

Secularization, Co-education and Conflict Management at Saint Mary's University:  
1967-1970

By

Bridget E. Brownlow

A Thesis Submitted to  
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts, Atlantic Canada Studies

February 2012, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Copyright Bridget E. Brownlow, 2012

Approved:

---

Dr. John G. Reid, Co-Supervisor

---

Dr. James Morrison, Co-Supervisor

---

Dr. Janet Guildford, External Examiner

Date: 3 February 2012



Library and Archives  
Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file Votre référence*

*ISBN: 978-0-494-88939-8*

*Our file Notre référence*

*ISBN: 978-0-494-88939-8*

#### NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

#### AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Chapter One - Women, Protest and Vatican II.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter Two - Secularization, Co-education and Mount Saint Vincent: Viewpoints from the 1990s.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Chapter Three - Later Perspectives.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Chapter Four - Conclusion: Managing Secularization and Co-education with Minimal Disruption.....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>107</b>

# Acknowledgements

I am amazed at the number of individuals who have greatly assisted and supported me from the onset of this study. First, my most sincere appreciation and gratitude is extended to my thesis advisors, Dr. Jim Morrison and Dr. John Reid. As a graduate student, it was my great fortune to work under the supervision of such highly respected historians who consistently provided me with guidance and support in a most professional and patient manner.

I would like to sincerely thank Kim Squires who championed my graduate studies at Saint Mary's without hesitation and with unwavering support. My deepest gratitude is also extended to Pam Stonehouse, Walter Thompson, Dr. Hetty van Gorp and Rick Lewis; four very important individuals in my life who encouraged me to pursue graduate studies and kindly provided the references necessary for admission to this program

I want to thank Hansel Cook from the Patrick Power Library. I was a frequent visitor to the Saint Mary's archives over the past few years and was always welcomed and supported by Hansel and his staff.

I must also sincerely thank all of the oral history interviewees who so willingly and openly shared their experiences in connection with the focus of this research. I found their stories to be most interesting, entertaining and invaluable to achieving a

deeper understanding of Saint Mary's University during such a time of significant change.

Finally, I am most grateful to Bernie and Darcy whose support, encouragement and understanding made this thesis a reality.

# **Abstract**

## **Secularization, Co-education and Conflict Management at Saint Mary's University: 1967-1970**

**By**

**Bridget E. Brownlow**

Saint Mary's University is a mid-sized Atlantic Canadian post-secondary institution with a long and complex history as evidenced by numerous developments and changes, particularly throughout the latter part of the twentieth century. Prior to that era, Saint Mary's was a radically different place from what it subsequently became. As an institution of higher learning, it was male-dominated and vigorously Catholic in its mission and traditions. The intention of this thesis is to provide a detailed and discerning account, primarily through the interpretation of oral history evidence, of the two most significant events in the history of Saint Mary's University which occurred between 1967 and 1970: secularization and the beginning of co-education. More specifically, this study will suggest that the introduction of co-education along with the secularization of Saint Mary's University, as seen by former students as well as by former and current faculty and staff, were events that resulted in significant changes within a short time, especially by comparison with the concurrent pace of change at other Atlantic Canadian universities. Ultimately, the thesis will suggest, Saint Mary's navigated through these major changes with remarkably little disruption.

Date: 3 February 2012

## **Chapter One**

### **Women, Protest and Vatican II**

Saint Mary's University is a mid-sized Atlantic Canadian post-secondary institution with a long and complex history as evidenced by numerous developments and changes, particularly throughout the latter part of the twentieth century. Prior to that era, Saint Mary's was a radically different place from what it subsequently became. As an institution of higher learning, it was male-dominated and vigorously Catholic in its mission and traditions. The intention of this thesis is to provide a detailed and discerning account, primarily through the interpretation of oral evidence, of the two most significant events in the history of Saint Mary's University which occurred between 1967 and 1970: secularization and the beginning of co-education.

More specifically, this study will suggest that the introduction of co-education along with the secularization of Saint Mary's University, as seen by former students as well as by former and current faculty and staff, were events that resulted in significant changes within a short time, especially by comparison with the concurrent pace of change at other Atlantic Canadian universities. Ultimately, the thesis will suggest, Saint Mary's navigated through these major changes with remarkably little disruption. It is in this context that the first chapter will present an examination of women's role in academia between 1945 and 1975 at other Canadian universities that have been studied by previous historians: McGill University, Saint Francis Xavier University, Mount Allison University, Dalhousie University, St.

Dunstan's University, and Mount Saint Vincent University. Also examined will be the 1960s "protest" culture as well as the association between the Second Vatican Council and the secularization of Saint Mary's University.

Historian Laurence Shook would suggest that Saint Mary's University was originally founded in 1802 by the Reverend Edmund Burke as an effort to provide education as a seminary and college which was to be dedicated to the Irish of Halifax. This early period in the university's history was marred by numerous setbacks and it appears Saint Mary's began to develop in earnest only by 1838. A number of ensuing challenges occurred over the next 80 years with the Irish Christian Brothers eventually assuming administration over the institution by spring of 1913.<sup>1</sup>

The formal arrangement between the Irish Christian Brothers and Saint Mary's was relatively short lived - according to Shook, the Brothers' administration of the college was undistinguished: "The brothers ... had not found a way to prevent the college from being a financial burden on the diocese, nor were they able to bring it to great academic prestige; nor had they able to recruit vocations for the diocesan priesthood on what the bishops felt to be an adequately large scale."<sup>2</sup>

In 1940, Archbishop John T. McNally succeeded in having the Jesuits assume the administration of Saint Mary's College. In 1951, the college moved from Quinpool Road in central Halifax to the Collins estate at Gorsebrook in the south end of the city. It was in 1952 that construction was complete on the university campus with the opening of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Laurence T. Shook, *Catholic Post-Secondary Education in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), 67-68.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 69.



“McNally Building”; and also in 1952 the “college” officially became a “university”. Between 1952 and 1970 Saint Mary’s continued to expand its infrastructure with the addition of the Bishop Burke Education Centre / Burke library in 1965, the Science Building and Residences in 1968, and Husky Stadium in 1969.<sup>3</sup>

The university’s focus on development was certainly influenced by the availability of federal funding for Canadian post-secondary institutions. A crucial source of change in Canadian post-secondary education during the post-Second World War era was increasing government involvement in financing. According to the analysis of David Cameron:

It was the Second World War and its aftermath which opened the floodgates to the federal invasion of provincial jurisdiction over higher education. University leaders, at least in English speaking Canada, were active in lobbying for federal participation. Having enjoyed a close and personal relationship during the war, university representatives joined senior federal officials and politicians in pressing for a more activist federal role in the process of post-war reconstruction.<sup>4</sup>

This interest in having the federal government participate actively in the funding of post-secondary education culminated in the creation of the “Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences”, also known as the “Massey Commission” as it was chaired by Vincent Massey, Chancellor of the University of Toronto. The Massey Commission recommended grants that proved to be instrumental in allowing universities throughout the country to embark on massive expansion of infrastructure and overall

---

<sup>3</sup> Anne West, *Saint Mary’s University – An Anniversary Portrait* (Lockport, Nova Scotia: Community Books, 2000), 50-55.

