

CHAPTER 9

BETWIXT AND BETWEEN: ST. THOMAS 1963-1964

A Family Affair

From the time of Bishop Rogers, through that of Bishop Barry and the Basilian Fathers, through the prewar, wartime, and postwar years, St. Thomas had been run essentially as a family affair, with all the personal warmth, attention, and indeed affection that family members feel for one another. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, however, the family came under stress. Most of these difficulties remained hidden from the students. Enrolment continued to grow, the faculty continued to dedicate themselves to their teaching, student activities flourished, the hockey team became the Maritime champions. Many parents and alumni, however, began to have grave forebodings about the future of St. Thomas, to the extent of expressing publicly doubts about the university's leadership. The memories of persons interviewed years later, people who had been students during that time, are naturally coloured and dominated by the knowledge of the university's physical relocation in 1964. All the same, most alumni remember those years less as a time of crisis than as a time of anticipation, adventure, and opportunity. But then, most students would accompany St. Thomas to its new home. Many parents, local alumni, and some unhappy teacher-priests would stay behind on the Miramichi, bereft of a revered, century-old institution.

For those charged with administering St. Thomas, 1963 was the most difficult year. Few could have predicted the outcome of the struggle over its future. Msgr. Donald Duffie spent his first year and a half as president laying the groundwork for the task of moving St. Thomas from Chatham to

Fredericton. At the start of 1963, his campaign was by no means won. Opposition to the move welled up when he finally revealed his plans. As it boiled over, both the provincial government and the hierarchy of the Catholic Church were forced to reassess their earlier support for the move. If the support of either party faltered, Duffie's plans would crumble. The government, maddeningly, refused to publicly and categorically support the move. And the authorities of the church that Duffie served were contemplating removing him from the scene altogether, and they unquestionably had the authority to do so. Without his steady—some said tactless and unfeeling—hand at the wheel, St. Thomas would surely remain in Chatham. Even Bishop Leverman, its de facto head (pending amendment of the university's Act of Incorporation, he had yet to be named officially a member of its board, and thereby its chancellor), seemed to be wavering, no matter how much enticement and support UNB's president and its friends were offering. The bishop's grandiose plans for the "little college" over which he had such fond hopes of presiding were in danger of falling apart.

Referring to Duffie, on January 11, 1963, Leverman admitted, "It may now be wise to remove him." Yet the path that, as we have seen, he alone paved—from his secretly engineering the diocesan transfer of Chatham from Bathurst to Saint John in the years 1953–59, to his appointing in 1960–61 a tough political strategist as St. Thomas's president—had an ineluctable logic that he could no longer abandon even had he wished to do so. He finally made up his mind to stand fully behind Duffie.

The two men did have outspoken and powerful supporters for their project, most notably the president of UNB, Colin B. Mackay. Another was Justice Louis Ritchie, who had long been offering advice (sometimes solicited, sometimes not) to Leverman and Duffie on the need to relocate St. Thomas. On January 29, 1963, at the height of the bishop's difficulties with the Holy See, Ritchie wrote Leverman a long letter of encouragement. It was "apparent to all who cared to see that the effort to maintain a university at Chatham was making the same progress as a man swimming against the tide and not even holding his own." He told the bishop that St. Thomas was

fortunate to have a President of Monsignor Duffie's calibre to handle the present crisis. He is the first President who has had the courage to take a realistic look at the situation and face up to the facts. The expression of any view contrary to a segment of local opinion always invites attack but rarely of such a scurrilous nature as that which the Friends [of St. Thomas] have directed at Msgr. Duffie, the members of the Deutsch Commission and others. Unfortunately, and to their shame, some priests have associated themselves with those attacks. The irresponsible tactics of the Friends, however, have boomeranged. They have antagonized all right thinking men and women. Outside of their own circle they are regarded as good material for funny stories. A number of their speeches, statements to the press, and "letters to the editor" have been incoherently illogical.

Some Friends called UNB "a godless institution" and "a den of atheists" in spite of the fact that a considerable number of faculty were Catholics or married to Catholics. What the Friends were saying about UNB, Ritchie declared, was simply untrue. Turning the bishop's mind to his opponents within the St. Thomas faculty, Ritchie continued:

A pungent criticism of the St. Thomas professorial staff that sticks in my mind is that they are "too inbred." When I sought explanation of that assertion, I was told a considerable percentage of the faculty was comprised of priests who had been born in Northumberland County or in that vicinity, who had been educated at St. Thomas and a seminary, and who, after ordination, had immediately returned to teach at St. Thomas, without rubbing shoulders with the outside world. The great majority of the Friends have not traveled too far from Chatham.

The pots, according to Ritchie, were calling the kettles black. And indeed, the Friends were wrong to suggest that St. Thomas's faculty had never left the Miramichi. Of the seventeen priests teaching at St. Thomas in the years 1960-64, thirteen had done graduate work outside of Canada in places like New York, St. Louis, Notre Dame, Oxford, and Louvain. The apparent ringleader of the protesting priest-professors, J. Winfield Poole, was born in Millville, near St. Stephen, in southern New Brunswick, received his undergraduate education at St. Joseph's, and did graduate studies at the University of Montreal and Fordham University in New York. Duffie had recently hired Hafeez Alexander, a young Lebanese Catholic and a PhD candidate at the University of Ottawa, to teach political science. Fenton Burke, a young Catholic from Cape Breton, a graduate of StFX, who had recently received an MA at UNB, was teaching English literature. Duffie was especially proud to have engaged Fr. Kandathil, with his PhD from Notre Dame, to take over teaching chemistry at St. Thomas.

Nevertheless, the battle was still being waged and hyperbole was inevitable. The bishop wrote Ritchie back a few days later: “Because of the persistence of poorly visioned people, the normal difficult problem of transferring a University to another city has been greatly aggravated and stirred up feelings to an overwhelming degree.” He agreed with Ritchie that

we are faced with a definite issue which does not admit of compromise—either we make a deeply radical change or we lose what we have and perhaps for indefinite time, the opportunity to do something for English-speaking higher education in this Province. And it is a question of Catholic education at that.

Leverman was repeating the arguments he was presently making to the apostolic delegate, Archbishop Sebastiano Baggio, in defence both of Duffie and of the whole project to relocate St. Thomas. Ritchie was somewhat surprised by the bishop’s new stance. As he subsequently wrote to Duffie, the bishop’s attitude was “a startling contrast to the ‘pious platitudes’ I received a few years ago [in response] to a letter I had written him saying that I thought it was folly to continue St. Thomas at Chatham.”

Hobson’s Choice

The very day, February 6, 1963, Leverman was making the final summation of his case to the apostolic delegate, the New Brunswick provincial cabinet was meeting. Three days later, Duffie, having used his usual private sources of information, wrote Leverman to inform him what happened at the meeting. It was, he explained, a matter of Hobson’s choice: take it or leave it. (Thomas Hobson, a seventeenth-century English stableman, was famous for telling his customers they had either to take the next horse available in his stables or to get none at all.)

The minister of education, Henry Irwin, asked the premier, Louis Robichaud, what answer they were to give if the opposition party brought up the matter of establishing a junior college in Saint John.

He was referring to the “compromise” reached whereby those who wanted a Catholic college in Saint John settled for having a junior college of UNB there if St. Thomas set up shop on the UNB campus in Fredericton. The premier thought that unlikely, but if they did so “to answer as briefly as possible.”

Robichaud reportedly told Irwin:

They are going ahead with Saint John College anyway, and with that St. Thomas will have to close in Chatham in any case. St. Thomas has to move to Fredericton whether the opponents on the Miramichi like it or not.

Duffie told Leverman it was evident that the government would not give any money to St. Thomas so long as it remained in Chatham. He urged Leverman to inform the apostolic delegate of this “confidential statement,” as he was afraid the Friends would “keep bombarding the Apostolic Delegate with all kinds of statements.” The apostolic delegate was to understand that Duffie’s information came from “the highest authority in the Province.”

Robichaud later denied saying St. Thomas would receive no money from government if it remained in Chatham; he insisted that he left it up to the universities to decide. Yet Duffie learned that even the Conservative opposition had come round to the necessity of relocation. He had assurances from the leader of the opposition, C. B. Sherwood, and even “helped him write the answer [he would give] if anybody in the audience asked the question about St. Thomas.” It was obvious, argued Duffie, that both government and opposition were eager to get things settled by moving St. Thomas to Fredericton and establishing a junior college of UNB in Saint John. Duffie wrote Leverman again on February 12 to say the Fredericton *Daily Gleaner* had just announced that Teachers’ College was scheduled to move to the UNB campus, bringing with it eleven hundred students, some five hundred of whom were Catholic. The newly situated college—incorporated into UNB as the Faculty of Education in 1973—would service all teacher training in the province, both English and French. Duffie pointed out that 51 percent of the province was Catholic—a fact, he wrote, of which the Friends of St. Thomas “are still totally oblivious and without any realization at all of its

import.” The Catholic majority in New Brunswick was “a solid fact now beyond controversy,” one that Duffie advised Leverman to convey to Archbishop Baggio in Ottawa, along with the warning that they would receive no government money if they did not move.

On February 13, Leverman passed the information on to the apostolic delegate. Nine days later, Duffie sent Leverman more information for Baggio’s benefit. A notice from *University Affairs* showed, he said, that Nova Scotia was following New Brunswick’s lead by establishing a University Grants Committee to make recommendations on postsecondary education. He pointed out that the terms of reference for the Nova Scotia committee were almost identical to those of the Deutsch Commission, which was “a very strong indication that if we are to survive we must accept in full the recommendations of these commissions.”

The Friends of St. Thomas Keep Up the Attack

The bishop had nowhere yet to rest his head. In a letter to Oscar Schneller, the diocese’s accountant, written on February 24, Leverman complained that “the Miramichi is now planning another offensive.” They were organizing a rally for March 9 at the Chatham exhibition building. “According to the grapevine,” he wrote, they were planning “a bombshell.” Just what the bomb might be, Leverman did not know, but they said they were going to take “drastic measures.” “No comment” was the only information they were getting from government, and “it annoys them to no end.” They are “a persistent people,” Leverman wrote in exasperation to Schneller:

“It is an anxious time and you should say a prayer that they do not pull pillars of the temple down upon themselves.” He felt the only bomb they could explode was a political one, and Leverman did “not want to get into politics.” Referring to the premier, he was afraid that “our friend at Fredericton is shying away from the question as much as possible.” He asked Schneller:

“If ever a man was up against a problem, I am. Why did I ever start the ball rolling? How can I keep it

in check?"

Response of the Holy See

Well might he ask. Leverman was finally beginning to appreciate the consequences of his about-face a year earlier. St. Thomas was not going to remain in Chatham. And the Catholic hierarchy was being subjected to an unfamiliar spotlight. Archbishop Baggio had no choice but to become fully engaged in the issue. He was alarmed by the negative responses he was getting. On February 26, 1963, he wrote Leverman at length, making clear the Holy See's unhappiness with the situation on the Miramichi. He understood that the statement to the premier and cabinet signed by Leverman and Duffie on December 11, 1962, might be taken to be "a definite acceptance" of the recommendation of the Deutsch Commission, and that it "would be practically impossible to turn back." Nevertheless, he would have to

inform the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities in detail, since the reactions to the move are not only of a particularly harsh nature but, it seems to me, are going far beyond the sphere of personal and local interests which are being affected and injured understandably by the transfer of the University, to the heart of the matter, which is a question of principle and of general interest in the field of education.

Baggio was receiving many objections to the transfer, both in the form of correspondence and "from conversations with people who for various reasons upon which I wish not to judge oppose the transfer." He said he felt obliged to inform the Sacred Congregation because "I have grounds for believing that the winds of many of these reactions may have already reached the Holy See." He proceeded to articulate the objections being raised:

(1) In the first place, some maintain that St. Thomas University has never pretended to be, never aspired to be, a large University but only a modest College for the Superior Education of the students of the area and which could go on indefinitely fulfilling in this region this useful purpose which has so happily benefited the Catholics of Miramichi and has served to foster numerous vocations, both ecclesiastical and religious. These deny, of course, that the formation given at St. Thomas is second rate education. Also, from the economic point of view, the critics [have] stated that the situation in Chatham would not in fact be disastrous; on the contrary, it would be better than in past years and that a small operating deficit would be easily absorbed from one year to the next. This operating deficit would be in reality less than \$10,000. Besides,

the Provincial Government has pledged itself to continue to pay the annual subsidies of \$70,000 should the University of St. Thomas be transferred to Fredericton or remain at Chatham. Furthermore, they say that with proper and opportune propaganda, the parishes of the region of Miramichi could be made to give more to their University. The priests who are teaching are not demanding any raise in salary. There are those also who feel that the faculties of science may not develop adequately in the present set up but [who] maintain that at least a Junior College, which is indispensable, be left at Chatham. The transfer to Fredericton, they feel, might be made gradually over a period of several years.

