individuals and groups who have organized, discussed and protested against any possible action in respect to the future of St. Thomas University in a possible transfer to another campus, and because such continued discussion may jeopardize and even close all doors against necessary and available negotiations and even place in grave danger the future of the said University, the Ordinary of this Diocese of Saint John, in his bounden duty to protect Catholic Education and to prevent disedification [sic] and possible scandal by seeming disunity, now declares and decrees by reason of his jurisdiction and authority to rule the Church of God in this Diocese, and gives the following direction and command to his priests:

Henceforth, all discussion shall cease concerning the problem at hand. Priests shall no longer organize, assist at meetings, permit, aid or abet groups of priests or lay people for purposes of protest or otherwise. The cause has been laid before you and fully discussed and debated and you have learned the mind of the Church in this grave and serious matter. Therefore, no form of communication shall be used to aggravate or promote further opposition. The matter now rests in the hands of authority which has the right and duty to form a judgment and make what decision seems necessary under the given circumstances. And therefore, no communication shall be sent to the governing body of this Province and thereby prejudice the case.

Also, since it has come to my attention that the various branches of the Holy Name Society have been or are to be approached to form protests, We as the spiritual Director of the

said Holy Name Society and all other such societies in this area and throughout the Diocese, forbid strictly and absolutely any such purpose of forming protestations. The Holy Name Society or any other society is not to be used as an instrument to settle Diocesan problems. There is an authority established for that purpose. The Holy Name Society and all like societies are spiritual organizations and are not established to express opinions on questions about which they have little knowledge and no competency.

The above order is of strict interpretation and is to be followed scrupulously immediately upon the reception of this letter. You are therefore directed to apply yourselves to your duties, whether parochial or professorial, with priestly zeal, humility and obedience, and to leave such vital and important decisions to the only and proper authority.

Let us, therefore, pray that when the time comes the Holy Spirit may direct, guide and give the light for a wise judgment. I am confident that you will follow the direction of this letter. May the prayer of Christ and of our Holy Father be realized, that unity and the bond of peace be with us always.

Leverman's gag order at least kept the priests out of the papers, although several continued to voice their objections and not always privately. It hardly stopped the public criticism and probably made things worse once the letter became known. Meetings were still held, and letters began to appear in the newspapers from former students and members of the "Friends of St. Thomas."

Opposition within the university also continued, although most of the priests obeyed the bishop and distanced themselves from the protests. One such priest was Fr. George Martin, who was registrar at the time and who supported keeping St. Thomas in Chatham. On August 19, Martin wrote in a memo to himself his views on the situation and his agonizing reasoning for withdrawing from any further involvement:

Granted that too rosy a picture was painted for moving to Fredericton, granted that there is real inconsistency in the Commission's application of the principle "Duplication is to be avoided," nevertheless, there is a case for moving to Fredericton, to which an unbiased mind could prudently adhere. There is, of course, a case for staying in Chatham. Acting upon the assumption that the choice between moving to Fredericton and staying in Chatham (in terms of what is best in the interests of Catholic education) is a very difficult one, since the Bishop is the one responsible for making a decision, we should let him decide and not pressure him to decide the way we think. Therefore, I am not going to take further part in any activity designed to bring pressure upon the Bishop to reach a decision favouring our side.

Assumptions: It is agreed that everyone wants the best for Catholic education in New Brunswick. In the present controversy we divided on the matter of means: (a) one side says go to Fredericton, (b) other says stay in Chatham. There is room for debate here. It is a prudential question. There was no debate. The secrecy of the affair smacked of conspiracy.

Complications. Passion as well as reason were involved—and naturally so.

But solution: Since the Bishop has the responsibility, he has the right to decide difficult things. Once the Bishop's decision is made known the faithful should not openly oppose his decision. It is unseemly for this to happen and it is a source of scandal.

But on the other hand the Bishop should avoid speaking of his decision as being the mind of the Church—and any other opinion as being something less than Catholic. Because his decision is not to be identified as the only decision open to an informed Catholic viewpoint, it is simply a practical judgment about what is to be done here & now. And it in no way shares the nature of a doctoral pronouncement. It is not *the* Catholic position. It is *a* Catholic position.