<sup>4</sup> David Cameron, *Higher Education in Canada*, ed. Glen A. Jones (London: Garland Publishing, 1997), 11.

development of university programs.<sup>5</sup> As Paul Litt has noted, there was significant opposition to many of the recommendations that came through the Massey Commission. For instance, public opposition was considerable in regard to funding for cultural and broadcasting initiatives. Litt suggests that outside of Quebec, this was not the case regarding financial assistance the Massey Commission was proposing for the development of post-secondary education:

The recommendation for federal aid to universities was the only area where there were no objections raised to the report on practical or laissez-faire grounds in the English-Canadian press. The proposal was greeted with great enthusiasm and was the exclusive subject of many editorials. Newspapers like the *Calgary Herald*, which opposed state intervention in principle, nevertheless supported federal aid for universities. The fact that universities offered material as well as spiritual advantages made aid for universities easier to accept than arts subsidies. Education was a more familiar and practical concern than culture, university graduates were needed by an expanding economy, and once again there was no threat to free enterprise in this area.<sup>6</sup>

The expansion in federal funding prompted an expansion of student numbers at Canadian universities that formed the essential backdrop for increased participation of women. The arrival of women at Saint Mary's in 1968 must be seen in the context of the changing roles of women within academia at various post-secondary institutions from the post-war period through to the early 1970's. Margaret Gillett's examination of the role of women at McGill University, for example, showed that, from the post-war period onward – despite the numerous challenges that women had faced in their history at the university – co-education at McGill was essentially taken for granted as the established norm. McGill,

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 10-14.

<sup>6</sup> Paul Litt, *The Muses, the Masses and the Massey Commission* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 229.

although it had appointed the first full-time female faculty member in Canadian history, Carrie Derrick in 1912, was not considered a leader in the inclusion and promotion of co-education in Canadian universities nationwide.<sup>7</sup>

McGill did face challenges regarding the equality of its female teaching staff. The Senate at the university commissioned a study of discriminatory practices based on sex, and Gillett noted that its report in early 1971 was revealing:

It studied 979 full-time academic staff members in all ranks from Lecturer to full Professor for the three years from 1967-68 to 1969-70 and discovered that the salaries of women fell below those of men in all ranks in all years and that, though the difference never exceeded 10% in any rank, the overall average salaries of female staff were 20% below those of male staff. This reflected the fact that there was a much higher concentration of female staff in the lower ranks. While the total proportion of women on academic staff was approximately 16.5%, only about 5.5% of the full Professors, and about 13% of the Associate Professors were women but about 20% of the Assistant Professors and 40% of the Lecturers were female. The study also showed that women were promoted less rapidly than males, that things were not getting better because the new appointments at the Assistant and Associate Professorships showed a declining proportion of women, that women received lower starting salaries than men, though a larger proportion of female than male appointees held Ph.D.'s.<sup>8</sup>

In the early 1980's Gillett wrote that, "If the 'women's movement' is defined as a co-operative effort on the part of women to attain rights and privileges previously reserved for men, then it is clearly no recent upstart on the McGill campus but is, in fact, about a hundred years old."<sup>9</sup> Once again this example of women in academia from a national perspective assists in placing the Atlantic Canadian experience in its proper perspective, in that the Atlantic Canadian experience of women in post-secondary institutions lagged

---

<sup>7</sup> Margaret Gillett, *She Walked Very Warily: A History of Women at McGill* (Montreal: Eden Press Women's Publications, 1981), 4-5.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 369.

behind during the mid-to-late twentieth century. It should be noted that this was not always the case as women played a prominent role in post-secondary education at the turn of the century. In his article entitled "The Education of Women at Mount Allison", historian and author John Reid states that women in the Maritimes were well ahead of their Canadian counterparts at the turn of the twentieth century.<sup>10</sup> In the context of female students attending Mount Allison Reid states, "Furthermore, the proportion of women enrolled in degree programs at Mount Allison was still well in advance of the average at Canadian universities, and was growing apace."<sup>11</sup>

Saint Francis Xavier College officially opened its doors on 18 of September 1855. This was a modest beginning for a Roman Catholic post-secondary institution which in the end was to become a central focus for the small community of Antigonish, Nova Scotia. Nearly a century later, in 1951, the University founded Xavier Junior College in Sydney to serve communities throughout industrialized Cape Breton.<sup>12</sup> This venture proved to be very successful and economic instability within the Cape Breton region did not prevent a continual increase in enrollment, "By 1970 Xavier College had attained a considerable level of maturity. Full-time enrollment stood at 559, part-time at 645 and non-credit adult studies at 980 for a total of nearly 2200 students."<sup>13</sup> Eventually, Xavier College merged with the Nova Scotia Eastern Institute of Technology to create the College of Cape Breton, today known as Cape Breton University.

---

<sup>10</sup> John G. Reid, "The Education of Women at Mount Allison 1854-1914," *Acadiensis*, 12:2 (Spring 1983), 18.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>12</sup> James Cameron, *For the People: A History of St. Francis Xavier University* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), 26.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 357.

St. Francis Xavier University (St. F. X.) holds a very special place in the history of educating women in Catholic universities throughout North America. In 1894, St. Bernard's Ladies' Academy of Antigonish officially became affiliated with St. F.X. As would be expected for the time, clear divisions and physical barriers remained in place separating the male and female student populations, but the affiliation between the two institutions was unique and progressive in and of itself.<sup>14</sup> In this context, James Cameron provides further detail concerning the first female graduating class:

The closing exercises at the academy in June 1897 established a landmark in female Catholic higher education. The *Casket* announced the event: "For the first time, so far as we know, in the history of Catholic Education in America, the degree of Bachelor of Arts was to be conferred on a class of young ladies by a Catholic College." Three years before, St. Bernard's Academy had been affiliated with St. F.X.: now four young women had completed the college course of studies with "marked success" and had passed the required examinations. The editors of the St. F.X. student journal lauded the "excellent abilities" of their female counterparts and also understood the historic nature of the occasion. St. Bernard's Academy, in affiliation with St. F.X., rightly won a certain distinction with this first; two more years would pass before another Catholic College in North America conferred the BA on female graduates.<sup>15</sup>

The female students from St. Bernard's Academy and male students from St. F.X. were kept largely separate, a distance based in large part simply upon gender differences. As we will see below, the separation of the sexes continued to pose problems within the St. F.X. community in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It was during this time in the university's history that students began to demand change with

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 366.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 96-97.

respect to ending the division of the sexes on its campus. By 1970 the female population on campus had climbed to almost 40 percent of the student population, in contrast to the meager 13 percent in 1950. As on many university campuses throughout the 1960s and 1970s, student protests were alive and well at St. F.X. Gender relations were frequently the subject of protests, as described by Cameron:

Open housing became a more explosive issue, eventually provoking a student referendum, briefs, negotiations, demonstrations, sit-ins, endless Xaverian Weekly harangues, and strikes. Female students, who resided at the Mount, unless they were day students, yearly were becoming a larger presence. It was perennial for male students to attack the Mount's restrictions on the female students; one particularly inflammatory article in 1969 was called "Mount St. Bernard: A Closed Society" and, of course, the ban against females in the St. FX residences became galling to many male students. In 1969 the student council declared it "a basic and natural right" that students control their own environment as much as possible. However, many faculty, though not all, feared the possible consequences of open housing for privacy, morale, academic life and sexual behavior, including its implications for the university's Catholicity.<sup>16</sup>

In 1945, there had been a mere ten administrative positions within St. F.X. and every position was filled by a male cleric. As the university expanded, there were more than twenty administrative positions by 1970, but the majority of these positions – and all of the senior ones – were still filled by males. According to Cameron by 1970, "Most of the principal administrative positions remained in the possession of clerics; however, lay people were represented. A noticeable predominance of administrators of Highland descent was evident, and almost all were male."<sup>17</sup> Following the war, enrollment had increased at St. F.X. with the return of veterans among other factors – for instance, in 1944 there were 513 students enrolled at St. F.X. with 17 per cent being female. In 1950, the student body had grown to

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 372.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 367.

913, again with close to the same percentage of female students.<sup>18</sup> In 1950 there were a total of 52 faculty members on staff at St. F.X. with only one being female; but by the year 1960 the faculty complement had grown to 91 with a total of 14 female professors employed by the university; the majority of the 14 were Roman Catholic Sisters.<sup>19</sup> Ultimately, by 1969, St. F.X. had moved toward the complete integration for female students within the university community as was the case on so many other campuses across the region and the nation.