(2) It has been affirmed that there might be grave misunderstandings over the entire question of making this transfer. The Deutsch Commission may have begun with its preconceived thesis of concentrating higher education in New Brunswick in the two universities of Fredericton and Moncton, basing the decision on the two languages, and not taking into account the other important criterion of religion. From then on all the arguments brought forward in the report may have been destined to prove this thesis. For his part perhaps Msgr. Duffie may have arrived at Chatham unfamiliar with the surroundings and with the grandiose idea of a huge center of studies—some add to this with a preconceived intention of liquidating the University. Under his “totalitarian” direction there could be no other result possible than the present grave crisis in discipline and studies. Some [have] also accused Msgr. Duffie, whose virtues and merits are beyond all discussion, with having lacked tact and diplomacy, and to have failed to appreciate the delicacy of his role, precisely because, being an outsider, he felt he had to do everything possible to be accepted by the people, by the University, and by his confrères. On the contrary, he is said to have done everything to alienate their sympathy. He, with his hasty statements to the press favourable to the transfer, is also said to have imperiled and perhaps impeded all hope of a calm discussion with other authorities of the University and other interested persons and to have provoked the birth of the organization of the “Friends of the University of St. Thomas.” To have opened a residence for young girls on the campus without even having obtained an appropriate locale for such a residence or the people adequate to staff it, has also been a source of trouble.

As to the questionable methods Leverman and Duffie used to secure the university board’s approval of the transfer, Baggio said he had been told that

Among the authorities of the university, only three are favourable to the transfer while the other remaining five officers were against it and the fact that they would not openly protest is due to their sense of discipline. Some also state that the reunion of the Board of Governors of the University, held on September 21, 1962, may have been prepared to obtain the approval of the transfer: of the thirteen members of the Board, three did not attend the meeting [and] at least five were decisively against the motion, which was passed because for this occasion they were joined by six other persons favorable to the transfer and appointed to this board meeting precisely to obtain this resolution. The minutes of the meeting were not recorded by the Board’s Secretary but by the personal secretary of Msgr. Duffie. Some are amazed that the decision to transfer was taken so quickly when the extraordinary contribution of the people of this zone, Miramichi, to the development of their University, was and still is so fresh in their minds.

This amounted to nothing less than an accusation of improper behaviour on the part of both Duffie and

Leverman.

Baggio continued that he sensed among his informants a fear that Catholic education would suffer from the move. They suggested that Catholic students would “become submerged” as a minority in the student body. There was also a fear that the majority of Catholic students would be tempted to take courses at the larger university,

“more numerous and better organized than those of the Catholic University, which when placed in proximity will suffer in the comparison.” Opponents of the move had informed Baggio that

In spite of what has been said about Catholic colleges federated with provincial universities elsewhere, the situation for St. Thomas students is different. In Vancouver, Toronto, Windsor, etc., most of the Catholic students are from the local area and do not face the problems Catholic students from the Miramichi area face. They would be leaving surroundings that are rigorously Catholic to go into an atmosphere that is foreign.

Nor was it clear that the federated colleges elsewhere were “producing the religious vocations as has been the constant tradition of St. Thomas in the past.” Furthermore, Baggio had been told that the reaction of the Catholic population in Chatham might be “more hostile than some would have us believe.” They might attempt, he was shocked to learn, “to build a new college in Chatham, one that will answer local needs, one that will be non-clerical and which will not accept the authority of the Church, which appears as having deceived them so in this matter.” In a pointed suggestion to Leverman that he had neglected his pastoral duties, Baggio wrote:

The population of Miramichi do not feel integrated in the Diocese of Saint John, and that while the area develops materially it is gradually being impoverished spiritually. Firstly, they lost the seat of their Diocese, and now they may lose their University.

Baggio was now proposing to Leverman a compromise solution, clearly involving Duffie’s removal from office:

An observer or impartial visitor could come to Chatham with a mandate, and without ties to anyone of either group, to facilitate the regulating of the problem, while at the same time saving Your Excellency from any bitterness and ungrateful reaction.

“On the other hand,” he added, it was possibly

too late because of the events that have transpired and because of the official declarations that have been made....Perhaps the wisest and most prudent thing to do would be to delay for a time the transfer and to do it gradually by beginning with courses that might be better organized at Fredericton. But this is only my humble personal opinion.

The Chastised Bishop

This was a distressing reprimand for Leverman to have to bear. The chickens had come home to roost. He was finally facing the consequences not only of his own inconsistent behaviour earlier but also of the covert way in which he and Duffie had carried on negotiations and manipulated St. Thomas's board—and this in spite of his own previous counsel to Fr. Lynn McFadden when he told the hapless rector-president in July 1959: “My idea is that we will all work together and everything open. I get many suggestions that way and can see the picture better.” On March 4 a chastened bishop replied to Baggio, “There is nothing for me to add at present. To do so would only be repeating what I have already stated in my letters.” The recitation of his and Duffie's political manipulations, as well as of the upheaval he had caused among the faithful in his diocese, must have been painful. His reaction was to attempt to justify to Baggio his actions in a bitter complaint:

I am very weary of the whole affair. I worked hard for those people and priests in every conceivable way. Even now they flaunt authority and it is proven by the open lack of obedience to obey my recent appointments. Unless four or five Clergy are rooted out of that area, there will be trouble. I have been criticized from every level that I was not taking action. I took it slowly and now you see what happens. The letter to the Premier committing ourselves was not published by him or us. That is still confidential. He requested it. It is true we subscribed to the recommendations of the Royal Commission but that was not enough for the Premier.

He sought the apostolic delegate's sympathy:

I am now “persona non grata” with the area of Chatham and will always remain so. Just what to do now, I do not know. I hope Your Excellency has a solution. Everyone is now watching just what is going to happen to episcopal authority. I mentioned in my letters that they would never be integrated, it looks now that this is true.

Leverman, however, was not willing to accept the apostolic delegate's suggestions either for the intervention of an “impartial visitor with a mandate” or for delay. He requested instead that Baggio

grant a private interview with a delegation from the university that could come to Ottawa the following Saturday, March 9. It would consist of Duffie and two board members, Henry Ryan and Frank Lenihan, who would lay before the apostolic delegate the facts of the situation.

Delegation from the Miramichi

Leverman was too late with his suggestion. In a letter from Baggio dated March 2, he learned to his dismay that another delegation from the Miramichi had already visited. It was an impressive representation: fourteen people, including the mayors of Chatham and Newcastle as well as “several professionals.” Baggio pointed out to the beleaguered Leverman that only two members of this delegation were on the bishop’s list of those “deliberately opposed to the transfer of the University.” Nevertheless, the delegates were “filled with consternation” on account of the “severe measures” Leverman had employed in removing McFadden from the rectorship in 1961 and McGrath from his position as secretary of the board and bursar in 1962. These removals, Baggio wrote, were perceived by the delegates as a “hard sanction and a serious threat to the population.” He reminded Leverman of his former misgivings about Duffie:

“Once more the people consider that the person responsible for these measures is Msgr. Duffie, who has become ‘persona non grata’ more than ever.” Baggio told Leverman he had been “very much impressed by the attitude and words of the delegation” and had “tried to calm them.” Their reactions, he felt, were “regrettable and harmful.” They “begged” him to intervene with the bishop so that “an impartial investigation” could be carried out. He could hardly refuse to relay to Leverman this

desire which has been respectfully expressed to the Personal Representative of the Holy Father by a distinguished group of Catholics, as I believe too that in this way I am doing Your Excellency a good turn. In fact I bear clearly in mind what Your Excellency wrote to me exactly a month ago today: “As for my own attitude towards the situation, I remember the words of Saint Jean Eudes: *La patience et mansuétude*. I have kept quiet, carried on no controversy and intend just not to be aggravated by the whole matter.” A resolution, I think, wise and proper more than ever.

Bishop Redivivus

Leverman was crushed. He consulted Duffie. The latter convinced him of the mortal necessity at this moment of standing firm. Thus, Leverman responded defensively to Baggio on March 5, 1963. He agreed that perhaps the timing of some of his actions, “such as moving or trying to move people, etc.,” was not the best, but he did not want “to labour the point in this letter”; those things could be explained later. He could not understand why “there is a serious threat” to the people of Miramichi. “They are the ones,” he claimed,

who are wondering why something hasn’t been done before this. Some of the clergy are frightened as they realize that at long last they are up against the wall and that they cannot defend their citadel too much longer. It needs to be broken.

As for McFadden, “he was the first priest to tell me some of them should be moved.” Furthermore, Leverman complained, he was extremely upset over newspaper reports that the premier said St. Thomas would get all the monies it was entitled to wherever it was. He was attempting “this very day” to get it verified in writing:

If this is true, then they have never told us. Both publicly and privately, the Premier stated that St. Thomas would receive no funds if it remained in Chatham. It was on this public and private assurance that we defended the situation. If the Government changed its mind then it has betrayed us. They certainly did not let us know.

Leverman was being less than straightforward. Duffie had told him several times that the premier refused to state in public that St. Thomas must move in order to receive government monies, whatever he may have intended. But the bishop was in a fighting mood. He complained to Baggio that one of the parties who had gone to see Baggio “was in my office a few days before the delegation went to Ottawa nearly in tears and said he had washed his hands clear of the whole situation. Yet, he appears at Ottawa.” If these people were so determined to run their own university, then “a separate administrator would have to be established. It is a question of whether I am to run it or they.”

In the meantime, he informed Baggio, in the interests of cooling things down, he had delayed the reassignment of some priests at the university or in Chatham to other parishes. He did so out of respect for Fr. McFadden, “who had said he was not well.” McFadden was now the pastor of St. Michael’s Basilica in Chatham, a post to which the bishop assigned him when he brought in Duffie as president. The bishop told McFadden to take a month’s rest. Aware that McFadden remained one of his toughest opponents, Leverman now wrote optimistically to Baggio: “He is just about accepting to do what he is told to do and what an important lesson for that area. If only you knew the heart-ache that poor priest has caused me. Much prestige is now at stake.”

Again Leverman was being less than straightforward. In fact, McFadden was far from “accepting to do what he is told to do.” When Leverman ordered him to the tiny parish of Lakeville above Woodstock, McFadden simply refused. A number of sources mention McFadden’s refusal to do the bishop’s bidding. Leverman appointed a young priest, Donald Warner, to replace McFadden. Warner arrived at St. Michael’s rectory and knocked on the door. When McFadden opened the door he was informed by the young priest that he had been sent by the bishop to take over the parish. The dour McFadden responded: “You’d better go get a hotel room then, you aren’t coming in here,” and closed the door on him.

Leverman was insulted by this lese-majesty. As he wrote Baggio, he “consulted canonical lawyers,” but they supported McFadden’s contention that he could be removed only by reason of a serious breach of his duties, not merely by the bishop’s say-so. Even Duffie had to admit that McFadden was a man of impeccable integrity. It was, Leverman wrote,

the concerted opinion that he should have obeyed and then made his stand. Indeed, I have open a place for him already, had he done what I directed, tho’ I could not say anything at that time about it. It was my plan not to leave him in a small parish. Recent events show that he should have been out of there, but that will have to rest for some time. My own error has turned into good for he may now realize that there is an authority and that authority must be respected. He is, of course, in the same parish.

In May, McFadden was still in Chatham, still pastor of St. Michael's, still a member of the board of governors at St. Thomas. Indeed, he would remain on the board long after Leverman resigned as bishop of the diocese and chancellor of St. Thomas in 1968.

Leverman also tried to reassign Fr. Edward Troy from the St. Thomas faculty to parish work elsewhere in the diocese, his PhD notwithstanding. Although the attempt was successful in one sense, it did not proceed entirely according to his wishes. An angry Troy preferred to resign not only from teaching at St. Thomas but from serving anywhere in the bishop's diocese, writing a letter of resignation to the bishop blasting Duffie's administration. In the letter, dated March 31, 1963, Troy explained that after graduation from StFX he prepared himself for a career as a university professor. He returned from Belgium with a doctorate in philosophy but "walked into a very unpleasant situation in which it was almost impossible to remain neutral." He mentioned "the animosity between many of the staff and the president and the lack of order and discipline among the students. The atmosphere had been poisoned by what was going on." He therefore made his decision to leave

as a protest against the educational philosophy that is presently applied at St. Thomas. I had expected a certain atmosphere of discipline, an effort on the part of the administration to promote the intellectual interests of the students and, in a Catholic school, some emphasis on the spiritual life.