But because it is the Bishop's position it should be respected. Because his is the chief authority (and perhaps the only one) involved in making the decision, his decision should be accepted with what amount of good grace it is possible to muster for the occasion. One thing has to be made clear, does the Bishop want our cooperation, or is he going to use coercion? At what level are we going to work? If he wants to use his episcopal power to make the laity go along with the move to Fredericton, then let it be clear. And in that case he doesn't need anybody's consent. But if he is looking for the consent of the people, if he is asking his priests to obtain the free consent of the laity, then let him be satisfied with whatever limited success he can achieve this way. If he should begin by asking the concurrence of the people, and, not being satisfied with the response, should use coercion, then he will have committed a frightful blunder endangering the faith of many of his flock.

Martin was under particular pressure because his brother, Robert, was a leading opponent of the move. But he stuck by his decision. He refrained from further involvement in the attempt to keep St. Thomas in Chatham as well as in the subsequent effort to have the Miramichi declared a diocese separate from that of Saint John. He kept his peace and continued to do his job as registrar, working with the president, assisting with the plans to relocate the university. Some members of the opposition in Chatham, not appreciating the agony of Martin's decision, naturally felt he had sold out.

Public opposition continuing, Leverman became increasingly concerned. Clearly feeling out of his depth, on August 31 he composed another nervous letter to the clergy on the Miramichi, which read as follows:

In my desperate efforts to save St. Thomas University and for the cause of Catholic Education I must appeal to you for your vision, assistance and strength.

The future of St. Thomas is in danger. We cannot maintain and bring our College up to even minimum standards without public assistance.

I must pay attention to serious opinions which come from the Hierarchy, educational experts and prudent persons.

Matters have been explained to you in detail and you know my mind and the mind of the Church. It is for us to act courageously, with confidence in God and with trust and unity in your Bishop.

There is a danger that organizations now forming can present a picture that is not correct nor expressing the minds of all people. Should such presentations or protestations reach a point where the Government will not implement the recommendations that have been made, then all doors are closed, with no further opportunity for negotiations; we would be left on our own and it is the serious conviction of serious men from walks of life stated above that in a short time, relatively speaking, we would have to close the doors of our College. Some do not realize how serious this danger is and how close they can come to ruining the very institution they seek to defend.

You will now take positive action and explain to your people and groups of all kinds that the Bishop is the one to decide such serious problems. You are to do this on Sunday, September 2, or on Sunday, September 9. There need not be a long dissertation but merely a short statement.

In the meantime, speak to individuals and groups, following of course the rule laid down in my previous letter. We have come to a point where we must stand firmly together and show confidence and strength.

You are “the salt of the earth” and “the light of the world.” Therefore in this time of trial you will manifest that priestly confidence in your Bishop and lead the people in the way of truth and along the road of enlightenment.

Into the Trenches

The Catholic priests under this barrage of orders remained relatively quiet, but the Catholic laity on the Miramichi would not be hushed. A leading member of the community and outspoken opponent of the move, lawyer and St. Thomas graduate Paul Lordon—the same Paul Lordon involved in the altercation with Duffie over beatniks—wrote Leverman on August 31, 1962, to inform him of “certain action” he proposed to take. He was informing the bishop ahead of time so that he would not be taken by surprise. He mentioned “a number of social, economic, ethnic and political factors” involved in the proposal to move St. Thomas that had not been given sufficient attention. He was therefore planning a series of eight or ten fifteen-minute radio broadcasts in September to explain these issues. He was doing this, he pointed out, on his own and was not being sponsored by any other person or association.

For all that Lordon said he was doing it on his own, opposition to the move was well-nigh universal on the Miramichi. Leverman and Duffie had to look elsewhere for allies. They were not hard to find in Fredericton. The dean of law at UNB, William Ryan—the person who recommended Deutsch

to Robichaud in the first place—wrote Leverman on August 22, 1962. Ryan hoped the bishop would not consider his letter “presumptuous,” but he wished to lend his support in implementing the recommendations of the Deutsch Commission. He reassured the bishop that he personally found convincing the reasons given for the move. English-speaking Catholic students would benefit from the extensive laboratory and technical facilities of UNB and would be able to receive a first-rate education in the pure and applied sciences. At the same time, by attending an affiliated St. Thomas, they could receive training in religion and scholastic philosophy. The move would also open up possibilities in the social sciences. Ryan saw the report of the Deutsch Commission as “a new point of departure” and felt that the “common good of the Diocese should be the overriding consideration.” He wanted Leverman to know that “there are at least some—and, I suspect, many—who are deeply concerned that a magnificent opportunity be not lost.”