Mount Allison University officially opened in Sackville, New Brunswick under the name “Wesleyan Academy” in 1843. It was initially all-male, and did not offer degree programs until 1862. Founded within the Methodist tradition, it experienced similar growth and expansion as the others highlighted in this account.<sup>20</sup> The year 1847 saw the governing parties at the Wesleyan academy reach an important decision, to support an expansion of the academy to include the education of women. A number of obstacles were faced and overcome during the following seven years, but in 1854 the Academy officially opened to provide women with opportunities for obtaining a post-secondary education.<sup>21</sup> Historian John Reid presents an interesting description of the general feeling within the institution at the time of the introduction of women, which in part also serves to illustrate how very little women were truly integrated into the overall educational system itself:

For the academy, the presence of more than a hundred female students and a staff of seven women teachers clearly altered permanently the hitherto male-dominated environment of the institution. Coeducation, however, was not the purpose. On the contrary, The *Mount Allison Academic Gazette* assured its readers in June 1854

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 368.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> John G. Reid, *Mount Allison University: A History, to 1963* (2 vols.; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), I, 29.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 49-55.

that 'the Family and Class organizations [of the female branch] will be entirely distinct from those of the other Academy, and the students of the different branches will not be allowed to associate or even meet, either in public or private, except in the presence of some officers of the institution.'<sup>22</sup>

The separation of male and female students at Mount Allison mirrored a somewhat similar phenomenon at St. F.X. The emphasis in the above passage on upholding the rigid separation between male and female students also indicated the potential for marginalization of women on the Mount Allison campus. It should be noted that women were admitted to degree programs at Mount Allison in 1872; however, a new phase in the university's history developed in 1944 with the end of the Second World War.

In the post-war period, as was the case in many Canadian universities, Mount Allison saw a surge in male applicants. Understandably, those men returning from the war were often keen to obtain a higher educational standing and as such enrolled in post-secondary institutions such as Mount Allison in fairly large numbers. Reid addresses this dynamic in the following,

The immediate post-war period inevitably saw a large preponderance of male students because there were more male than female veterans. During the 1946-7 year, for example, there were 275 male veterans and only 21 female; in the overall student population that year, the proportion of men rose to a thoroughly exceptional 72.2 percent. Thereafter the proportion declined steadily until 1951-52, when it was 60.9 per cent, and then rose again to reach 67.7 per cent in the fall of 1957. Now, therefore, the proportion of women students was less than one-third, considerably lower than the 43.5 per cent at which it had stood in the last year before the war.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 57.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 269.



During this same period of time, and until the latter part of the 1950's, no females were given appointments in the professoriate outside of the home economics division.<sup>24</sup> The Massey-Treble School of Home economics, the Conservatory of Music and the School of Fine and Applied Arts were three areas overtaken by the university in the earlier half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These three departments originally fell under the auspices of the Ladies' College which had twenty years previous been a separate and autonomous "all female" institution. Given the earlier amalgamation of these institutions, in the post-war period there were in fact four female faculty members who functioned specifically under the Massey-Treble School of home economics.<sup>25</sup> Overall however, it is without doubt that women played a very small role at Mount Allison on the faculty side from the post-war period through to the early 1970's.

Dalhousie University was founded in 1818 by Lord Dalhousie. Dalhousie is one of the largest of the Atlantic Canadian Universities and of particular interest is the fact it was founded on secular principles, unlike the other post-secondary institutions that form the basis of this study. It nevertheless appealed to various sects of the Protestant faith, especially Presbyterians, but it was ultimately an institution, along with others in the Maritimes, open to individuals of any and all denominations.<sup>26</sup>

As was the case with Mount Allison and Saint Francis Xavier, women were present as students in the relatively early years following the founding of Dalhousie University. Judith Fingard writes that the initial group of females who attended Dalhousie University,

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 250.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> P.B. Waite. *The Lives of Dalhousie University, Volume One, 1818-1925* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), 23-24.

“includes registrations from 1881-82 to 1900-01, 392 women went to Dalhousie; they formed 23% of the student body.”<sup>27</sup> One could easily suggest that this 23% formed a significant number of female students attending university in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, which in and of itself would make the institution seem unusually receptive to women.

On the other hand, it is relevant to examine how women were treated at Dalhousie despite their early participation in university life as both students and faculty members. In this context, Fingard writes the following,

What was characteristic, if not exactly unique, of the little college by the sea was the entirely male orientation of the organization and the programmes of the university. Unlike universities such as Mount Allison, McGill and Western Ontario, Dalhousie never included a women's college. Universities comprehending women's colleges provided more opportunities for the employment of female faculty. The women did not always have the same status as their male counterparts, but the collegiate organization provided the minority with a community of peers and students in which to take refuge from the totally male areas of the campus.<sup>28</sup>

By 1953, Dalhousie saw its male students comprise three quarters of the student population.<sup>29</sup> Female students would increase in numbers at Dalhousie as the years progressed and, not surprisingly, with significant growth in the female population taking place toward the end of the sixties. For all that, the institution was not necessarily warm and welcoming toward its female population. Peter Twohig has written extensively on Dalhousie's School of Nursing and his research indicates that women in the Faculty of Nursing were subject to an institutional setting that was both isolating and challenging in

---

<sup>27</sup> Judith Fingard, “Dalhousie Coeds, 1881-1921,” in Paul Axelrod and John G. Reid, eds., *Youth University and Canadian Society: Essays in the Social History of Higher Education*. (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989), 26.

<sup>28</sup> Judith Fingard, “Gender and Inequality at Dalhousie: Faculty Women Before 1950,” *Dalhousie Review*, 64:1 (Winter 1984-5), 688.

<sup>29</sup> Waite, *The Lives of Dalhousie University, Volume One, 1818-1925*, 174-5.

a variety of ways – frequently leaving its female students and faculty feeling marginalized.

Twohig described the challenges faced by the former director of the School of Nursing,

Electa MacLennan:

There is little doubt that MacLennan oversaw some difficult times at the School, and likely bore the battlescars of a woman directing a program considered marginal – or at least “foreign” – to the broader university objectives. It will be recalled that the school was established on a provisional basis and that MacLennan and her assistant Jean Church, were never paid at a level commensurate with their colleagues in other professional schools let alone the professoriate in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Finally – and this speaks volumes for the place of the school in the broader university community – the school of Nursing never enjoyed a suitable, permanent home for the entire period of her stewardship, despite a decade of rapid expansion and construction on the Dalhousie campus.<sup>30</sup>

In 1976, the President of Dalhousie University, Henry Hicks, established a committee to examine and report on the status of women at the university. Its report uncovered significant gaps in salaries and career advancement between women and men at Dalhousie. As noted by Peter Waite, “The report’s immediate concern was appointment, working conditions, and salaries of women academics. It reported late in 1978 with some striking statistics for 1977-8. For 777 cases overall, mean salary at Dalhousie was \$26,598. The mean salary for 650 men was \$27,924; for 127 women it was \$19,808. That was a formidable gap.”<sup>31</sup>

An important element of the history of women in higher education on Prince Edward Island is examined in G. Edward McDonald’s *The History of St. Dunstan’s University*,

---

<sup>30</sup> Peter Twohig, *Challenge and Change: A History of the Dalhousie School of Nursing, 1949-1989* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 1998), 97.

<sup>31</sup> Waite. *The Lives of Dalhousie University, Volume One, 1818-1925*, 393-4.

1855-1956. Prince of Wales College did admit women as early as 1879, but there were no female students at St. Dunstan's until 1938, and none in significant numbers until the post-war period. Prince of Wales was by definition non-denominational and therefore was the only option open for female students – including Catholic women- on Prince Edward Island until the late 1930's. According to MacDonald:

Next to the physical expansion, perhaps the most obvious difference between pre-war and post-war St. Dunstan's was the presence on campus of growing numbers of women students. Judging from the histories of other Canadian universities, co-education was ludicrously overdue by the 1940's; and yet, the exclusion of women had been a logical extension of St. Dunstan's perceived educational mission. At the same time it reflected the nature of Island Catholic society. In St. Dunstan's infancy, co-education was unheard of. Higher education of women – and they were not expected to aspire very high – was the province of women's colleges.<sup>32</sup>

MacDonald noted that the Roman Catholic administration at St. Dunstan's demonstrated a strong resistance to the introduction of co-education from the 1920s, when it was first suggested as a possibility. The initial admittance of women to St. Dunstan's was limited to Sisters of St. Martha, who were the first female graduates of the university. Even in the 1940s, St. Dunstan's was not quite ready to have secular females participating in university affairs.