Instead, the administration of Msgr. Duffie

appears to hold no principles in any of these matters. Rules have been set up but are not enforced. There is widespread drinking and no control over students in the residence, a den of noise and bedlam. What is going on at St. Thomas makes a mockery of the university motto: *doce me scientiam, bonitatem, disciplinam* [teach me knowledge, goodness, discipline].

Troy asserted that he was not subject to Leverman's ecclesiastical jurisdiction because he had been ordained by the bishop of Bathurst before the Miramichi was transferred to the diocese of Saint John. He submitted his resignation to Duffie that same day and left to become a chaplain in the military.

When Leverman finally responded, he thanked Troy for his "clear exposition as he saw it of conditions at St. Thomas. Such conditions arise, unfortunately, in the long history of such institutions. I

must face these things and cannot change my post.” He added:

Your letter evokes a number of comments I could make for your priestly guidance, but I refrain as you are not my subject. One does not do these things easily to another who belongs to another Diocese—neither to a priest or Bishop. It is regrettable that you leave the Diocese under “a protest.”

We know from Duffie’s correspondence that he considered Troy, along with Poole, one of the most influential opponents of the move out of Chatham. He must have been relieved to be rid of the outspoken and articulate priest. (A note of supreme irony: Troy, after leaving the military with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, became bishop of Saint John in 1986, thereby returning to St. Thomas as its chancellor.) We do not know if Leverman discussed Troy’s letter with Duffie, but it is likely and may explain why Leverman waited more than two months before responding to Troy.

Troy was not the only priest punished for his refusal to toe the line. As we have seen, McGrath was removed from his position as the board’s and the university’s secretary, as bursar, and indeed as a member of faculty, although like McFadden he remained a member of the board; both would remain so until 1983.

The Bishop’s Delegation

Meanwhile, on March 9 Leverman’s promised delegation visited Baggio in Ottawa. It consisted of two monsignors (Duffie and Boyd) and two laymen (the lawyer Ryan and the accountant Lenihan). The bishop was pleased to hear afterwards from the apostolic delegate that they had “a thorough and rewarding discussion.” The delegation had the desired effect: “Withdrawal of the permission granted to transfer the university to Fredericton is no longer a possibility, nor would it appear at present reasonable to even consider it.” There was, however, a gentle warning for the bishop, who was directed

to take into account the sensitivities of some of those involved. The transfer is to be effected gradually and delicately with as little injury as possible inflicted, while at the same time assuring the people of Miramichi that Catholic education to the end of the High School level will be preserved there. Most certainly, there are those who feel that the future holds for them

the loss of everything.

In the end, convinced by arguments of economic necessity, academic respectability, and especially enhancement of opportunities for Catholic students from across the province, the representative of the Holy See decided not to interrupt the plans to affiliate St. Thomas with UNB.

Baggio's words "gradually and delicately," however, must have given Leverman and Duffie pause. The land was already being cleared for new buildings on the UNB campus. Construction was scheduled to begin in the summer of 1963, to be ready for classes in September 1964. There could be nothing "gradual" about the transfer, and as for doing it "delicately," indications were not promising. Leverman wrote Baggio that the Friends of St. Thomas were organizing another public protest, a "regrettable mixture of politics and the College question," in April.

Two days before the rally, a bomb scare caused the organizers to change its location. As Leverman wrote again to Baggio, rumours were flying that those responsible for the scare were persons in favour of relocation. The idea was ridiculous: "The blindness of certain individuals would tempt one to think Satan is trying to frustrate the efforts of the Church to advance to what is best and right."

Tipping Point

With hindsight, the bishop would see that affairs had finally tipped in his favour. A provincial election was held in April 1963. The Liberals were again confirmed in power. Moreover, they won all four seats in Northumberland County, even though two of the four Conservative candidates were outspoken opponents of moving St. Thomas. With a new mandate and evidence of majority support on the Miramichi, the government no longer need worry about political opposition. In a letter to Baggio Leverman commented that there would now be "a slow lessening of resistance as far as the hard core is concerned. Besides, the College will still be here for another year." It appears that in his mind, one more year in Chatham would satisfy the Vatican's requirement that the move be made "gradually." The

movement to have the Miramichi declared a separate diocese was also dying thanks to strong disapproval from the Vatican. Leverman received a letter from Baggio dated May 4, 1963, along with a copy of the letter sent to “J. E. Stevens and Friends” in response to their petition for a new diocese of Chatham, separate from Saint John. The request was based on the premise that the people of Chatham (and St. Thomas) were better served by Chatham Catholics than Saint John Catholics. The apostolic delegate informed them that a new diocese was not possible and encouraged them to work together within the present diocese:

There is no doubt that the University of St. Thomas has experienced difficulties in the economic order. I do not wish to discuss attitudes or decisions taken nor the policy of the Rector. But there are serious-minded men, independent and outside the community itself, who question whether the University can be sustained when its revenues are restricted solely to the Miramichi area.

Besides,

I would be worried about the drama that could well unfold if the day arrived in Chatham when it was necessary either to close or to transfer the College outside the Diocese. One likes to think that this would be impossible but no one can guarantee that it could not come about. In any case, most Catholics are of the mind that four dioceses in the province are enough.

More good news for the bishop followed. In a letter dated May 7, Baggio wrote that he had just received a letter from the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Universities and Seminaries, the Vatican’s body in charge of educational affairs. The Sacred Congregation had no objection to the proposed federation with UNB. While acknowledging the benefits to be obtained by such a federation, wrote Baggio, they stressed “certain accompanying dangers” that must not be overlooked. St. Thomas should ensure that the benefits of the move were not “acquired at the price of faith and doctrine.” St. Thomas authorities were also warned—as they had been a year earlier—not to become “involved harmfully in local politics.” This time, Leverman could assure the apostolic delegate that political involvement was thankfully ended.

Duffie expressed his views on the post-election situation in a letter to his steady supporter Justice Ritchie:

Following the election there was some pessimism and despair among the Friends. The Liberals won every town and village in Westmorland, Kent and Northumberland where Van Horne spoke. Paul Lordon was soundly defeated. The Liberals managed to be silent with his name until after the election results were in on election evening, and then Norbert Theriault ridiculed him. Bob Martin lost a great deal of prestige because of his political endeavours in regard to St. Thomas, and lost even the town of Chatham by a wide margin. In the final three days of the campaign the sole issue as far as Martin and Lordon were concerned was the College—a vote for the Liberals was a vote for the move, a vote for the Conservatives was a vote for St. Thomas to remain in Chatham. And Martin signed a declaration publicly that he would resign from the Conservative Party if the Party made the slightest move to aid in the removal of St. Thomas. The Friends of St. Thomas were split and one pitted against the other. The Liberal majority was reduced in Northumberland, but not as greatly as in Restigouche or Kent. And the verdict was clear—the people, even Chatham itself, preferred to be Liberals rather than Friends.

Duffie expected everything would move forward more quickly now, although he anticipated that the Friends would “probably attempt to regroup forces.” He informed Ritchie that Joe Sears, from UNB, and Harry Ryan, the secretary of St. Thomas’s board, were meeting that very day to begin contract talks between UNB and St. Thomas.

St. Thomas’s Location on the UNB Campus

Ritchie replied in a letter dated May 14 with some advice for Duffie about those talks, specifically about St. Thomas’s precise location on the UNB campus. Ritchie was told that UNB had plans for handling up to six thousand students. He asked if those numbers included St. Thomas students, and was told that there were no projections for enrolment at St. Thomas. Someone suggested that the land assigned to St. Thomas was

of an irregular shape, and the size and location [were] such that future expansion must be down the hill so as to crowd existing buildings. When the danger had been pointed out to them, the UNB executives were said to have justified the size and location of the lot on the ground that they were satisfactory to the St. Thomas authorities, but on being pressed further admitted it was impossible to say the lot would be adequate fifty years from now.

Ritchie urged Duffie to take another look at what they were being given “to ensure that it is more than ample to cover any expansion possible during the next fifty years, or even over a longer period.”

The advice was unnecessary. Ever since the decision was effectively made to move St. Thomas

to UNB, Duffie assiduously cultivated his personal connections with UNB's officials. He established a particularly close relationship with the president, Mackay, as well as friendly relations with the vice-president, Bev Macaulay, the dean of science, F. J. Toole, the dean of law, Bill Ryan, the president's secretary, Edie McCloud, and a number of professors in various departments. We should not underestimate the importance of those personal connections in smoothing the way for St. Thomas's emergence on campus. For example, following discussions with Mackay the previous fall, Mackay presented to the UNB senate on January 7, 1963, the revised campus development plan as approved by the board. It showed the proposed locations for St. Thomas and the new Teachers' College, and provided for UNB's expansion to accommodate eight thousand students (considerably more than the six thousand Ritchie suggested). According to UNB senate minutes, "The feeling was expressed that the space reserved for St. Thomas University was not sufficient for future development." As a result it was agreed that the plan be given more study. At its February meeting, Mackay informed senate that the architect had been asked to change the location of Teachers' College, which would "allow for greater width in the area for St. Thomas University."

K. C. Irving, the noted industrialist, was a "North Shore person" from Bouctouche, a friend of McFadden and St. Thomas University, and, as we saw earlier, not necessarily opposed to St. Thomas moving to Fredericton. As a member of the UNB board and its representative on senate, he was the one at the January meeting who objected to the space allotted to St. Thomas. As he wrote his friend Beaverbrook on May 25, at the January meeting "nearly all those present...were quite adamant in their views that no change be considered in the location and the layout." It appeared that some people at UNB had reservations about St. Thomas's future expansion on the campus, if not its very existence there. Nevertheless, he wrote, he had the support of several UNB senators, especially University Secretary Mary Lou Lynch and Dean of Science F. J. Toole, not to mention the president himself. "As an appeasement to my insistence and much to the annoyance of some of those present," wrote Irving,

the senate agreed to further study. He was enclosing for Beaverbrook the revised plan that was finally approved by the board. It showed the reassigned position of the Teachers' College to the east of College Drive and of St. Thomas University, including Holy Cross House, to the west, "so as to make it possible to give St. Thomas University a more usable shaped property should they require additional buildings at some future time."

On May 31 Irving wrote Beaverbrook again:

The property boundaries have now been relocated so that the building line of Teachers' College and the boundary line of the St. Thomas University property are, respectively, 67 feet east and 180 feet west of the centre line of the new driveway which is to extend from the present campus to Montgomery Street. This seems to be about the best arrangement that can be secured at this date.

On June 5 Beaverbrook wrote Irving to say he found the plan "quite excellent":

I like the location of both the Teachers' College and the St. Thomas University very much and I am obliged to you for sending the plans to me. The University is indeed fortunate in obtaining your interest for you are a great help to them.

On the same day, Irving wrote Beaverbrook, saying Mackay had given him an artist's sketch of the proposed St. Thomas buildings. (The sketches had been prepared by Larson & Larson.) Irving wrote, "The appearance I think is good and the lay-out will work in nicely with the University of New Brunswick's future plans." As the St. Thomas community as well as visitors to the campus would appreciate in years to come, Irving correctly foresaw the growth and new buildings at St. Thomas. And we can appreciate, too, that the very existence of those buildings owed much to the skillful politics of Msgr. Duffie.

Holy Cross House of Studies

One of the new buildings came to be known as the Holy Cross House of Studies, or Holy Cross House for short. It was intended to be a home for members of the Order of the Holy Cross. In this regard, Baggio earlier had asked Leverman for the name of someone who could

“give an unbiased and objective view of the situation, the temperament of the people, the history of the College, the various individuals concerned, etc.” On May 1, 1963, Leverman reminded the apostolic delegate that he had already suggested to him the Very Rev. Arnold Toner, provincial since 1958 of the Holy Cross Congregation in Montreal and a native of Grand Falls, NB.