The letter must have cheered Leverman. On September 4 he replied:

My purpose and decision is to afford to the greater number of our Catholic men and women an opportunity to secure training in Religion and Philosophy and more ready availability to the sciences. It is evident now that we cannot sustain even the minimum standards because our potential is so limited.

He also told Ryan he wished he had “a few men of your vision of things in the area concerned.” The people of Chatham, he wrote, were “limited to the district and cannot see the greater good, but only what immediately concerns them.” He admitted that the opposition was “severe” and the outcome at this stage unsure, but the opinion of “reliable sources” was that the welfare of the college could not be sustained in Chatham. He also had “the best of opinions” behind him for the move as well as “the sanction of higher authorities.” He, too, had been concerned about the great number of Catholics attending UNB for whom the diocese was doing too little.

Uncertainty in the Government

By early September 1962 the cabinet was still considering the recommendations of the Deutsch Commission. Mackay wrote Deutsch on September 4 that the minister of education had informed him the government might not be able to implement all the recommendations at once. He also wrote that the Miramichi people “have begun to kick up their heels.” Although Duffie had issued a statement in favour of the move and Leverman was standing firm, “the Premier is not.” The latter, Mackay thought, was worried about losing the four seats in Northumberland County, especially since a former (Conservative) MLA, Robert Martin (Fr. George Martin’s brother), was leading the charge.

Politically, things were hanging in the balance. Duffie, through his brothers William (the cabinet minister) and Ted (the MLA), had excellent contacts with the government, and he used them to advantage. He visited Fredericton in early September. As he informed Leverman, he discovered that a cabinet meeting to discuss the commission’s recommendations had been cancelled. But, reported Duffie, he had learned that Mackay visited Henry Irwin, minister of education, and “explained the whole situation.” Mackay also spoke to Beaverbrook but did not “get much satisfaction.” Alarming, Beaverbrook was concerned about all the opposition, having received letters himself.

Duffie reported that his brother Ted was busy as well and had visited André Richard, also a member of cabinet, who had been “at one time or another, somewhat of a holdout.” Richard persuaded the premier to talk to Ted. When his brother eventually got in to see Robichaud, Duffie reported, he “found him in one of his happiest moods since the election.” The premier told Ted Duffie that “he wanted to do what was right for education, and wanted a good educational program.” He was being “pressed by many quarters” in Northumberland County, receiving letters of protest, including ones from “a couple of priests.” He also received a letter from Lillian Fleiger, of the Catholic Women’s League in Chatham, to which he replied on September 4 that the location of St. Thomas University was “a matter for decision solely by those responsible for the administration of that institution of higher learning.” He told the group to express its views directly to those responsible for the administration of

the university. He concluded: "May I assure your Council that this Government will not attempt, under any circumstances, to direct the removal of St. Thomas University to any other than its present site."

Duffie reported to Leverman that Robichaud admitted to his brother Ted that it would be difficult to remove St. Thomas, but "if the Bishop and Msgr. Duffie wished to take the initiative," everything would work out. Duffie also relayed to the bishop the premier's remark "that [the bishop's] office was appointive for life, and his was elective and for a limited duration." The premier appeared to have been pleased with a recent piece Duffie wrote for the *Telegraph Journal*, calling it "an immense help to him." Duffie informed Leverman that the premier told his brother William that "he would be willing to go along with the Report" if Leverman would make a statement to the press similar to Duffie's, and if Duffie would make another statement to the press outlining the educational content of the report as it affected St. Thomas. According to Duffie's brother, Robichaud was worried that "many people were still under the impression that St. Thomas was being obliterated and completely absorbed into the University of New Brunswick." Duffie informed Leverman that he told his brother to tell the premier they would do as he suggested, so long as he "would give a guarantee that he would accept the Report and not leave us stranded." Robichaud replied, "I give you my guarantee that if they make these two statements, the Report will be implemented in its entirety."