There is no question that Mount Saint Vincent University also has a long and fascinating history – one filled with significant growth and change not unlike what took place

---

<sup>32</sup> G. Edward MacDonald, *The History of St. Dunstan's University, 1855-1956* (Charlottetown: Board of Governors of St. Dunstan's University and the Prince Edward Island Museum and Heritage Foundation, 1989), 414.

concurrently at many of the other Atlantic Canadian universities examined thus far. Mount Saint Vincent was an all-female institution, and in this respect it stood alone within the Atlantic region. Mount Saint Vincent Academy and Boarding School had been founded by the Sisters of Charity in 1873 as a Catholic school for girls. Over time The Academy went on to become a “Normal School” focused on providing training for teachers as well as continuing with the formative education of young Catholic women in Halifax and beyond. In the early twentieth century, the Sisters of Charity embarked upon the effort to obtain degree-conferring powers for Mount Saint Vincent.<sup>33</sup> In her book, *Charity Alive*, Sister Teresa Corcoran referred to the work of the Mother General at the time, Mother Mary Berchmans: “A woman of courage, vision and determination, to her more than any other person belongs the credit for the emergence of Mount Saint Vincent College as the only degree granting college for women in Canada.”<sup>34</sup>

There were numerous efforts toward amalgamation between Mount Saint Vincent University and Saint Mary’s University which waxed and waned over the course of many years. These discussions on possible amalgamation between the two institutions began in the 1950s and continued as late as 1967 before ending with the decision of Saint Mary’s to introduce full co-education in 1968. The often-tumultuous relationship between the two institutions, which will be explored more fully in Chapter Two, demonstrated that at the time, the Sisters of Charity and the Jesuits – who were responsible for the administration of

---

<sup>33</sup> Teresa Corcoran, *Mount Saint Vincent University: A Vision Unfolding 1873-1988* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1999), 10-12.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

the respective institutions – could never see eye to eye regarding their capacity to share power and control over a single university.<sup>35</sup>

Connected in part with the shifting gender roles of the era, the post-secondary “protest culture” of the 1960s is both fascinating and relevant to the overall historiography of this thesis. Students at Saint Mary’s in the 1960s and 1970s could not have avoided the impact of student-led demonstrations at universities taking place throughout the western world. One could speculate that the anti-war protests taking place in the United States would have had some influence on the student body at Saint Mary’s given the significant number of American students enrolled in classes on campus during this time.

In the abovementioned context, a thoughtful piece was submitted in the Saint Mary’s *Journal* in early 1970 directly linked to the impact of the “protest culture” on campus. Written by Saint Mary’s student Francis Campbell, the article is entitled “As I See it: Campus Unrest” and begins with the following: “Unrest, rioting, defiance of rules and just plain old-fashioned rebellion is so much part of university life today, one is almost inclined to believe it is part of the curriculum”.<sup>36</sup>

According to author Doug Owram, Canadian universities in the 1960s were indeed places of protest and dissent:

Universities have always been centres of controversy. This is not surprising, for universities shape fundamental values and train the elite of the next generation. Those within university take ideas seriously and often express them vociferously. Those watching from outside want to ensure that their own values are not, somehow, being undermined for the next generation. Governments find that

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 155-166

<sup>36</sup> Francis Campbell, “As I See it: Campus Unrest”, *The Saint Mary's University Journal* (hereafter *SMU Journal*), January 22, 1970, 7.

their role as financial provider clashes with the universities insistence upon autonomy. In other words, forces outside the system have a stake in what goes on. The faculty and the students traditionally resist interference. They then often battle among themselves and with administration, to see whose voice will be the most powerful.<sup>37</sup>

It appeared that battles between the administration and students at Saint Mary's were certainly numerous but not terribly explosive. Students rallied together over issues such as the quality of cafeteria food and the introduction of co-education. Clearly these were issues of relative importance to the student body but overall the protests which ensued were not overly disruptive to the campus as they were on an international level in places such as Berkeley or Kent State.

In their oral history interviews, several Saint Mary's alumni remarked on how difficult it was for the Jesuits to adjust to this new generation of students in the 1960s. As such, one must consider how at Saint Mary's student dissent was certainly further complicated by what would have been a very strict and traditional hold over the student body upheld by the Jesuits over the course of many years.

The regular coverage of "protest events" at other universities both nationally and internationally appears to have maintained a place of importance in the student-run newspaper. For instance, the March 1967 edition of the *Journal*, under the heading "Students Stage Sleep-in," ran a CUP (Canadian University Press) story from Calgary regarding a student protest over residence issues:

---

<sup>37</sup> Doug Owram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 175.

Students at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology – tired of writing letters, presenting briefs and forming committees – have had a sleep-in “to publicize the need for residences”. SAIT students began agitating for new residences last September when they pitched tents on campus in an effort to draw attention to the lack of government sponsored residences. “The sleep-in, scheduled for Wednesday (Feb. 21) was open to all SAIT students possessing a sleeping bag or blankets. Sleep-in organizers have promised to provide entertainment and breakfast for the bedless students.”<sup>38</sup>

At St. F.X., the 1960s also brought about the age of student protest and subsequent change in many of the old rules and regulations. Similarly to Saint Mary’s, St. F.X. was administered by a traditionally minded Catholic hierarchy. According to Cameron:

The student experience at St. F.X. of both males and females was deeply altered, indeed transformed, during the 1960s. Two key developments materialized; both would contribute weightily to institutional metamorphosis – the dismantling of the traditional regimen *in loco parentis*, and the right to student participation in university administration. The old ways of student deference to authority and contrite obedience to the college hierarchy passed into oblivion.<sup>39</sup>

In early 1970, the Saint Mary’s *Journal* reported on two other student-led protests in the region, the first at UPEI and the second at St. Thomas University in New Brunswick. Issues for the UPEI students were centered on increased tuition and a perceived poor quality of education: “About 300 University of Prince Edward Island’s students ended a brief sit-in January 27 when Education Minister Gordon Bennett threatened them with police action. The students were protesting fee increases and sub-standard education at PEI’s only university.”<sup>40</sup> At St. Thomas University, meanwhile, “Students ... will be on strike this week unless their administration abolishes curfews and visiting regulations in student

<sup>38</sup> “Students Stage Sleep-in,” *SMU Journal*, March 10, 1967, 10.

<sup>39</sup> Cameron, *For the People*, 369.

<sup>40</sup> “Police oust 300 UPEI protestors,” *SMU Journal*, February 6, 1970, 5.



residences.”<sup>41</sup> The article went on to point out that St. Thomas was the third Roman Catholic University in the Atlantic Region to come into direct conflict with administrators over the issues related to visiting hours in student residences – of course one of those three was Saint Mary’s University.

One other short-lived and perhaps uniquely “Saint Mary’s” style of protest concerned student dissatisfaction with administrative laundry procedures – more specifically, students were protesting against the university’s practice of washing their clothes. In late January 1970, this particular topic for protest resulted in a “panty raid” on the newly filled female student residences. According to the leader of the protest, Student Union President Mike deVerteuil, “We want to do our own things,” he said. “We don’t need Big Mommy to tell us how to wash our clothes.”<sup>42</sup> The article then went on to conclude that the new co-eds were more than capable of defending themselves in the face of this unexpected undergarment raid, “The co-ed students were not enthused by the panty-raid. They reacted strongly and after thirty minutes repulsed the invaders”.<sup>43</sup>

Saint Mary’s faculty member Dr. Mike Larsen was a student at the university in the early 1960s. Larsen, originally from New York City, had some interesting insights to share regarding the student protest culture from an American perspective as well as from a Halifax / Canadian perspective. He spoke to this directly in the following excerpt from a 1993 oral history interview:

---

<sup>41</sup> “St. Thomas may strike”, *SMU Journal*, February 6, 1970, 5.