There was a good reason for recommending Toner. At the start of 1963, the English Canadian Province of the Holy Cross Congregation (the *Congregatio a Sancta Cruce*, CSC) decided not to expand its parish and facilities in Waterloo, Ontario, but rather in New Brunswick. Leverman welcomed the suggestion. He reminded them that, as a result of the Deutsch Commission’s recommendations (not to mention his and Duffie’s subsequent labours), St. Thomas would soon be moving to the UNB campus in Fredericton—an ideal spot for the congregation to establish a “junior seminary.” Indeed, it was a perfect opportunity for the church to ensure that St. Thomas could continue its long-standing practice of supplying candidates for the priesthood, one of the criticisms of the move from Chatham to the non-Catholic campus in Fredericton. On March 26, Toner wrote to the order’s superior general in Rome to inform him of the opportunity for Holy Cross:

When I mentioned to Bishop Leverman of Saint John (Fredericton is in the Saint John Diocese) the possibility of setting up our own junior seminary on the campus of University of New Brunswick, he was most enthusiastic....Moreover he knows that if we have priests in the seminary, they will be there to teach in his college at the University. We would welcome this.

By the spring of 1963, negotiations between the CSC, the bishop, St. Thomas, and UNB were proceeding apace. Representing Holy Cross, Toner wrote the superior general again on May 13:

My Council and I believe that our best opportunity for recruitment is Fredericton, NB, where we are invited by the Bishop of Saint John, NB, to construct a seminary in conjunction with the new St. Thomas University which will be placed on the campus of the University of New Brunswick. The seminary we propose to build would serve not only new recruits preparing for the novitiate while taking their first two years of college, but also professed religious who have completed their novitiate and are now finishing their college....Bishop Leverman of Saint John is very favorable to this idea of having both our junior seminarians and professed scholastics on the campus. This would add strength to his project.

Leverman and Duffie recognized the strength that having Holy Cross on the new campus added

to their project. Mackay at UNB and all those who advocated increasing the Catholic presence on campus welcomed it, particularly since the cost of construction was to be borne by the Holy Cross order. It remained for Duffie to negotiate an agreement with UNB for subleasing land to the Holy Cross Fathers. The land St. Thomas was to occupy was assigned to the university by UNB on a ninety-nine-year, renewable lease. A clause required St. Thomas to secure permission from UNB if it wished to sublease any portion of the land. Thus on February 25, 1963, Duffie wrote Mackay for formal permission to grant to the Anglo-Canadian Province of Holy Cross a sublease with “the same covenants and restrictions” that St. Thomas had with UNB. Duffie explained that the land was to be used for a residence for two or three professors,

who will be an integral part of the St. Thomas University professional staff, and some duly matriculated university students who would be enrolled at either St. Thomas or UNB. The residence building will be an integral part of St. Thomas University, subject to all its academic rules and regulations. It will not be a seminary, although its residents will be those who have some thought at the present time that at the end of their university course they may go on to take seminary studies. They will also be free to sever their relationship with Holy Cross, and equally they may be told by Holy Cross that they are not desired by the latter.

Mackay replied that he “appreciated having the proposal set out in such detail” and that the UNB senate had given its approval. He said he examined the design for the building submitted by Larson & Larson and found it “quite suitable.” Duffie sent the plans to Fr. James MacDonald, whom Toner had designated the superior of the new Holy Cross House. Duffie explained that it would be situated on a 1.7-acre parcel within the land leased from UNB by St. Thomas on a coterminous, ninety-nine-year sublease, at the top of the campus, fronting on Montgomery Street. It would be somewhat removed from the other St. Thomas buildings but in the same style and clearly on the same campus. Toner and MacDonald shortly visited Fredericton and together with Duffie viewed the site. On June 12 Toner wrote Leverman saying the visit had been “very encouraging.” He was

anxious to proceed with construction at the same time as the Diocese will be starting your buildings. At first glance the prospect of a 99-year lease of property would seem as acceptable as a clearcut deal, since it binds us more closely to UNB.

Toner praised the bishop for his efforts with regard to relocating the university. He told him he thought the matter seems settled and those who oppose you are becoming ashamed of themselves. Again you land on your feet, as I predicted from the start! This whole attempt is the greatest move for Catholic education the Maritimes have yet known. I'm deeply anxious to bolster this project with all possible effort.

Leverman welcomed Toner's support. As we saw, Toner was well aware of the controversy on the Miramichi. The previous fall he had weighed in on the bishop's side by telling his cousin Vance Toner, St. Thomas athletic director and outspoken opponent of the move to Fredericton (or at least, as he said later, of Duffie's methods to achieve that end), to "get off the pages of the newspaper."

Coming to inhabit the order's new "junior seminary" were, along with the superior Fr. MacDonald, two other priests: Frs. O'Brien Waugh and Bernard Murchland, both of whom would teach on St. Thomas's faculty, the former in philosophy and the latter in English literature. The group also included ten temporarily professed religious (seminarians), including Marc Smith (later ordained and later still a professor of philosophy at St. Thomas), Donald Layden (later ordained and then chaplain), and Brother Ron Rumbolt (who worked in the bursar's office until 1978). Brother Irl Washburn arrived later in the term to serve as cook.

Construction of Holy Cross House was scheduled to begin in the fall of 1963 to be ready by September 1964, the same time as the other buildings. A problem in securing funds, however, delayed construction until the spring of 1964. Duffie invited Toner and MacDonald to Fredericton, and early in November 1963, the men met with the architect to modify the plans for their building. To reduce costs to \$500,000, they agreed to remove the planned garage and gymnasium.

Thus when the Holy Cross contingent arrived in September 1964, as Prof. Marc Smith remembers, the bedrooms in the east wing were unfinished, there was no central heating, plumbing was primitive, and there was no chapel or refectory. Fr. MacDonald, however, closely supervised construction so that by Christmas the refectory opened, by February the chapel was completed, and by

September 1965 the handsome Larson building was complete.

Duffie subsequently became a frequent visitor to the Holy Cross provincial residence in Beaconsfield, Quebec. Toner remained the order's provincial superior until 1968, visiting St. Thomas as well as preaching missions and retreats in the Saint John diocese. In 1968 he was appointed chaplain at St. Thomas and made a member of the board of governors as well as a member of faculty, where he became a fixture on campus, teaching courses in theology and religious studies until his retirement in 1993.

“The Worst of the Storm is Over”

In May 1963 Leverman attended convocation at St. Thomas in Chatham. As he wrote afterwards to Baggio,

It was a great success. There was no manifestation of undue word or gesture of any kind whatsoever. Of course, no reference was made at any time to the troubles involved. Everything was carried out as if nothing previously happened.

He even spoke to McFadden, whom as we saw he earlier attempted, unsuccessfully, to remove from his position as pastor of St. Michael's. Obviously that failure still rankled in the bishop's heart. Yet the future was looking brighter. Schneller, in a letter to the bishop dated June 17, said he had a feeling that “the worst of the storm is over” and that there “should be very little difficulty from here on in toward implementing your very fine educational plan.” If so, it would “no doubt be attributed in large part to Your Excellency's firm and dignified stand premised on the economic aspects as well as educational advancement.” Schneller felt that the college was “merely an expedient instrument or focal point having to do with a basic discontent in an area which goes back to the early part of the present century.” A declining economy in any particular area, he believed, was difficult to pinpoint with the passage of time, but nevertheless that situation created “frustrations and an unreasonable attitude towards any act that looks as if it might create a sort of final

deterioration.” The church was merely “an innocent bystander.” It willy-nilly became involved with the decline of the area and had to curtail its operations accordingly, “such as structural changes in the Diocese, the removal of the Cathedral centre, and now the last straw, the removal of the University.”

As Schneller saw it, the situation was “virtually insurmountable” even if the petty local difficulties could be overcome. The people of the Miramichi needed to break with the past. A poorly financed university without a proper staff or a decent library and with “no recognized accreditation” was of no value to the place. What they needed instead was “a high-class technical institute,” the sort of institution that was “in demand these days” and which could expect to get even larger grants from government than could small universities. Chatham should probably have a technical institute combined with an agricultural institute.

While Schneller was giving the bishop advice about how to give St. Thomas a higher profile, Ritchie was giving Duffie advice about how to secure more grassroots support. He heard there was a lack of public information about St. Thomas’s plans, making it difficult for parents to plan. It also affected students’ attitudes toward the university. The justice warned Duffie that such complaints “should not be brushed aside lightly.” He suggested that Duffie submit to his board the details of the proposed program for St. Thomas. He should lay out the estimates of the capital and operating costs of implementing the program, as well as information as to the source of those funds. Once the board approved the plans, he should have it printed up and “placed in every home in the diocese” so people would know what was happening. Ritchie argued that if such publicity had been attended to a year earlier, the diocese would not now be split in two: “For so long as that split and the present conflict continue, little if any financial support for St. Thomas on the Fredericton campus can be expected from the northern part of the diocese.” Furthermore, the southern part of the diocese needed to know what financial commitments it was expected to assume as a result of the move.

“Three, Two, One”

Though satisfied that the major political problems had been overcome, Leverman was becoming concerned with the actual mechanics of moving St. Thomas to Fredericton. On June 29 we find him writing Schneller to say he was having “to keep a sharp eye on the whole scheme of things” to prevent “others from advancing their own immediate designs to the detriment of the over-seer.” (He did not specify who these “others” were.) He was worried that government funding was still not defined. With a wonderful mixture of metaphors, he informed Schneller that nothing was yet “nailed down. One must nail the first board to the floor before anything can be started. If you have no guarantee for the withal to build the structure, you can be left holding the bag.” It should, he declared, be simply

a matter of one, two, three. First the government makes a commitment, in general terms, but due to political events it has been slow, devious and reluctant to come to a practical application. This is the foundation stone, the first plank, the first spike. And it has not been done yet.

Number two was the agreement between the diocese and UNB, which was “merely, though not simply, a clear statement of intent.” Number three was the discussion with the architects, which depended on numbers one and two. But, worried Leverman, things were not proceeding that way. Instead, “It is going Three, Two, One, or any other combination than the necessary one, and I do not know how to get it back to the proper progression.”

Specifically, the bishop worried that Mackay and Duffie had put the cart before the horse. In December a year and a half earlier, they wrote up an affiliation agreement which, because the Deutsch Commission had not yet published its report, had to be kept secret until just recently. Then they determined the actual location of St. Thomas’s new buildings and even commissioned architectural plans—still without a firm commitment of funds from the government. It made the bishop nervous. He hoped to meet with the premier on July 2 “to clear up number One.”

St. Thomas’s New Larson Buildings

Duffie, on the other hand, was not at all nervous. Indeed he was pleased with the way things were going in the summer of 1963. The final version of the affiliation agreement was published, taking effect on July 1. Later that month he received the revised plans from Larson & Larson for the new buildings at the top of the campus, including Holy Cross House. The university's central building with its church-like copper-clad steeple would house administrative offices and classrooms. Offices for the president, registrar, and bursar would be situated on the ground floor at the east end with the windows of the first two looking out magisterially over the St. John River valley and the town below. Several large classrooms were also designed for the ground floor, accessed by a wide central hallway running east-west the length of the building. The dining area opposite the main door and running north-south had been modified slightly from the original design. Male and female students would dine there together rather than separately. Such mixing of the sexes was not, however, to be extended to the religious members of staff. On Duffie's insistence, the architects added a small dining room for the priests to the southeast of the main dining room, equipped with sofas and chairs for use as their private lounge. Another small dining room to the southwest of the main dining room was added for the use of the nuns whom Duffie expected to teach at the university.

The main door of the Administration Building opened onto a north-lit open foyer with stairs on either side leading up to a chapel and more classrooms on the second floor. The third floor was originally designed to house faculty offices and a library, but the library had been removed from the plans to allow accommodations for the president and for the bishop whenever he chose to visit. Two bedrooms, each with its own bath, would have an office and lounge area connecting them. (As it happened Duffie would spend very little time in his designated living quarters.) The elimination of the library would not be a disadvantage, decided Duffie, because the agreement allowed St. Thomas students to share UNB's library facilities, presently housed in the Bonar Law-Bennett Library. (The Harriet Irving Library would be completed in 1967, at which time the old library

became the provincial archives.)

The second Larson building was the men's residence, a building similar in appearance to a recently completed residence at StFX, with 198 rooms for students and six suites for priests. The third building was Holy Cross House, situated, as we have seen, at the top of St. Thomas's allotted land. It contained rooms for the priest-professors and religious students with its own chapel and dining room. The fourth Larson building was the women's residence, a mirror image of the men's.