Later Duffie heard from his brother William what transpired at the next cabinet meeting. The premier began the meeting by saying, "We have the matter of the Royal Commission on Education, and I want to implement what is best for education in New Brunswick. And I think that the uproar in Chatham will subside in a short while." André Richard spoke up to say that the report had to be implemented in its entirety. Irwin and DesBrisay, minister of finance, then declared: "Let us release the thing tonight," whereupon the premier said: "Not so fast. If anyone else wants to say anything, say it." At that point, wrote Duffie to Leverman,

My brother [William] said that you would be making a statement shortly, and that I would be

dealing with the Report in the first speech that I made. The Premier then turned to the Honourable Graham Crocker, from Newcastle, who is spokesman for the Liberal party in Northumberland County, and Mr. Crocker said: "This is acceptable to me, and I am now willing to go along with it." Mr. DesBrisay said: "Let us publish the thing tonight," [but] the Premier said "Mr. DesBrisay, you have another matter for consideration by the Cabinet," and the whole matter dropped there.

The premier was being his usual cautious self. But Duffie maintained that in his brother's opinion, if the bishop were to issue a statement "this week or in the Monday papers," the premier might release a statement to the press before leaving for Italy. It seemed, wrote Duffie to Leverman, that everything was now settled. "The thing will work this way," his brother had told him:

The Government will give all the monies stated in the Report for the purposes of higher education in New Brunswick. What we do and where we go is our business. We move to Fredericton and the money is there for us, but the government will never say or allow it to be said that they are forcing us to go to Fredericton or are moving us to Fredericton. It would be suicide for the Liberals in this section; and if a Conservative Government came into power, the same thing would apply to them.

Regrouping the Troops

Leverman wrote another letter to Dean of Law Ryan telling him about the proposed "federation." Ryan replied that he realized "the grave problems" facing the bishop. A major problem as he saw it was "to persuade the government that courageous leadership is required of them." He pointed out that, as Leverman was aware, there were many Irish Catholics in the diocese who were convinced of the importance of the federation. The problem was "to mobilise this opinion and to bring it to bear at the points where it is most needed." He was ready to help but had hesitated "to take any initiative" for fear he might interfere with Leverman's plans. He offered to meet with Leverman to discuss the situation. He had already been talking to Mackay, who was "not taking any stand at the moment." Ryan told Leverman he admired Duffie's "firm and courageous statement to the press" and was "ready—indeed anxious—to cooperate."

Ryan was being diplomatic. He understood that the indecisive bishop indeed had no plans. As for Mackay, he was pleased that Leverman seemed to be taking a firm stand but felt the premier was not. As he wrote Deutsch, “[The premier] is worried about the four seats in Northumberland County and since the former Conservative MLA Robert Martin is heading the opposition, he has become alarmed over the whole business.” To which Deutsch replied:

Of course we had anticipated that there would be local opposition but had hoped that larger consideration would prevail. We had urged the government to take a positive attitude on the matter so as not to get into a defensive position. I gather their slowness has placed them into a defensive posture. However, I hope that the government will yet decide to work out your program of future development with some assurance. I hope the government will realize that there are matters of very considerable importance to the welfare of the province and its citizens.

In the campaign to move St. Thomas, everyone looked to Leverman for leadership. Duffie, his able lieutenant, could only do so much. Shortly after his long letter of intelligence about government thinking, Duffie wrote Leverman another, shorter letter following up on their telephone discussion of the night before, trying to impress upon his superior the need for decisive action: “The principal thing is that we give an unqualified statement of acceptance of the Royal Commission Report and make it plain that we have decided and intend to move to Fredericton.”

Finally spurred to action, Leverman released an affirmative statement about the need for the move. Ryan wrote to cheer him on: “This—if I may say so—is the firm, progressive and courageous leadership that we so urgently need.” Mackay’s friend Ritchie, on September 10, also wrote to pat the bishop on the back for his “ready acceptance” of the Deutsch Commission’s recommendations. In his exhortatory enthusiasm, Ritchie pronounced that it was “an irresponsible and selfish group in Northumberland County” that was opposing the transfer of St. Thomas to Fredericton. He praised Leverman for the sermons he delivered in Chatham on September 9, reported in the local papers, which “carried the hall-mark of firm dignity” and “should, but may not, still the irrational mouthings emanating from the Chatham area.”