<sup>42</sup> Wanda Lust, “Residence attacked in massive panty raid”, *SMU Journal*, January 22, 1970, 3.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

Nothing comparable to Berkeley or the free speech movement, the students of the democratic society. The SDC. Nothing like that. Nothing of that degree. For the American kids, we were in the early sixties tuned to what was happening with the Cuban missile crisis. When that started to heat up, a lot of us left and headed back, a lot of us started hitch hiking or whatever and started returning because we thought we would be called up, and then nothing happened and we came back and continued on with school. In the early sixties we got some of this in the Journal. Those students like Pat Hickey who was a young firebrand from Long Island, saw journalism as a way of shaking up the establishment and so on, but it was still a very conservative, Halifax was very conservative and the student body for all the useful rebellion or whatever was still a fairly conservative group. I mean it was just wild; it wasn't focused in the same way as the political action groups on campus were in the west coast of the U.S.<sup>44</sup>

Understanding some of the connections between the outcomes of the Second Vatican Council and the secularization of Saint Mary's University is also an important focus of this thesis. The willingness of the Jesuit administration to hand over the control of the university to a secular board in 1970 was invariably motivated, at least in part, by the sweeping changes brought about by the Second Vatican Council. According to former Saint Mary's University faculty member Father Larry Murphy,

I've heard it said many times by people who were here, the Jesuits who were here would know – the Bishop simply said after the Second Vatican Council, look my priority is not to run this university. I can't run this university anymore. So he went to the university, went to the government, and they got a new charter and the new charter said you're going to give special attention not to Catholic but to Christian values....<sup>45</sup>

In essence, one could safely speculate that, at the very least, the timing for the secularization of Saint Mary's University was certainly made somewhat easier by the

---

<sup>44</sup> Dr. Michael Larsen, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives), June 22, 1993.

<sup>45</sup> Father Larry Murphy, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 26, 1993.

changes associated with Vatican II. One oral history interviewee in particular commented extensively on the connection between the two events, suggesting that there was great excitement and anticipation related to the softening of Catholic rules and regulations on campus. According to Laurence Shook,

A spectacular change of outlook has been apparent since Vatican II, 1962-5. The council's declaration on Christian Education, although faithful to the conviction that Catholic schools and universities should where possible be maintained, seems to take for granted the fact that many schools will in fact be mixed. It speaks of the school as establishing a centre engaging 'the joint participation of families, teachers, various kinds of cultural, civic and religious groups, civil society and the entire human community'.<sup>46</sup>

In another oral history interview carried out in 1993, Dr Donald Weeren, former Professor of Religious Studies at Saint Mary's, spoke to the secularization of the university in the context of a wider secularizing trend:

The going public accelerated or confirmed certain trends that were already at work. I think, whether, if Saint Mary's had, let's say Saint Mary's had not gone public. Would it have retained the same kind of religious character that it had when I came here? I have some doubt about that. It's hard to, it didn't happen that way so that that question can never really be answered. I think there was a certain secularization process at work in society, in universities.<sup>47</sup>

One can infer that Dr. Weeren was referring, at least obliquely, to the impact of Vatican II in relation to society and universities in general. His remarks convey a perception

---

<sup>46</sup> Laurence T. Shook, *Catholic Post-Secondary Education in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), 413.

<sup>47</sup> Dr. Donald Weeren, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives), June 1, 1993.

of a societal trend toward secularization which, as we know, was certainly prompted in the Catholic sense by the outcomes of the Second Vatican Council.

In a 1968 paper concerning the secularization of Catholic higher education, Joseph Kelly makes several interesting points related to this particular area of this thesis. For instance, he spoke to the complications surrounding the overall system of Catholic education which often included elementary and secondary education as well as post-secondary.<sup>48</sup> This was certainly the case at Saint Mary's where, for many years, the university was directly connected to a boy's high school which ultimately closed in 1963 – a closing which occurred in the midst of deliberations during the course of Vatican II. Kelly also proposed that the changes which occurred in Catholic universities and colleges had a direct link with the questioning of traditional roles and functions which came out of the Second Vatican Council. In this respect Kelly further suggested:

The call for ecumenism that flowed from Vatican II had perhaps its greatest impact on Catholic colleges and universities in three important ways: (1) The wall of separateness was greatly reduced between Catholic institutions and those in the state and private sector; (2) The principle of public debate and discussion came on the scene with a vengeance; and (3) Nearly all Catholic colleges and universities rushed with great vigor to include laymen, Catholic and others in their support structure...all done, of course, in the relatively old "advisory board" frame. By this time, Catholic institutions had taken giant steps toward being more public than Catholic.<sup>49</sup>

There was also a wider context, comprising the history of co-education and secularization at two universities with distinct similarities to Saint Mary's: Fordham

---

<sup>48</sup> Joseph Kelly, "Secularization – Public Trust: The Development of Catholic Higher Education in the United States," Paper Presented at the Wingspread Conference on the Contributions of the Church-Related College to the Public Good, December 1968 (ERIC document ED047655), 5.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 7-8.

University in New York and The University of Notre Dame in Indiana. More specifically, the Jesuit administration and subsequent secularization of both Notre Dame and Fordham paralleled the experience of Saint Mary's, and for Notre Dame the introduction of co-education was an additional common feature.

As was the case at Saint Mary's, the 1960's brought pressure on the Jesuit administrations at Fordham and Notre Dame to initiate discussion of secularization at their respective institutions – even though the two institutions differed in that Fordham had long been co-educational. Founded in 1841, Fordham was officially handed over to a lay board of trustees in 1969. In *Fordham: A History and Memoir*, Raymond A. Schroth detailed many issues facing that institution in the 1960s, including financial challenges and the changes prompted by Vatican II. He concluded with a general observation derived from the experience of secularization at Fordham:

Finally, and for some institutions traumatically, virtually every leading Catholic university restructured its governance so that it no longer “belonged” to the religious order that founded it, but instead to the representatives of the constituency it served and that supported it now as represented by its newly formed lay-dominated Board of trustees.<sup>50</sup>

The issue was considered specifically in a study commissioned by Fordham in 1968, to consider the efficacy of a continued formal relationship between the university and the Catholic Church. The introduction stated:

---

<sup>50</sup> Raymond A. Schroth, *Fordham: A History and Memoir* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008), 266.

This volume has a narrow focus but broad implications. Its purpose is to identify precisely, so far as possible, measures that a prominent church-related university might have to adopt were it to shed identification as a religious institution in the conventional sense and, instead, gain acceptance as a completely independent institution of higher learning.<sup>51</sup>

Again, the wider context was clear, and it was with an understanding that the findings of the study could apply to other post-secondary institutions, in particular those institutions directly linked to Roman Catholicism, that the conclusion was reached that secularization was indeed the most practical solution to improving the university's future. Fordham officially transferred control of the administration to a lay board of trustees in 1969.

Saint Mary's University shared even more in common with the University of Notre Dame, although Saint Mary's, by comparison, introduced co-education the earlier and secularization the later of the two. By 1965, Notre Dame was heavily engaged in debate surrounding secularization and co-education. The numerous factors at play included financial considerations, the influence of Vatican II and the desire to have a more well-rounded student body with the introduction of women to the campus.<sup>52</sup> The secularization of Notre Dame took place in 1967 and according to Thomas Schlereth:

Several factors conditioned this contemplated break with the past. A number of Catholic institutions, such as St. Louis University and the C.S.C.'s own University of Portland, had already announced the adoption of lay-dominated boards. More significant to some

---

<sup>51</sup> Walter Gellhorn, *An Independent Fordham: A Choice for Catholic Higher Education* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1968), 1-2.