Duffie had a right to be pleased with the plans. He already had plans for a fifth building to house faculty offices and an auditorium, once additional funding could be found. It would also be a Larson design. Altogether, the collection of Neo-Georgian brick buildings would form an attractive and integrated St. Thomas campus that would become home to hundreds of its students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

New Coat of Arms

Duffie and Leverman discussed whether or not to change the university's coat of arms when it moved to Fredericton. The shield on the crest during the Chatham years was chosen by the Basilian Fathers when they took over the management of St. Thomas in 1910. It pictured on its four quarters a chalice, a lectern, a Latin cross with divergent ends, and a stylized symbol of the trinity (changed from the original Basilian crest, which had a *fleur de lys*, signifying the order's founding in France in 1822). The Basilians placed their order's motto at the foot of the shield: *doce me bonitatem et disciplinam et scientiam* ("teach me goodness and discipline and knowledge"). Duffie and Leverman felt that since the Basilians were no longer connected with St. Thomas and since St. Thomas would be on the UNB campus, some modernizations were in order. As the architectural plans were being finalized in 1963, Duffie proposed placing the university's crest on the gable end of the new Administration Building high above the main doorway. The original architectural sketch had shown only the date "1964" placed

on the pediment below the steeple and a blank gable. Duffie contacted the architects, who agreed but required a precise sketch. Duffie asked for ideas about the new university crest, and his registrar, Fr. George Martin, mentioned that a former student by the name of John J. Kennedy, from New York, had done “some work along these lines.” Duffie located Kennedy and asked him to make a sketch, along the lines that he and Leverman had discussed, reflecting the university’s new situation and outlook.

After correspondence with Duffie, Kennedy, an amateur escutcheonist, developed a detailed sketch. The four images of the Basilian design were replaced by (1) a Latin “cross bottonny” (a cross with tri-round rather than divergent ends), centred at the base of the shield within a stylized triangle (preserving the sense of the trinity); (2) a “lymphad under sail” (the stylized square-rigged, oared sailing ship taken from the provincial crest, also featured on the UNB crest), centred at the top (the “middle chief”) of the shield; and (3) two stylized suns at the top two corners (the “dexter chief” and “sinister chief”) of the shield, representing the illumination or enlightenment brought by academic learning. Two small but not insignificant changes were made to the university’s Latin motto, to appear on the banner surrounding the shield: the personal indirect object “*me*” was removed, replacing “teach me goodness...” with the simple imperative “teach goodness...”; and the word order was changed, putting “knowledge” before “discipline” (*doce bonitatem scientiam et disciplinam*), which seemed more fitting for an institution of higher learning. Finally, the crest was coloured green and gold, the university’s colours. (For unexplained reasons, the date “1954” was printed in small lettering at the bottom of the crest, between the shield and the banner, probably a misprint for 1964. At any rate, it remained on the crest until 1989, when it was officially removed.)

In the fall of 1963, Duffie sent a copy of the new crest for the bishop’s approval. They would retain, explained Duffie, the essence of the Basilians’ motto, since “it is a good motto, and the Basilians at Assumption have arranged it sufficiently different that the St. Thomas motto would be distinctive as far as universities go.”

He explained that the crest, including the surrounding banner with the Latin motto and “St. Thomas University” printed above it, would appear on the university’s stationery and other official publications such as the calendar. When placed on a building, however, as in the case of the new Administration Building, no lettering would appear on the crest. The bishop approved. Duffie sent the sketch to the architects, who, he reported later, “adopted it as it was” and built it into the final plans for the main building, where it remains today on the renamed George Martin Hall.

Rearguard Action by the Friends

Regardless of what Schneller and Leverman thought about the “worst of the storm” being over, in the summer of 1963 difficult days still lay ahead for Duffie and the bishop. The Friends of St. Thomas did not give up easily. The Friends’ president was still Robert Martin, the recently defeated Conservative candidate for Chatham. Early in the summer of 1963 they re-formed themselves as the “St. Thomas College Association,” aiming now at keeping St. Thomas in Chatham by forming a separate diocese for the Miramichi, despite the fading chance of success. The Vatican had already pronounced that the Miramichi could not support a university or a separate diocese.

On August 30, Robert Martin sent Baggio a telegram. He said he was shocked to learn that the government had reached an agreement with Duffie and Leverman for the “disposition of St. Thomas” in Chatham. He said that the college authorities were dividing up the college land and selling it, despite the fact that the minister of lands and mines had advised him the government “was not decided whether to make public funds available for [St. Thomas’s] move.” Martin’s telegram continued: “Financial rumours indicate money not available to operate St. Thomas in Fredericton as proposed. No evidence of conciliation from diocese. Apparent that they intend to proceed whether move feasible or not. People greatly disturbed.”

Baggio contacted Leverman, saying he had to answer Martin's telegram "as soon as possible. But how?" He requested Leverman's "immediate attention" to the matter. Leverman responded on September 4, saying the telegram represented nothing worrisome, nothing new. "It is a repetition," he wrote. Then, in a letter dated September 13, Leverman told Baggio that although the association had planned another rally for September 8 in Chatham, for unexplained reasons it never took place.

Finances

In the same letter of September 13, 1963, Leverman asked Baggio for a \$2 million loan to cover the costs of the move. The government promised \$750,000 by way of recompense for the two new buildings in Chatham. That had been the "conditio sine qua non" since the beginning of negotiations, he wrote, but the government was going to pay at the rate of \$150,000 per year for five years. Leverman wrote, "The Diocese has not the resources or potential to undertake new construction and retain the new buildings at Chatham for any purpose, however, desirable." The loan was needed because "the burden of setting up our new University now demands that we go into debt for the first time." The idea was that buildings in Chatham would become government property, to be used as they saw fit. The parish would retain the old Bishop's Residence, more recently the university's Administration Building, possibly for educational purposes.

Meanwhile, the bishop was feeling better about construction plans in Fredericton. They had cleared the ground for the two new buildings. The Congregation of the Holy Cross had agreed to erect a House of Studies on the new campus, he wrote, although a minor problem in securing the necessary funds would delay construction until the spring of 1964. The Sisters of Charity, it appeared, would be funding a women's residence. The nearby Teachers' College would soon be built. The UNB campus, he wrote,

has now more Catholics than ever. In less than another year and a half, there will be quite easily

well over a thousand Catholics on that Campus. It is important to keep near the teachers as so many are Catholics, [as well as] the Nurses whose studies are becoming more and more University directed. This is our chance to keep in touch with these people. We could not do it unless established there. This will take time but, with God's grace, we will be there to offer Catholic doctrine and guidance. The site provided for us is magnificent.

Sounding a bit as if his crusaders had recaptured Palestine from the infidels, he concluded:

“Please God, the Cross will rise high over the Campus and Catholic influence will be felt by all.”

Mending Fences

On September 7 Leverman wrote Baggio to say he had been visited by a delegation of six men from the Chatham area. They said they were not there to discuss the “College question” but “to find ways and means of narrowing the breach between the Bishop and the area.” Leverman responded that as far as he was concerned, there was no serious breach. He had attended convocation without any problem.

Nevertheless, the delegation proposed establishing a small group consisting of two priests and two laymen, to be named by the Miramichi deanery, to meet with a similar group from the “other parts of the Diocese” to discuss “concrete proposals which would heal the breach they felt had occurred.”

Leverman said he acceded to their request, although reluctantly, because the dean was none other than Fr. McFadden. Still, he would contact the pastor of St. Dunstan's, who would arrange a meeting in the middle of October. He had no idea what they might propose, adding, “It will probably all fall through.”

Although he told Baggio he didn't think much would come of it, Leverman also admitted that it might be “the first breach in the wall.” The group acknowledged many things, such as “untruths, resistance on the part of a small group, etc.,” and he hoped this would “be the beginning of a unity” for which he had “laboured for so long.” In any case, he believed that the whole educational question was coming to an end. Agreements had been signed, plans were nearing completion for new buildings in Fredericton, announcements would soon be made. He expected to finalize everything on September 18,

1963.

On September 17 a spokesman for the delegation contacted the bishop again. They had agreed to ask “the Dean of the Miramichi,” Fr. McFadden, to appoint two clergymen and two laymen from the Chatham area for a meeting with representatives from Saint John on the weekend of October 11–12, the purpose being to “engage in an objective discussion of all the points of contention presently existing between the two parts of our Diocese.” The spokesman assured Leverman that “rumours to the contrary, this move was initiated solely by the laymen of the Miramichi area and not by any member of the Clergy.” Their hope was for “a speedy and satisfactory solution to all problems of mutual concern.” Leverman remained skeptical that any good would come from it and had second thoughts about the wisdom of agreeing to allow McFadden to select the members from the Miramichi, but he was willing to reserve judgment.

It’s Official: St. Thomas to Move to Fredericton

The bishop left for his yearly visit to the Vatican. On October 9 Duffie wrote to inform him that on September 30 the premier finally agreed to officially announce that St. Thomas would move to the UNB campus and be open for classes in September 1964. Given the ground clearing, it could hardly have done otherwise. Duffie informed Mackay, who told his director of public relations to prepare a press release; it appeared on October 5. Ads for tenders for the new St. Thomas buildings went out the same day. The public reaction, wrote Duffie, was “good” from all those he had spoken to. He tried to contact a number of the priests before they heard about it through the media, but they were all out. The response from Robert Martin and Donald Whalen at the association was yet another call for separation from the diocese, but, as Duffie told Leverman, “No-one pays any attention to Whalen.” Furthermore, that very afternoon he met with various influential people at the Beaverbrook Hotel, including Justices Ritchie and Bridges and cabinet members Webber and Crocker: “The cabinet men were agreed it had to

move. Louis had no worries. Graham Crocker had no worries. They said a few politicians had to have their say.” Duffie also reported that he received a letter from Chatham that day and was told “everything is running smoothly with the students and others.”

But Leverman was not so sure about “the others.” He had been worried about McFadden ever since he failed to remove him from his post as pastor of St. Michael’s in Chatham. The bishop felt, rightly or wrongly, that McFadden was the cause of much of the opposition to Duffie. He had reluctantly agreed to his appointing the members of the delegation from Chatham, and sure enough, McFadden sent what the bishop took to be an “obstructionist” telegram. Leverman responded with a sharply worded letter on October 12, which prompted an equally sharply worded response from McFadden. The bishop, McFadden wrote, misunderstood his cable:

- (1) I am not opposed to establishing St. Thomas on the campus of UNB.
- (2) I am not “persisting in efforts” in opposition.
- (3) I have never interfered in your dealing with the Miramichi people (as your letter makes me think you believe).

WHOEVER tells you differently lies. Be conscious that I too have to give a personal accounting to Our Lord in the not too distant future.

I have tried to get everyone to be of like mind and in an effort that will take strength and good will, and that under the leadership of the Bishop. Have you not heard me beg for this end—and get only cold stares from both sides?

I HAVE BEEN DOING all those things which you counsel. I have preached moderation: some will not heed me any more. Believe me I have not been the cause of bitterness among the people.

Your Excellency, what I tried to express in a personal cable is simply that having established St. Thomas at the UNB you could [have stated] that you would like to have a couple of years beyond High School taught at Chatham (as well as Saint John). This would settle the extremists and those they can influence. They would be overcome by your fatherly generosity and wisdom. (If this failed, the economy of the society would be blamed.)

It is only with the thought of being of help to Your Excellency that I have done what I consider my duty. The last thing that I want to do is to annoy you.

What about Chatham?

In spite of his obvious annoyance at McFadden’s attitude, Leverman was relieved to receive a letter from Msgr. Joseph Gallagher, chancellor of his diocese and member of St. Thomas’s board, dated

October 16. Gallagher wrote the bishop to say there had been only “a few outbursts after the announcement of the transfer, but at the moment things are very quiet.” He warned, however, that he understood a petition had been sent directly to His Holiness the Pope. (This would have been Paul VI, recent successor to John XXIII.) He added, reflecting the general feeling among Leverman’s counsellors that ex-Rector McFadden was the *eminence grise* of the opposition to St. Thomas’s move: “One would think that Fr. McFadden would realize there is no point in trying to start all over again.” Gallagher also reported to the bishop on the meeting a few days earlier between the delegations from the northern and the southern parts of the diocese. Although he did not attend, he received a report from Hugh Whalen of UNB, who was the southern group’s spokesman. Whalen was pleased with the meeting and felt that “the other group went home also pleased.” The Miramichi delegation consisted of Fr. Thomas McKendy, Fr. Winfield Poole, Mr. Terence Driscoll, and Mr. Vance Toner. “Not the real Miramichiers,” wrote Gallagher, “or at least not all, that you requested. However, they were the ones appointed and seemed satisfactory.” “There could have been a flare-up,” Whalen reported, but there wasn’t. The premier knew Whalen was meeting with the group and “hoped he would put them in their place—but Hugh said he was not going there for that purpose but to discuss the matter peacefully.”