The general's lieutenants were still debating how to stiffen their leader's backbone. On

September 17, Mackay wrote Deutsch:

A strong statement by the Bishop has quieted the vocal and official opposition but I gather the Miramichi continues to seethe beneath the surface. Duffie's statement was a bit too strong and has stirred up considerable resentment among the locals who regard him as something of a new-comer to the scene....The devious way in which the politicians play lip service to the report has me worried and I would expect it will be some weeks before we can tell whether or not we are going to be able to get on with the job. If they don't implement the report then they are stuck with our present financial problems and if they pay off our bills without giving anything to the others, then there will be a growl from the remaining institutions in the province. It seems that you have placed the government in a bit of a box (which is a very good thing), and so I continue to hope that all will work out for the best.

Duffie, writing to Ryan, said he thought Leverman's sermons in Chatham on September 9 had "a good effect" and that as a result the situation in Chatham seemed quieter. He warned Ryan, however, that any "overt lay action in the Saint John and Fredericton area might be unwise at present." Ryan replied that he thought it might be strategically advisable for the bishop to make a formal request to the premier to implement the commission's recommendation. Such a request, he told Duffie, should be supported by a formal resolution of St. Thomas's board of governors in favour of moving the university to Fredericton. If Duffie could arrange that, it would be "almost inconceivable" that the government could refuse the bishop's request "if the other recommendations of the Commission are implemented."

Ryan's suggestion made sense, but it presented the chancellor and president with a dilemma. Their strategy was to adopt a firm, authoritarian approach, first keeping the plan to move the university secret until the decision was effectively made, then using episcopal authority to muzzle objections from the priests. Yet St. Thomas's board was composed mainly of persons from the Chatham area. Only six of the thirteen members were priests, and the hearts of three of those priests (Harrington, McGrath, and Broderick) were clearly planted in Chatham. Not only was the board likely not to endorse a motion to support the commission's recommendations, there was a danger it might vote *against* them. Duffie was a superb strategist, but even he had to recognize the limits of the authority of himself as president and

of the bishop as chancellor when set against the authority of the university's legal board.

Appendix to Chapter 7

John J. Deutsch. Deutsch had spent over twenty years in public service as a member of the research department of the Bank of Canada (1936-42), as special assistant to the Department of External Affairs (1942-44), as Director of the International Economic Relations division of the Department of Finance (1944-53), and as Secretary of the Treasury Board (1954-56). He had also served on numerous royal commissions, commissions of inquiry, and advisory commissions. In 1959, after three years as Head of the Department of Economics at UBC, he had been recruited by the Principal of Queen's University to overhaul the university's financial management and administration.

UNB Symposium. In October 1989 the University of New Brunswick sponsored a symposium entitled "Shaping the System: Higher Education in New Brunswick." One of the major topics discussed was the Deutsch Commission and its recommendations. At one of the panel discussions, former premier Robichaud remarked that higher education in New Brunswick was in "a chaotic state" in the 1960s. UNB was getting the support it wanted from government, but not the other universities and colleges. All were having trouble surviving and no one was sure of what had to be done. At the 1989 symposium, Mackay claimed that "Msgr. Duffie triggered the move of St. Thomas to Fredericton." Duffie had been in favour of the move, he said, had talked to Deutsch, and had then told Leverman that if they did not move St. Thomas to Fredericton Mackay was going to ask the Basilians to set up a Catholic college in Fredericton. Leverman had responded that Mackay could not do so without his permission, whereupon Duffie had told him that if Leverman opposed the move, Mackay had threatened to issue a statement saying that the Bishop was opposed to having a Catholic college on the UNB campus.