<sup>52</sup> Thomas Schlereth, *The University of Notre Dame – A Portrait of its History and Campus* (Indiana: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), 220.

members of the Holy Cross congregation were the directives of the Second Vatican Council that had urged religious communities to share their ministries and monies more generously with the laity in the common Christian effort of the Church.<sup>53</sup>

The introduction of co-education at Notre Dame became official in 1971. As would be expected, there were certain challenges with this development in the university's history, but the administration saw the introduction of women as an opportunity to improve the overall quality of education for its students. Schlereth's analysis suggests that the transition for Notre Dame in the realm of adopting co-education was strikingly similar to what was experienced at Saint Mary's: "The integration of women into an all male institution, previously run by men for men, went remarkably smoothly."<sup>54</sup>

In closing, this chapter has briefly examined several important issues during the 1960s and 1970s which are central to this thesis: the role of women in higher education within a select number of Canadian universities, followed by the student protest culture and lastly the impact of the Second Vatican Council on the secularization of Saint Mary's University. All three subject areas will be addressed in a more comprehensive manner in the next chapter with the benefit of additional oral history testimony - the hope being to convey a more detailed and descriptive historic account of the impact of co-education and secularization specifically at Saint Mary's University.

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 220.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 221.

## Chapter Two

### Secularization, Co-education, and Mount Saint Vincent: Viewpoints from the 1990s

Chapter Two of this study will first explore the historical relationship between Mount Saint Vincent University and Saint Mary's University. In addition, the chapter will present a variety of oral history testimonies obtained in the 1990's from former faculty, staff and students directly associated with each institution – though the majority are associated only with Saint Mary's. The primary focus of the excerpts taken from these particular oral histories will be the memories attributed to the early years of co-education, secularization and the 1960s protest culture as they relate to Saint Mary's and Mount Saint Vincent respectively.

As noted in Chapter One, the introduction of co-education at Saint Mary's University is inextricably linked to the institution's long and complex relationship with Mount Saint Vincent University. Of particular relevance in this context is the early relationship established between Mount Saint Vincent and Dalhousie University as a result of the Mother Superior's relentless quest to obtain the right to confer degrees. In 1914 the Dalhousie Senate determined the following concerning its relationship with the Mount: "The Senate agreed in principle to an affiliation provided that the arrangement be a permanent one. Dalhousie would give third and fourth year courses and the Mount professors, provided they had a staff prepared academically to give these courses, would give the courses of the first two years." <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Teresa Corcoran, *Mount Saint Vincent University – A Vision Unfolding 1873-1988* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1999), 31.



This cooperative relationship continued between the two institutions for 25 years, eventually coming to an end in 1940 due to financial considerations for the Mount. Yet, commented author Teresa Corcoran, "...for many of the sisters, first as students and then as teachers, the past twenty-five year relationship with Dalhousie had created firm and lasting relationships."<sup>2</sup>

Fewer than 25 years later, the Mount would be looking once again to renew its ties with Dalhousie when negotiations with Saint Mary's failed to reach a mutually acceptable agreement. Sister Francis d'Assisi, President of Mount Saint Vincent between 1954 and 1965, had been one of the first to benefit from the Mount's association with Dalhousie, as she graduated from Dalhousie during these early years receiving her B.A. in 1921.<sup>3</sup> In this context, it was Francis d'Assisi who was responsible for the first three years of negotiations with Saint Mary's, raising the question as to just how powerful an influence her experience was with Dalhousie and in turn how this experience may have impacted her negotiations with the administration at Saint Mary's.

According to Anne West in *Saint Mary's University: An Anniversary Portrait*, "The 1950's saw battles with Mount Saint Vincent College over whether Saint Mary's should admit women, but the Jesuit Fathers realized that to survive Saint Mary's must become co-educational."<sup>4</sup> This is a very interesting comment, primarily because of the use of the word "battles" to describe the negotiations between the Mount and Saint Mary's. The adversarial terminology does indeed seem to match the description of other sources

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 71.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 70.

<sup>4</sup> Anne West, *Saint Mary's University – An Anniversary Portrait* (Lockport, Nova Scotia: Community Books, 2000), 43.

pertaining to the flavour of discussions between the two universities. According to Corcoran, the first set of negotiations between the two institutions took place in and around 1950. At this time, the intention of the Mount was to build on the new Saint Mary's campus so that there would be a more accessible location for students to attend classes as opposed to traveling to Rockingham. These negotiations yielded no positive results for the Mount, as Corcoran summarized:

The answer came in the person of Bishop Alfred Leverman of Halifax, who visited Sister Francis d'Assisi at the Motherhouse with the message from Archbishop John McNally. The property as divided was inadequate for the two institutions since the men would need the extra property for playing fields. In addition, the Jesuit provincial did not wish to have women on the campus. Another site at the outskirts of the city was suggested but the sisters declined this offer.<sup>5</sup>

In order to understand the nature and direction of negotiations between the Mount and Saint Mary's it is important to consider the Mount's transition from college to university and the construction that was associated with this growth. By 1959, the Mount had continued to expand and administrators were in the process of planning for the eventual construction of three new buildings on campus. As noted in chapter one, federal subsidies for university infrastructure were readily available in this era, and Sister Francis d'Assisi, President of Mount Saint Vincent University, was determined that the Mount would benefit from this financial largesse.<sup>6</sup> This, alongside other factors, ultimately led her to propose to the Mount Saint Vincent Board of Governors that

---

<sup>5</sup> Teresa Corcoran, *Mount Saint Vincent University – A Vision Unfolding 1873-1988* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1999), 95.

<sup>6</sup> Sister Mary Olga McKenna, *Charity Alive – Sisters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul, Halifax 1950-1980* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998), 156-8.

consideration be given to the creation of an Atlantic coalition of Catholic Universities.

Not least of these factors was an awareness of the considerable influence exerted by the church hierarchy:

As early as April, 1962 Sister Francis d'Assisi had reported to the board of governors a growing attitude among the Catholic bishops of the Maritime Provinces that presidents of the Catholic universities in the region should explore the feasibility of an Atlantic federation of Catholic universities. The underlying premise was that the rising costs of university education made it increasingly difficult for small universities to continue to offer a reasonable standard of quality programs and to attract suitably qualified faculty. Now that the government was in the business of partial financing, there might be serious questioning regarding duplication of services.<sup>7</sup>

On 3 February, 1963 a group of senior representatives from Saint Mary's University and Mount Saint Vincent University officially met for the first time to discuss the prospect of the two institutions coming together to form a federation of Catholic post-secondary education in the region. The outcome of these discussions was a commitment by both sides to engage in further dialogue on collaboration. This process came to be seen as the first step toward a wider affiliation. As such, the Jesuit administration at Saint Mary's University put together a proposal for review – one which was quickly rejected by Francis d'Assisi and her colleagues as being too dismissive of the Mount as an *equal partner* in the proposed co-educational arrangement. The negotiations continued to lag over the course of the next several years, before and after Sister

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 161.

Catherine Wallace took over as President of the Mount from Sister Francis d'Assisi in 1965.<sup>8</sup>

At Saint Mary's University, on the student front, evidence of the dialogue surrounding co-education seems first to appear in March 1967, when a small piece on the subject was featured on the front page of the Saint Mary's University *Journal* under the heading "Decision Expected":

Co-education no longer exists in the realm of impossibility for Saint Mary's University. This was learned on the morning of March 1<sup>st</sup> when five executive members, representing both the old and new councils, met with Bishop James Hayes, Chancellor of Saint Mary's University and Apostolic Administrator of Archdiocese. During the forty-five minute meeting, which had been intended to determine the Bishop's opinion with regard to co-education at Saint Mary's, the executive learned that the Board of Governors had set up a special committee to investigate the entire question of co-education in the Archdiocese. Among the important questions for its consideration will be the possibility for co-education for Saint Mary's. Bishop Hayes, while unwilling to voice his opinion on the topic, assured the students that their views on the subject would be heard by the committee.<sup>9</sup>

Within a few months, dialogue and debate concerning co-education at Saint Mary's University had clearly become more heated. An October edition of the *Journal* was emblazoned with the heading, "Mount Won't be Affected". The headline reflected the fact that the administration and students at Mount Saint Vincent were worried about the loss of female students who may have chosen instead to study at Saint Mary's. The article itself was based on a statement of policy suggested by members of the Saint Mary's University Students' Association (SMUSA), and the commentary presented a

---

<sup>8</sup> Teresa Corcoran, *Mount Saint Vincent University – A Vision Unfolding 1873-1988* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1999), 156.