The Miramichi delegation began by affirming their obedience to the bishop. Whalen, reported Gallagher, even “felt there was a certain apologetic feeling about some of the things that had happened. Only once did Fr. McKendy make any reference to the President.”

The meeting lasted three hours. The Miramichi delegates wanted to know what the government was going to do with the buildings it was acquiring from the diocese. They suggested that it should establish a trades and technical school there, for which they asked for diocesan support. More specifically they wanted to know which of the St. Thomas buildings would be retained by the church. Gallagher told Whalen that he thought the government would be taking over only the new buildings, those constructed since the region became part of the diocese of Saint John, but that he needed to

clarify that first with the bishop. What they really wanted to know, Whalen said, was “what are they going to have left in the Miramichi in the way of Catholic education?” They realize, reported Whalen, that St. Thomas is going to move and that they cannot get even a junior college. Willing to accept that (as they must), they would still like to have some kind of centre of Catholic education in the Miramichi under the direction of priests.

What sort of centre for Catholic education did they have in mind? It could be a high school, providing grade 13, as in Saint John, which did not make it a junior college. Or perhaps a boarding school under clerical direction, “something more than just a parochial school.” Gallagher reminded the bishop that Whalen “knows the Premier well and is an active Liberal and would not hesitate to point out the need of such a school, if you did not object.” He cautioned the bishop, however, that neither Duffie nor Boyd thought it wise to make an official appeal for support for a trades and technical school in Chatham. Better, they felt, if Whalen, as a private citizen (and a good Liberal), gave his views to the premier.

Gallagher wrote that he would await Leverman’s comments. Telling the Miramichi group that some buildings would remain in Chatham for their benefit, he suggested, might help smooth things over. They could then “feel they have accomplished something and that they will be able to do something about the attitude of the rest.” All announcements so far, Gallagher pointed out, appeared to represent a loss for them. “At least this group is accepting this, but they are looking to what will remain on the positive side.”

Meanwhile, Back in Chatham

Duffie continued to keep Leverman informed about what was going on. In a letter dated October 17, 1963, he told the bishop that the Sisters of Charity were having financial difficulties but that he “impressed on them the necessity of being on the campus by 1965.” He wanted a women’s residence, for which the architectural design already existed, and hoped they could work something out. The Holy Cross Fathers were also having money problems. The architect had produced plans for a “wonderful

building” for the fathers and one hundred students, but even with modifications it was going to cost \$800,000. Duffie told Leverman that Fr. MacDonald “is going to have to reduce a bit again.” MacDonald and Toner were coming to Fredericton in November to talk to the architect. They had agreed to cancel the planned garage and gymnasium so as to get costs down to about \$500,000.

Duffie also gave Leverman news about Chatham. The resident students in Chatham were “quite firm in their desire to move.” The students in the women’s residence seemed “overjoyed.” As for the day students, “they are most friendly.” The university had an “excellent group of Freshmen” who were working hard, and their performance was 5 to 10 percent better than in the previous year. In short, he added, “conditions have entirely changed over last year.” He attributed this to “the finality of the move, which has united them.” The new professors he hired “shifted the balance of power.” They were giving the students “a lot of work and a better idea of what University studies means.” There were “no disturbing elements on the other side among the students”; no one had “tried to create a situation of embarrassment.”

In Duffie’s view, then, everything was going well. The three or four senior students who were looking for prefect jobs and work in the library had turned out very well and “are out to show they can handle the situation.” Although some in Chatham

regret the college is moving, I have not run into any fanaticism. Everyone seems to have accepted the finality of the thing, despite the fact that there is some strange thinking among a few with a lot of responsibility for this attitude in the same three or four high places where it was before and a couple of die-hard politicians.

The difficulties in Newcastle came from the same four or five as before, although

Paul Lordon seems to have washed his hands of the whole affair. He told the newspapers that he was not surprised at the move for two reasons: (1) that the college had lost its independence when it accepted Government monies, and (2) that the people had voted wrongly in the last election and it seems some would sell anything for some politics.

About the Friends, Duffie wrote:

The core of the Friends, and I cannot trace that beyond an extremely few persons, went frantic.

They released ten days ago a rather harsh few paragraphs. A couple of them came to the university and took all the Alumni files and a typewriter, having gained entrance to the room in a way innocent to the person who allowed them in, asking for entrance to look at something and claimed the right to take the files. Whether they made the decision on the spur of the moment or whether it was a trick, I do not know. At any rate, they have them at present.

As for St. Thomas's buildings in Chatham, nothing had yet been decided about what the government would do. Duffie cautioned Leverman that "no one as a representative of you should approach the Premier." When Duffie spoke to Robichaud at UNB's convocation, the premier said nothing,

merely "this St. Thomas question" and shrugged his shoulders, saying "I do not know." He left that same day and was away for several days but had not issued any statement, although a week or so ago he had said that the Government was not a dictator and would not interfere with what UNB and St. Thomas wanted to do.

Duffie thought that any statement the premier might make in the next few weeks would not serve any "useful purpose," and added:

No one has any doubt in the world but that the matter is concluded and I think we should just move along the way. Everything will be revealed in time and everybody is taking it for granted that the Government is going to do something with the buildings.

As for the recent delegation from Chatham that met with the Saint John group:

"It was a bit of a fishing expedition, as well as saying they had nothing to discuss except the college, rehashing old arguments and pledging loyalty. Obeisance and obedience." Leverman responded to Duffie's letter, claiming that he was

not surprised at the "State of the Union." I have not changed my opinion that from the beginning it was the salt of the earth that had gone stale. Just what to do to restore the flavour, I am at a loss what to do. Perhaps after a while a solution will come of its own. There is a mutual fear that has been there for some time. I may now be obliged to make certain changes to see if causes might be removed.

From his vantage point, "There appears to be a fundamental readiness to accept the situation but still enough opposition from the Fathers to confuse and delay a very important move. I am hoping and praying that a little time will help."

Hints from the Government

On November 2, Whalen sent a carefully worded letter to McKendy saying he had “made the contacts necessary” to obtain information on what was to be done with the St. Thomas buildings in Chatham after the move: “It should be gratifying to your committee to know that only the three latest additions are being taken over by the Provincial Government.” It therefore seemed logical that the remaining buildings “might be used for educational facilities, provided the necessary arrangements can be made with the proper authorities.” The bishop could not make any specific commitments, as future planning would involve the provincial government, and the government was not willing to make it public yet. Whalen suggested that it would all be cleared up after the bishop returned from Rome; a study could then be “made jointly by all parties involved.” By way of conclusion, he gave McKendy some personal advice. The government would likely not make any announcement until

the so-called “Friends of St. Thomas” desist in their public attacks on the commitments already made. It was most disheartening this week to find my efforts being thwarted by the advertisements in the press of the province. I hope that the information I am giving you will be an incentive for your committee to work for the restoration of unity so essential in this particular situation.

Leverman expected McFadden to inform him about the meeting of the delegates from the two parts of his diocese. When he did not hear, he wrote McFadden, criticizing him for not reporting. McFadden responded defensively on November 7 that he had not understood he was “directed” to report. He quoted Leverman’s instructions: “I am asking you to appoint the group or establish it.” Because the bishop originally was pleased with the delegation from Chatham that visited him and suggested the formation of the two delegations, McFadden asked them to suggest names of people best suited to “interpret the delegation’s ideas to their counterparts from Saint John and Fredericton.” As we saw, those suggested for the Miramichi delegation were Frs. McKendy and Poole along with Terence Driscoll and Vance Toner. McFadden asked them to attend the meeting in Fredericton. None of them, he told Leverman, “had sought to be appointed.” He assured the bishop that neither of the priests “ever

made any sort of statement that would jeopardize their good name nor be adverse to the best interest of the Diocese.” McFadden, of course, knew that because all four opposed the move they would not have been the bishop’s choice.

Sod Is Turned

On November 2, 1963, Duffie sent Leverman, still in Rome, the news that a major event in the history of St. Thomas University had taken place on October 30: the sod was turned for St. Thomas’s first two buildings at UNB, the main building and the men’s residence. The newspapers reported that Diamond Construction had been awarded the contract and would begin work immediately. Duffie wrote:

Dr. F. J. Toole and Chester Mahon represented UNB. Msgr. Boyd represented the Bishop. Also present were: Frs. McMahan and Wallace, Ashley Colter for Diamond Construction Co., Otis Logue, and for St. Thomas, myself, the Dean of Women Anne Bradley, members of the St. Thomas faculty Leonard Doucette and Ann Dunnigan, and a few others. We were at the ceremony in a blistering rain, the day after hurricane Ginny. Four photographers, two other newspaper men, and CFNB were also there. Msgr. Boyd spoke nicely. Diamond is at work now.

Duffie had thanked everyone for attending and said he was confident of “happy relations between UNB and St. Thomas in the months ahead.” He would write the bishop at greater length later. At the moment his desk was covered with letters; he was

besieged by requests for pay increases, and whether or not or what I am going to do with Mrs. McCarthy [the cook], etc. They certainly have accepted the finality of the thing even if the friends had a full page ad in the same issue as the account of the sod-turning.

Duffie reported that he had his first communication from St. Thomas’s neighbours at the top of the hill near where the new buildings were to be built. Some of them were not happy about the location of the men’s residence building, which was near their homes. He pointed out to them that the planning of the UNB campus had been a “long time in the making,” and that the planning for the sections of land for

St. Thomas University and the Teachers' College specifically was also done "after much planning." He told them it was impossible to change anything, given the amount of space available, and that it "would have even been impossible from the beginning." He also told them he was sure in the end they "would like the appearance of the new buildings," which would "enhance" their section of the city.

Duffie also had to fight some rearguard actions. The Friends of St. Thomas inserted a full-page ad in all the daily newspapers of the province. It offered pictures of the buildings in Chatham and lists of groups opposed to the move, as well as criticism of the Deutsch Commission, the "so-called Officials of St. Thomas," and the board of governors "augmented by the addition of persons who voted in favour of the move." But for Duffie, it was only the final twitch of a dying body. The campaign was over. Duffie was in still charge. St. Thomas was moving. Everything was official and underway. He told Leverman that everyone accepted "the finality of the thing," meaning the principle had been won. Now for practical matters.

Practical Matters

For example, who among the faculty and staff would be moving to Fredericton and who not? What to do about the staff employed in the residences and dining hall? For all the publicity, here it was November 1963: would the buildings be ready for use by next fall? The Holy Cross Fathers were still working on the details of their sublease with St. Thomas and agreement with the diocese. They were not planning to start building until the spring; completion could be a year and a half after that. As for the women's residence, the Sisters of Charity were also having financial problems. They were not sure "just where they stand" and so had made no definite commitment to start building. Where would St. Thomas's female students stay? This, wrote Duffie, was one of the first items Leverman would have to attend to when he returned.

Duffie wrote Leverman again on November 21 to say that things seemed to be settling down.

Fewer angry letters were appearing in the papers. But problems loomed, especially for St. Thomas. He had just returned from Nova Scotia where he attended meetings of the Central Advisory Committee. The committee was made up of university presidents and heads of education departments from all four Atlantic provinces. The changes taking place, Duffie wrote, are "terrifying." They were offering different types of degrees. Some institutions, like the new UNBSJ, were contemplating introducing televised courses. Everyone was worried about the lack of qualified professors in Canada. They would have to hire on the American educational markets, competing not only with each other but with American institutions, at American rates of pay. Would the money for salaries be there? Personnel problems were demanding a lot of his attention. Mrs. McCarthy, the university's cook, had asked if she could come to Fredericton. Duffie stalled, telling her that all the details of the move were not worked out, but he would inform her as soon as he could "find out the solution to several problems we had." It was a touchy problem. McCarthy had been in charge of hiring all the girls who worked at the university. In light of the coming move, several had already left to find jobs in Chatham. Besides, they had tentatively agreed to give the kitchen contract to food services at UNB, who would do all the hiring. McCarthy, wrote Duffie, had "aged considerably in the last two years and certainly is beyond the age and physical condition where the Food Services would hire her. It is a problem we have to work out before the new year." She was willing to work as housekeeper for a priest who was moving, but this Duffie thought was a doubtful proposition. At least he thought he could find employment for one of St. Thomas's maintenance men in the comparable UNB department. John Brennan, a long-time St. Thomas employee, decided to stay in Chatham but needed work. Duffie thought there ought to be opportunities for him and two or three others when the government took over its buildings. As for the old Administration Building, with some changes Duffie thought it might be of use to the high school, although "when one gets beyond the first floor of the old Administration Building there would be considerable work necessary and the two top floors are not in any excellent condition."