St. Thomas Faculty

The faculty in 1960-1961:

Rev. Bernard M. Broderick, MA(NotreDame)	Education
J. Edward P. Butler, MA (STU)	History
Alphonsus P. Campbell, PhD (Fordham)	English
Rev. Edmund J. Casey, BA (STU), MEd (SLU)	Education
Leonard E. Doucette, BA (London), Cand PhD (Brown)	Latin & Mdn Langs
Charles Dugas, BSc (StFX)	Physics & Biology
Rev. George J. Harrington, MA (Catholic Univ of America)	Philosophy
Very Rev. A. Lynn McFadden, MA	History
Rev. Henry W. McGrath, BA (STU)	Chemistry
Rev. Francis McGrath, BA (STU)	Economics
Rev. Thomas J. McKendy, BA (STU), MSc (Fordham)	Religion
Rev. George W. Martin, BA(STU)	English
Rev. J. Winfield Poole, BA (StJoseph's), BEd (STU),	

STD (UofMontreal)
 Capt. Wallace Power
 Richard Toner, BSc(StFX)
 Vance E. Toner, BA (STU), MS (Springfield)
 Rev. J. Edward Troy, BA(STU), PhL(Louvain)

Mathematics
 Military Training
 Mathematics
 Phys Education
 Philosophy

The faculty in 1961-1962 [new additions in bold type]:

John R. G. Brander, BA (UNB), MA (Queens)
 J. Edward P. Butler, MA (STU)
 Rev. Edmund J. Casey, BA (STU), MEd (SLU)
J. Sheldon Currie, BA (StFX), MA (UNB)
 Leonard E. Doucette, BA (London), Cand PhD (Brown)
 Msgr. **Donald Duffie**, BA (St. Joseph's), BCL (UNB),
 BCL (Oxford), JCD (Laval)
 Charles Dugas, BSc (StFX)
Leo Ferrari, BSc (Sydney), PhD (Laval)
 Rev. George J. Harrington, MA (Catholic Univ of America)
 Very Re A. Lynn McFadden, MA
 Rev. Henry W. McGrath, BA (STU)
 Rev. Francis McGrath, BA (STU)
 Rev. Thomas J. McKendy, BA (STU), MSc (Fordham)
 Rev. J. Winfield Poole, BA (St. Joseph's), BEd (STU),
 STD (U of Montreal)
 Capt. Wallace Power
Pierre Sallenave, BA (Potiers)
 Richard Toner, BSc(StFX)
 Vance E. Toner, BA (STU), MS (Springfield)
 Rev. J. Edward Troy, BA(STU), PhL(Louvain)

Economics
 History
 Education
 English
 Latin & Mdn Langs
 Political Science
 Physics & Biology
 Philosophy
 Philosophy
 History
 Chemistry
 Economics
 Religion
 Mathematics
 Military Training
 French & Spanish
 Mathematics
 Phys Education
 Philosophy

Sources, Chapter 7

For the material in this chapter, extensive use was made of the written correspondence of Bishop Alfred Leverman, Fr. Lynn McFadden, Msgr. Donald C. Duffie, and Fr. George Martin, 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]. Use was also made of Lord Beaverbrook's correspondence and Colin B. Mackay's correspondence, also located in PANB.

Other sources used were:

Minutes of the Board of St. Thomas University, 1960-62.

St. Thomas College Calendars, 1960-62.

The Aquinian 1960-62.

Legislation establishing the Deutsch Commission, 9 May 1961.

Leddy, J. Francis [article on John J. Deutsch, *DCB*]

Leroux, John, *Building a University: The Architecture of UNB* (Fredericton, Goose Lane, 2010).

Symposium on Higher Education re the Deutsch Commission, UNB, 1989.

Ryan, William F., "The University of New Brunswick Faculty of Law,"

University of Toronto Law Journal, 1965, p. 172.

Urquhart, M.C. "John James Deutsch," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*.

Contemporary accounts in the following newspapers:

The *Chatham Gazette*

The *Fredericton Daily Gleaner*

The *Saint John Daily Telegraph*

Personal interviews with the following:

James O'Sullivan, former member of the Deutsch Commission

-Much useful biographical information about people who lived in the Miramichi area can be found in W.D.Hamilton, *Dictionary of Miramichi Biography*. Saint John, 1997.

-Other useful biographical information can be found in the Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online (www.biographi.ca); and *The Canadian Encyclopedia* (www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com)