<sup>9</sup> "Decision Expected", *SMU Journal*, March 10, 1967, 1.

meticulous description of the rationale for introducing co-education to Saint Mary's

University:

The society in which we live dictates the educational processes. It is shortsightedness to create an unnatural situation in which to educate particularly when such a situation thwarts our educational objectives. The development of maturity and responsibility is being retarded in our present situation. How does all this affect the student? This question can be explored in several ways. The feminine presence on our campus would develop the abilities of both sexes to work, discuss and learn together. They would find themselves looking at one another as much as individuals as by sexes. This would provide room for both the male and female viewpoints to be expressed and discussed. This natural situation is presently lacking at our university. It would boost the level of cultural and social activities at Saint Mary's University to a point where an effectual community atmosphere prevails. Community atmosphere is a prerequisite to sound education, as dialogue and exchange constitute a large part of the learning process. This cannot be achieved in an all male state.<sup>10</sup>

Approximately one month later, there were tentative agreements in place outlining a scenario for the Mount to construct a building on the Saint Mary's campus. As discussed previously, this was the second such proposal to build on the Saint Mary's campus, the first being in 1950. The news of the Mount's eventual plan in November of 1967 reached Saint Mary's and beyond rather quickly, with articles appearing in the *Halifax Mail-Star* by the end of the month. One such article identified student opposition to the Mount's proposal, from a perspective that favoured co-education at Saint Mary's:

The student body of St. Mary's university in Halifax has taken objection to the proposal that nearby Mount St. Vincent University construct an academic building on or near the St. Mary's campus. Robert Shaw, president of St. Mary's Student Association said Tuesday the objection stems from an "intimation" that the move would facilitate greater cooperation between the two institutions and be a stumbling block to St. Mary's becoming co-educational on its own. "We do

---

<sup>10</sup> Robert Shaw, "Mount Won't be Effectuated", *SMU Journal*, October 13, 1967, 1.

not object to the move if it has no bearing on determining the future status of St. Mary's," Mr. Shaw said.<sup>11</sup>

Negotiations between Mount Saint Vincent and Saint Mary's continued to stagnate from November of 1967 onward. Sister Catherine Wallace had no more success than had her predecessor in reaching a cooperative decision with the administration at Saint Mary's. Eventually, those in a position of power at Saint Mary's reached a unilateral decision and issued the following news release on 13 December, 1967:

Last evening the Board of Governors of Saint Mary's University met to discuss the future of Catholic higher education in the Archdiocese of Halifax. The Board has been considering a Saint Mary's University Faculty and Student body demand for the right to admit students of both sexes, and it has also had to consider a Mount Saint Vincent Senate proposal for cooperative education between the two universities. The members of the Board approved co-education in principle for Saint Mary's but felt that it should be achieved by some kind of merger uniting Vincent University, and the Sacred Heart Convent. The Board concluded that the Universities involved should negotiate for a ninety-day period to find the best way to implement coeducation, whether by amalgamation, federation, or cooperation.<sup>12</sup>

Despite the front-page attention given to the "positive impact" associated with the introduction of co-education at Saint Mary's University, in the same October, 1967 issue of the *Saint Mary's Journal* there was a very different opinion issued in the editorial section: "We strongly disagree with the implication that Saint Mary's has not and is not turning out mature men due to what the brief calls an 'unnatural situation'.<sup>13</sup> The editorial made clear that there were very strong divisions on campus with respect to co-education, to the point that there was a threat of conflict leading some into carrying out

---

<sup>11</sup> "St. Mary's Students Object To Mount Plan", *Mail Star*, November 29, 1967, 3.

<sup>12</sup> News Release, December 13, 1967, Saint Mary's University Archives, in Burke Gaffney Fonds, Saint Mary's University Academic Series 1999.17.

<sup>13</sup> "From the Editor's Desk", *SMU Journal*, October 13, 1967, 3.

acts of violence. In this same piece it was stated, “The issue, slowly festering in back room debate, is now manifesting itself as different factions take their stands. It is only our sense of propriety which prevents us from disclosing what can only be called threats, if co-education does or does not come to Saint Mary’s.”<sup>14</sup>

This type of student dissent directed *against* co-education will be explored in more detail further on in this thesis. It is clear however, that such a negative reaction to the introduction of women on the Saint Mary’s campus was not the most prevalent opinion among the student population, especially as it failed to garner any front page attention in the student newspaper.

While the Saint Mary’s University Students Association may have had the loudest voice as a proponent of co-education, as evidenced in numerous *Journal* articles, there is little doubt that there were student dissenters scattered throughout the university community. A number of faculty members at the time were well aware of the students who opposed co-education, and yet many of them were strong supporters of the change. Following a period of time away from the university, faculty member Father Larry Murphy returned to campus in the late 1960s to a surprising situation:

Anyway, it was remarkable at times the negative reaction from some of the people I knew at St. Mary’s when I came back – the negative reaction to the girls! And the first couple of years it was really tough on the girls I think. A lot of the boys made it quite clear sorta that they felt that St. Mary’s was a male school and that they didn’t take kindly to the girls coming in there and there were a few girls who acted very badly as a result. They sorta went overboard

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

in trying to please the boys but I found the place - I found the place much better.<sup>15</sup>

Father Murphy's views were echoed by another faculty member, and administrator, Father William Stewart, who also recalled that some of the opposition to co-education came from the male students on campus:

... it was never just a smooth transition because we had to fight those who opposed co-education. Many of them, the students themselves, the attitudes in those days were so different from what they are today. The boys didn't want girls around the campus, messing around and spoiling their fun. You'd think that the boys would be all in favour of having girls, but there was a lot of opposition there.<sup>16</sup>

In a similar context, Stewart provides a lively and detailed account of both co-education and relations with the Mount during this tumultuous period in Saint Mary's history. It is worth noting that Stewart's remarks are somewhat limited with regard to his perception of the Mount's position on co-education. For example, he indicates that the Mount was strictly for the education of women which in fact wasn't exactly the case, with the Mount actively trying to amalgamate with Saint Mary's over the course of many years. In addition, the Mount was not long in adopting co-education shortly after Saint Mary's:

When I was in Administration, I had made, taken steps to try to turn us towards a co-education, largely because there were girls who wanted to take particular

---

<sup>15</sup> Father Larry Murphy, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project*. (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 26, 1993. Please see "Appendix A" for further detail on oral history research

<sup>16</sup> Father William Stewart, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 8, 1993.



courses that they could only get at the university and couldn't get at the Mount and so forth. The Jesuits had tried to get together with the Mount and had done lectures at the Mount in an effort to get them to join us. In fact the sisters were offered a part of the campus for a building, in an effort to attract them and have them put up a new building on our campus and then it would have been a cooperative effort between the Mount and Saint Mary's. If that had happened there's no telling, we'd probably be twice the size we are today. The Mount would have none of it. The Mount was strictly for the education of women and they weren't interested in joining forces with a boy's college. I remember dear Sister Francis of Assisi, God Bless her Soul, some of the correspondence should have been written on Asbestos paper. It was, nothing ever came of it again 'cause they just weren't interested in a co-educational effort. I could see that co-education was inevitable or was going to come here to Saint Mary's if we were going to grow. A student came one day and said that she wanted to do courses, so I found out what she wanted to do, made sure she couldn't get them anywhere else, and took her in as a full time student. Slowly having squeezed in one or two girls like that I got jumped on by the Arch Bishop and the President and just about everyone else for sneaking these female types into the place. Eventually, in '69 the place became officially co-educational because we couldn't get the Mount to move and trying to remain solely a boy's school was hindering growth.<sup>17</sup>