The Prospect of Fundraising

To Duffie, the biggest challenge before them was fundraising. On November 26 he wrote Leverman, still in Rome, that he met with various people involved in UNB's fundraising drive, including President Mackay, Vice-president Bev Macaulay, bursar Chester Mahan, K. C. Irving, and Fred Harrison from Montreal. All advised against a joint UNB-St. Thomas campaign. Harrison had been canvassing in Montreal and was "convinced that the campaigns should be separate." It was impossible, Duffie reported him saying, "to go into a firm and ask with the right hand for one University and with the left hand for another." If they tried to combine their efforts, both universities would suffer. Irving agreed. He told Duffie that UNB had its friends and St. Thomas had theirs, although perhaps "some were friends of both." Irving thought St. Thomas was in a strong position to ask industry for money, "not so much because it is moving but [because] it is really beginning to establish a new institution." So two drives it would have to be.

It would be a challenge. Duffie heard that St. Mary's University had launched a big campaign in Montreal and Toronto, but they had graduates there "as well as the Jesuit connection." Besides, it already had a well-established reputation in the sciences and, unlike St. Thomas, had been accredited by the National Conference of Universities and Colleges of Canada; Another drawback was that the St. Thomas appeal included plans for a chapel in the main new building and a men's residence with living quarters for priests—uses that most national firms would not support. Residence funding was probably covered by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. In any case, Duffie had learned a lot about "the technical difficulties and the mechanics to University appeals," and would discuss them with the bishop when he returned from Rome.

Petition to the Holy See

In the same letter of November 26, Duffie informed Leverman about the latest tactics of their opponents. Unable to stop the move, the Friends shifted their efforts to having the Miramichi declared a separate diocese. They visited Baggio but he sent them back without encouragement. Ever persistent, they sent a petition directly to the Holy See. Duffie was “not sure of the wording,” but said it was “in effect an appeal against the apostolic delegate,” which he thought disgraceful. Reports as to the number of signatures on the petition ranged from 250 to 272. Many refused to sign it, and many who did were “ignorant in the true sense of the word.” The petition, he heard, was set aside on the strength of a letter from the apostolic delegate. Duffie was confident the petition would be ignored. Once news of the denial became known, wrote Duffie, “all the faculty who favoured the move have acted with dignity and complete restraint, without ostentation or exultation. In fact I was somewhat surprised that they did so well. Three or four of them suffered a lot in the last year, but if charity is the word, they have shown much more charity than was shown to them.” Most of those faculty, of course, were recently hired by Duffie. Yet even the ones still opposed were keeping their peace. Everyone “was trying to be charitable,” wrote Duffie, although “there has to be a relationship between truth and charity. The difficulties have come from the same men all through.” Duffie told Leverman the university was fortunate that Fr. Kandathil’s bishop agreed that the chemistry professor could extend his stay at St. Thomas for a few more years. During that time he would be invited to join the UNB faculty.

Duffie informed the bishop that he discussed with Fr. McKendy, the theology professor, the positioning of the altar and sanctuary in the new chapel in the main building. Vince Donovan, a priest who would be teaching sociology after the move, would be supervising its construction. Donovan had been the commanding officer of St. Thomas’s air force cadet squadron in Chatham and was willing to continue in that position in Fredericton, if it were possible to set up a squadron there. It would “enable him to have a small income per year in addition to his University salary,” an important consideration as the priests’ salaries were “still very low and there will be fewer opportunities to augment their salaries

in Fredericton.”

In his reply, the bishop asked Duffie to consider rewarding those members of the staff who supported the administration and the move. Duffie gently dissuaded Leverman:

I think anything special to anyone now would not help. No one is expecting it. And if there was one or five, then somebody else would be left out. And there would be that division. However, I leave that to your wishes.

Campus Facilities

A few days later, on November 29, 1963, Duffie wrote to congratulate a friend who had just been appointed a judge in Ontario. He provided a useful summary of the situation at St. Thomas:

The buildings are getting started in Fredericton....The first Mens' Residence and the second building, which will contain offices, classrooms, chapel and dining rooms, are due to be completed by August 1964....We shall be on the campus of UNB for classes in September 1964. We are hoping that we will get the Women's Residence started in the early fall of 1964. If the Women's Residence plans go through, we will have three million dollars' worth of buildings on the campus. Then we will have to stop and find a good part of the three million before we can go on but this will give us a good start especially considering that UNB is contemplating a new library in 1964 and in 1965 a classroom building which will also be available to us. They are also providing all the science facilities and all the athletic facilities. There is still a maze of detail to work out but to date everything has gone splendidly except that both UNB and ourselves have financial problems. UNB has 2,500 students at the present; we have 275. New Brunswick Teachers' College began their new building worth one and one-half million just directly to the right and they will have 1,100 students, 500 of whom are Catholic, [also] starting in September 1964. The new library will be in the triangle where St. Thomas, UNB and Teachers' College meet.

As Duffie indicated, the move to the UNB campus would involve mutual planning and much cooperation among the three institutions. In early December he travelled to Fredericton to meet at the office of the minister of education with representatives from UNB and Teachers' College. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the sharing of campus athletic facilities. Although the other two institutions had three representatives each, Duffie appeared alone for St. Thomas, as usual without having consulted any of his university officials as to what to ask for, not even Vance Toner, the athletic director. Toner was simply informed afterwards as to what had been agreed. But that was Duffie's style,

to which many at St. Thomas—priests, faculty, and staff—had objected so far and would continue to object in the years ahead. Although there is no question he fought hard and skilfully to obtain the best for St. Thomas as an institution, when it came to interpersonal relations, the skill level dropped.

In any case, he did not do badly at the meeting. All present agreed to “full cooperation” among the three institutions concerning physical facilities. Students from all three would share the outdoor running track and the swimming pool in the Lady Beaverbrook Residence. UNB was hoping to construct another pool “at an indefinite future but as early as finances will permit.” (The Sir Max Aitken Pool opened in the Beaverbrook Gymnasium four years later, free of charge to students and faculty at St. Thomas.) All students could use the Beaverbrook Gymnasium for intercollegiate basketball games and some physical education activities. The government was building a new gymnasium for Teachers’ College, to be called the South Gym, “with explicit provision for St. Thomas.” Furthermore, the government designated the land adjoining Teachers’ College for additional playing fields “explicitly for Teachers’ College and St. Thomas, but also for additional UNB needs.” As for the overcrowded Lady Beaverbrook Rink, it “will necessarily have to serve everybody at least for the immediate years ahead.”

As Duffie informed the bishop after the meeting, intramural athletics at St. Thomas would become an integral part of the total program of UNB, which was “under the direction of John Meagher, a graduate of Loyola whose brother is a Jesuit.” Meagher’s counterpart at St. Thomas, athletics director Vance Toner, could work out the details with him and with Andrew Martin at Teachers’ College. As for bookstore facilities, Duffie worked out an agreement with Marjorie Logue, manager of the University Bookstore, to provide textbooks for St. Thomas courses. The bookstore would employ part-time one St. Thomas student “as against seven UNB students.” Construction of the Administration Building and the men’s residence was underway. When the bishop returned he would see for himself how the new St. Thomas campus was taking shape.

A Junior College for Chatham?

The progress was undeniable. For Duffie, 1963 had been a challenge but in the end a banner year. Any doubts about St. Thomas's relocation in Fredericton were now laid to rest. Yet a serious and related question remained unanswered: what postsecondary educational facilities would be left in Chatham after St. Thomas left? The notion of a separate diocese for the Miramichi appeared to be dead, along with the possibility of establishing a Catholic junior college there. The government had not made clear what it intended to do with the St. Thomas buildings it had acquired. Miramichiers were understandably apprehensive. On December 12, 1963, James Currie of Chatham wrote to Lord Beaverbrook in England:

Daniel Hurley, a former Beaverbrook scholar now teaching at UNB, is a lucid thinker. Last month in a letter to the editor, he wrote: "St. Thomas at Fredericton is something to be lauded by everyone. Anyone interested in education will hail this as an advance....Can anything be salvaged for the Miramichi? The answer is obvious to all who wish to see. The need still remains. The buildings remain. Cannot a Junior college continue?"

As you know, My Lord, there is a trend right across Canada to establish new colleges and even new university campuses. The student population has doubled these past ten years. It will double again in the next decade. While we are happy that St. Thomas will develop at Fredericton, we are anxious to have, at least, a couple of years beyond High School taught here. The need is here, indeed 150 local teachers were able to follow summer school courses and live at home this past year. The buildings are here for a Junior College. There are people also who would gladly continue to dedicate themselves for the benefit of the local people. We don't want to strip the Miramichi bare! It will not be to the betterment of the Province if the Miramichi becomes a Dog Patch (as the Americans say). The eyes of Canadian college educators have been on us for the past two years. We hope that we don't deserve this total ruthless uprooting being planned for us. Only you, My Lord, can save something at the college level (two years as in Sydney) for our valley.

Lord Beaverbrook, unwell at the time, replied:

I am so sorry, I cannot help you. The project you mention is enormous, and I am too old to undertake it. And you should not put your hand to the task before making sure that you can carry it through. I am delighted at the immense progress being made on the North Shore.

With happy memories and very good regards, Beaverbrook.

Currie countered:

My Lord, I was not suggesting that you undertake the responsibility of maintaining something at the college level on the Miramichi. Rather I was trying to bring to your attention that I know there is a sufficient number of people who want to have a couple of years of College work carried on here. I refer both to those who would contribute and those who would benefit directly. But they are leaderless. The people are anxious, the cause is just, the buildings are here, the need is paramount—and the time is now. A word from you to both parties who are planning to have St. Thomas exclusively settled in Fredericton would be the greatest of your prodigious gifts to the well-being of our people.

The parties, of course, are Bishop Leverman and Colin Mackay with their advisers and associates. I hear what the people are saying. The above-mentioned parties do not. They wouldn't believe me, but I know that the only way to get support for St. Thomas in Fredericton is by leaving something at the college level on the Miramichi.

Beaverbrook does not appear to have replied. Six months later, on June 9, 1964, the recipient of St.

Thomas's first honorary doctorate died.

Problems with the Leadership

Fr. Arnold Toner, provincial of the Holy Cross Order, visited St. Thomas earlier in 1963. Although he supported Duffie's campaign to relocate in Fredericton, particularly his arrangements for the order's new junior seminary there—the Holy Cross House of Studies—he was disturbed by the problems he discovered between the president and his faculty. In February 1964 he told Bishop Leverman that Duffie should possibly be removed, "because he is no man to keep a community together." Leverman rejected Toner's advice; nevertheless, he had his own reservations about his loyal lieutenant. As he told Oscar Schneller, he knew

that is half the problem with [Duffie]. He is a poor relations man for groups. He gets on well with faculty and members of other institutions and members of Parliament and so on. But the blunt Duffie way and the blind spot he has in another makes it difficult for me and forms a barrier between me and the faculty there. But no one realizes what a change could mean at this point of the game. He has the full knowledge of all that is going on, academically, economically, contact-wise, etc. I have to just bide my time. There is not the same complaint against him this year as of last. It is not all Miramichi, you know. I have a double problem. Duffie sees it only from one view point, his own.

While the bishop bided his time, Duffie kept on bulldozing. Personnel issues were minor

obstacles. He was too involved in the preparations for the move, and it was a one-man show. He had taken over practically all administrative duties; he made all the decisions. The new faculty he hired were all looking forward to the move. He tended to ignore those who had been there for years, especially those who decided to stay. Now that the battle to move had been won, he could finally enjoy his position as the university's president. He liked negotiating with people at UNB and in the government in Fredericton. He enjoyed being asked to speak in public. As he wrote to a friend:

Things are running along routinely here. I am back and forth to Fredericton practically every week. I am now in the UNB Academic Council and have to turn up at such things as Founder's Day. The UNB crowd from the top down and from the bottom up have been tremendous all winter and at all levels the offers have been excellent.

The students [here] asked me to be a special speaker at the St. Thomas Day banquet, and the Home and School Associations of Harkins High and St. Mary's have invited me to speak next Thursday evening. I am giving one of the lectures in the St. Michael's Marriage Course next Sunday night.

Duffie did have to deal with some awkward requests. Two former students who gave money for the chapel that was never built demanded their money back. Likewise, a priest who said he "donated one thousand dollars towards the construction of a college chapel at Chatham" wanted his money back. The president of a savings and loan association said he forwarded "a substantial cheque" for the chapel:

Since the chapel was never built, and since subsequent efforts have determined that it never will be built in Chatham, I hereby request the return of this donation. It is regrettable that I find it necessary to make this request because I know that many others besides myself feel that these monies that were solicited and donated for a specific purpose should have long since been returned, since the authorities of the University have known for a long time that this chapel would never be built. I am sure that you will agree that Christian honesty decrees that this refund be made, so I am looking forward to a favorable reply shortly.

Duffie acknowledged the letter a month later, attempting to dodge the matter of a refund by saying that he had no alumni files and did not have a record of how much the gentleman contributed:

The whole matter is a rather complicated business, and there is some indication in your letter that all the facts have not been presented to you. I trust that you will allow me some time to write you at greater length. You will understand in the meantime that naturally my personal decisions are quite limited as any University President's hours are. I also would hope that I would have the opportunity sometime of speaking with you personally. I do not foresee at the present time that I will be in your immediate area in the very near future, but then, I do go your

way fairly often because I have some business and many good friends there.

On the larger scale, money ceased to be a problem. In February 1964, Bishop Leverman heard from Archbishop Baggio that the Sacred Congregation of the council in Rome authorized a loan of \$2 million to pay for relocating the university. "Normally the tax or interest on this would be one dollar for every ten thousand dollars borrowed," but they would "leave the amount of the offering" to the bishop's discretion. Leverman was so pleased with the loan that in thanking Baggio he enclosed a cheque for two hundred dollars to be put toward the interest, as suggested, one dollar for every ten thousand borrowed.

Meanwhile, St. Thomas's senior class, the class of '64, was preparing for exams and convocation. It would be the last class to graduate from St. Thomas in Chatham. Duffie wanted to find someone to whom to give an honorary degree and who could address convocation, set for May 13. As usual he consulted no one. He finally settled on Edward Byrne, chairman of the recent Byrne Commission on high school education in the province. Byrne waited two days before responding. He told Duffie he had been offered an honorary doctorate by another university whose convocation was the same day. He decided, however, to accept Duffie's invitation for several reasons. First, "as a New Brunswick English-speaking Catholic" he felt he should accept St. Thomas's invitation. Second, he admired the work and advances made at St. Thomas in the last two or three years and had long been an advocate for the institution. Third, he felt that his acceptance might give some impetus to the new project in Fredericton. Duffie welcomed Byrne's support. He could now attend to the serious business of moving the university to Fredericton.

Crisis in the Diocese

With Duffie's unflagging support, Leverman was convinced that the issue of relocating St. Thomas was resolved and that he could now relax. Although the university was set to move out of Chatham into new

buildings in Fredericton, the bishop's diocese—which only five years earlier he had carefully rearranged so as to include the Miramichi—was again under threat. The move to carve out a new diocese for the Miramichi refused to die. Duffie's assurances to the contrary rang hollow in his ears when in April he received a letter from Baggio bringing to his attention the unwelcome fact that the departure of St. Thomas from Chatham did not mean an end to his responsibilities to its Catholic residents. The apostolic delegate told Leverman:

I had hoped, and I knew that it was your ardent desire, that time would heal the wounds inflicted upon the people of the Miramichi by the developments of the last two years. On the contrary, the feelings of resentment have deepened and to my sad surprise are reaching a new and more critical stage. After much insistence had been brought to bear both here and in Rome, I agreed to receive a group of laymen from that area whose request it was that I study again the question of erecting a new diocese, which they feel to be the only solution capable of saving and restoring the faith of these people.

Following that meeting, Baggio received

a brief, signed by twenty-two priests of the diocese, who find themselves bound in conscience to support this move [to establish a new diocese for the Miramichi] of the laymen in the interests of the pastoral welfare of the Diocese.

He had studied their brief carefully. There was no doubt in his mind “that both groups in support of this petition are sincere in their proposal and are in good faith.” As a result he had “no other alternative than to accede to their request to submit the question to a thorough and accurate investigation.” Baggio was sending Fr. Arnold Toner to the Miramichi to talk with the priests and report on “the possibility and advisability” of creating a new diocese. He had already contacted Toner; all that remained was to set a date for the visit. Baggio himself was nearing the end of his term as apostolic delegate to Canada and would turn over all the relevant materials to his successor, Archbishop Sergio Pignedoli.

Leverman, feeling personally attacked, was deeply upset at the news of these new protests. He wrote Schneller in May, complaining that

The old Miramichi is kicking up again with another protest for a Diocese. It is ridiculous. This

after another meeting with ten men from the area who were very kind, respectful, etc. etc., and then ten days later I hear of another petition. They are not to be trusted.

The latest document was “libellous, a fabrication and a lie.” Some of the priests in the area refused to sign it. He was just getting over an operation and now he returned to face “the old problems with a few new ones.” To make matters worse, he wrote, the alumni association was making financial demands. They met on May 6 and issued a notice that they had loaned the university \$30,000—\$10,000 in each of 1960, 1961, and 1962—money to be “paid back on demand.” They now demanded it back.

Rules for Future Capital Expenditures

In response to the bishop’s worries, in early July 1964 Schneller paid a visit to Fredericton to talk about St. Thomas’s finances and to have a look at the emerging campus. He was impressed, not only with the way the campus was taking shape but also with the way Duffie was managing things. To speed up the building of the women’s residence, for which the Sisters of Charity were having difficulties raising the promised funds, he told Duffie he was recommending the release of funds from the bishop’s building fund. He wrote Duffie on July 12 to confirm their agreement:

With reference to our talk, and in the light of your proven ability to stay within the limits of your estimates, I have suggested to Bishop Leverman an expenditure of \$460,000 for a completely furnished residence to accommodate one hundred girls at St. Thomas University, with driveway, landscaping and service tunnel connections included. No doubt you will be hearing from His Excellency in due course.

But Schneller also laid down some rules governing future capital and operating expenses. Given that the diocese “cannot afford to indulge in more than one project which is not self-liquidating,” he wished to

establish the pattern which should govern expansion and operations from here on:

1. The Diocese provides the primary facilities of the college, chapel, cafeteria, residences, etc.
2. The Diocese cannot be expected to pick up the tab for any operational deficits. Therefore, it is imperative in a Catholic university to see to it that operational revenue provides a break-even point or surplus in any fiscal year’s operation.
3. Contrariwise, the Diocese should not expect to benefit from any surplus, such surplus being

needed to establish foundations for staff, scholarships, etc.

4. Capital expansion, once the primary plant has been installed, must of necessity come from outside sources such as Federal-Provincial Governments, business institutions, alumni, etc.

The Fate of St. Thomas Properties in Chatham

The following month, August 1964, Duffie met with the minister of public works, his deputy, and their lawyer to discuss the vacated buildings in Chatham. The government would pay the university \$750,000 (over five years) for the two newest buildings. It was giving the Lord Beaverbrook Arena to the town of Chatham, which was what the late Beaverbrook wanted. The government was taking over the old college building, gymnasium, playing fields, and all remaining property up to the line of lots that St. Thomas had already sold. It was giving one of the university's houses to St. Michael's Academy and taking an option on the other two. Government officials would evaluate all the property and negotiate a price for what they were taking, in addition to the \$750,000.

Unfortunately, financial matters were not as simple as they appeared, as the distressed bishop soon discovered. On September 1, 1964, the new apostolic delegate, Archbishop Pignedoli (he had replaced Baggio on June 1), wrote Leverman, now in Rome for his annual visit to the Vatican, outlining his concerns. Pignedoli had been studying the file on the removal of the university and noted his predecessor's

insistence that the College be maintained for the use of the people of the area in some educative way, such as a technical school, since their financial commitment in the past to the present set-up has been heavy, therefore they are entitled to some returns.

It was the diocese, not the university, that was selling property to the province. Referring obliquely to the issue of designating a new diocese for Chatham, Pignedoli wrote:

Since the entire question is presently under study and of such a delicate nature, I could not risk remaining silent and felt obliged to remind you that as in borrowing money so too in selling property the permission of the Holy See is required.

He looked forward to discussing these matters "more thoroughly" when the two met in Rome.

In Leverman's absence, on September 2, 1964, St. Thomas opened its doors at its new location. Everyone—students, professors, officials—must have been nervous about the venture. After all, moving an entire university is difficult. Yet classes began as scheduled on September 12. Fredericton had a new university.

St. Thomas and the Spirit of Vatican II

While Duffie and Leverman were engineering St. Thomas's relocation from Chatham to Fredericton, coincidentally Pope John XXIII in October 1962 initiated the Second Vatican Council (Vatican II). (Although Pope John died in June 1963, the Council continued until 1965, when it was brought to a close by Pope Paul VI.) Ironically, Vatican II sought to introduce into the ancient and rigid faith an atmosphere of dialogue and negotiation through greater lay participation in the liturgy. Duffie and Leverman practised anything but "dialogue and negotiation" as they steamrolled over the objections of most Miramichiers, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. And yet, the move to Fredericton unquestionably resulted in the gradual secularization of the university's faculty, curriculum, and student body. The shift at St. Thomas, like Vatican II, was driven by political, social, economic, and technological changes in the modern world. But whereas the Catholic church in the years after Vatican II reverted to a more conservative and authoritarian stance, the community of St. Thomas University proceeded to become more liberal, more secular, and less authoritarian.

Appendix to Chapter 9

Faculty

St. Thomas faculty in 1963-64 (the last year in Chatham):

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

Hafeez Alexander , BA, MA, Cand PhD (Ottawa)	Political Science
Anne Bradley , BA (Mt St. Vincent), BEd (STU)	Education
John Brander, BA (UNB), MA (Queens)	Economics
Fenton Burke , BA (StFX), MA (UNB)	English Lit
J. Edward Butler, MA (STU)	History
Rev. Edmund Casey, BA (STU); MEd, Cand PhD (St. Louis U) (on leave)	Education
J. Sheldon Currie, BA (StFX), MA (UNB) (on leave)	English Lit
Rev. Vincent Donovan, BA (STU), MA (Fordham)	Latin & Classics
Leonard Doucette, BA (London), Cand PhD (Brown)	Mdn Langs
Msgr. Donald Duffie, BA (St. Joseph's), BCL (UNB), BCL (Oxford), JCD (Laval)	Political Science
Anne Dunnigan , BSc (Dalhousie)	Biology
Leo Ferrari, BSc (Sydney), PhD (Laval)	Phil & Physics
Rev. George Harrington, MA (Catholic Univ of America)	Sociology
Rev. Edward Higgins , BA (Ste Anne)	French
Rev. A. J. Kandathil, BSc, MSc (Madras); BPh, LPh, BD, LD (Kandy); PhD (Notre Dame)	Chemistry
Rev. George Martin, BA (STU)	English Lit
Rev. Thomas McKendy, BA (STU), MSc (Fordham)	Theology
Rev. J. Winfield Poole, BA (St. Joseph's), BEd (STU), STD (UofMontreal), MA (Fordham)	Mathematics
Pierre Sallenave, BA (Potiers)	French & Spanish
Vance Toner, BA (STU), MS (Springfield)	Education
Rev. J. Edward Troy, BA (StFX); PhL, PhD (Louvain)	Philosophy
Rev. W. D. Walsh, BA (STU), Cand MA (Fordham)	History

Sources, Chapter 9

For the material in this chapter, extensive use was made of the written correspondence of Bishop Alfred Leverman, Msgr. Donald C. Duffie, Justice Louis Ritchie, 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].

Other sources used were:

Minutes of the Board of St. Thomas University, 1963.

St. Thomas University Calendars, relevant years.

The Aquinian.

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

Marc Smith, "The Holy Cross Fathers at St. Thomas University", *The New Freeman* 101 (2001).

Contemporary accounts in the following newspapers:

The *Chatham Gazette*

The Fredericton *Daily Gleaner*

The Saint John *Daily Telegraph*

Personal information from the following:

-Professor Allen Bentley

-Professor Senator Noel Kinsella

-Professor Reverend Marc Smith