The idea that women were making significant strides towards equality with men in society at large was not lost on some of the other informants who were interviewed as part of the Saint Mary's University oral history project. In this respect, long term administrator and former student Heather Davis highlights the following concerning her experiences with co-education,

I know that when I went to classes uh, at Saint Mary's I was the only girl in a group of boys and then uh, I thought it was odd, uh, but I suppose the classroom in itself expanded with the girls and the girls brought in their own, uh, women's ideas and before then I suppose, women's ideas were not thought of type of thing, but uh, I suppose in a sense it's the same with the world too, you know, years ago when you turned on television you had all men and uh, now you have a choice of women or men, and uh, I think it's a

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

very good thing that it went co-ed because if it didn't go co-ed I think I would have been lost in the shuffle.<sup>18</sup>

Dr. Mary Sun, one of the first female faculty members at Saint Mary's University, was also interviewed for the university's oral history project. When she was asked about her memories of the major changes which occurred at the university during her career, which began in 1968, she replied with the following, "Well, the big change was the arrival of girls. This was an all-male Jesuit college where team football was important".<sup>19</sup> It should be noted that Dr. Sun, Father Stewart and father Murphy all referred to the students as "boys" and "girls" as opposed to "men" and "women". This may indicate the more parental atmosphere that remained present at Saint Mary's throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s. With respect to Dr. Sun, she was clearly pleased with the introduction of co-education and her remarks further serve to support subsequent remarks by Elizabeth Chard concerning the university's struggle with a "locker room" image – one that some thought could have been improved with the introduction of women.

Dr. Andrew Seaman, former Saint Mary's University English professor was another participant in the university's oral history project. When asked about the effect of women on the campus he responded with the following:

Oh it was without a question a positive influence. There was no other way that Saint Mary's could have gone, I mean, there was no real possibility you know, in

---

<sup>18</sup> Heather Davis, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 22, 1993.

<sup>19</sup> Dr. Mary Sun, Interviewed by Hansel Cook, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) May 17, 2006.

retrospect, there was no real possibility or reason for Saint Mary's to remain a male college. There are virtually no such things as male colleges now, or women's colleges for that matter. I mean Mount St. Vincent had gone equally the other way admitting male students. Segregated education was simply a thing of the past by that time. Probably Saint Mary's hung on longer than it should have but that was partly due to the fact that it was administered by the Jesuits.<sup>20</sup>

Another former English Professor, Dr. Lillian Falk, provided some insight concerning co-education at Saint Mary's University in her oral history interview which was conducted in 1993. It seems both relevant and important to highlight the fact that Dr. Falk, like Elizabeth Chard and Dr. Sun, would have been among the first female faculty members of Saint Mary's University, thus her perceptions would have been influenced accordingly:

Yes that was the second year of my, ah...., teaching year. What was it like? Ah...., it was kind of exciting, it was, I looked forward to it in anticipation, curious what would happen. I was wondering whether I would simply have more women than men or whether there would simply be more men than women and I've never ceased to have wondered because I don't know the statistics, how come there are always half and half. Any classroom that you enter is half and half. I know the general population is half and half but that does not mean that they register half and half. That's how it always is and that was very nice. It was nice to be there when it changed.<sup>21</sup>

Ultimately, the decision to adopt co-education as official university policy was reached by the Board of Governors at its meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> of September 1968. According to the minutes, there was a general acceptance among Board members that the wishes and aspirations of the Mount were no longer a factor in deferring the

---

<sup>20</sup> Dr. Andrew Seaman, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June, 1993.

<sup>21</sup> Dr. Lillian Falk, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 1, 1993.

announcement to the public that co-education would soon be a reality at Saint Mary's University. The views of the Board on this matter are described in the following excerpt:

Monsignor Granville said he felt that Saint Mary's University should now proceed on its own with respect to the matter of co-education. He indicated that in his view, the University had done everything in its power to effect a joint understanding relating to the matter, and that in view of the decision taken by the Mount, should now feel free to adopt co-education as a matter of University policy.<sup>22</sup>

The minutes then went on to describe when and how the message of co-education at the university would be communicated publicly. This was obviously an area in which the university wanted to proceed very carefully. The sensitivity, of course, was directly linked to the concern for negative perceptions that may have been held by those representing Mount Saint Vincent University throughout the course of the negotiations between the two institutions.

It was inevitable that the administration at the Mount would be alarmed by the prospect of Saint Mary's becoming co-educational, as this could have prompted a serious loss in student numbers for the university. There is some fascinating detail contained in an oral history interview conducted in July, 2008 with Sister Marie Gillen, former Director of Student Services at Mount Saint Vincent University. As indicated by Sister Gillen, there was a significant amount of envy on the part of Mount students regarding what they thought were better quality services and more permissive rules at Saint Mary's. For instance, the Mount students would issue complaints for something as minor as a salad bar, which they saw as being superior at Saint Mary's: "So even such mundane

---

<sup>22</sup> Board of Governors Meeting Minutes, September 16, 1968, Saint Mary's University Archives, in Burke Gaffney Fonds. Saint Mary's University Academic Series 1999.17.

things as food, was even a big issue and they wanted much more say in what they had. That was sort of the cutting edge of salad bars: they wanted a salad bar because Saint Mary's had a salad bar or something."<sup>23</sup> In this same context, Sister Gillen provided a more detailed description of some of the issues in contention brought forward by students at Mount Saint Vincent:

Then the other big thing that surfaced every year was to have boys in residence. They were quoting Saint Mary's and Saint Mary's every Saturday they could have boyfriends in from this hour. And the administration was against it, Catherine [Wallace] was there I forget how long, then Sister Albertus came in. When Catherine was around she did a lot of things like telephones and got rid of loco parentis, and there were a lot of other changes. So when Sister Albertus came, they had to find something else [to complain about] and it was this. Oh and then they were allowed to have a pub here and then we had these pub nights, so she changed the tenor, so basically Catherine was good at bringing things in that the girls had wanted. Then they got on to this about Saint Mary's, everything was always compared to Saint Mary's and they could, in the girls' residence there, they could have the boys in on the weekends. I don't know what the hours were. But Sister Albertus, she was different than Catherine, she was dead against it. She'd just say, see if you can get them off that tack, I said well you're the one that has to decide this. Well how are you going to monitor this? I said, well that's something... we'll have to figure that one out, the student council and myself. So the whole time I was there, every year it would emerge. It used to be, when they first came between September and Christmas, it didn't seem to emerge but after Christmas it was always "why can't we be like Saint Mary's they can have the boys in on Saturday." I'd say well it's in the president's office, you put a petition in to her, and then she'd be wild.<sup>24</sup>

There is additional insight into the changes which occurred at the Mount detailed in another oral history interview conducted in June, 2008. This excerpt is from the observations another former administrator at Mount Saint Vincent, Sister Rosemarie Simpson. Sister Simpson mentioned both the leadership of Mount's President, Sister

---

<sup>23</sup> Sister Marie Gillen, Interviewed by Amy Nickerson, *Oral History Project* (Mount Saint Vincent University Archives) July 10, 2008.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

Catherine Wallace, as well as the changes within the Catholic Church which resulted from Vatican II:

So Catherine Wallace at that time too, there was a change in terms of... it was leading up to independent ownership... She started back in the 70s a movement towards making the college, then it became a university in 66, of making its own entity because it was owned by the Sisters of Charity. And one of the things that she did was see that there was a proper pension plan put into place, that there was the development of a university senate. Then when there was a shift, a board of governors was put in place to make it "a stand alone". So a lot of that was because of her innovation, there was also a parallel happening, in that the Second Vatican Council, what they called at the time *aggiornamento* means like the opening of the windows. The Sisters were becoming "more modern" so that around 67-68, the option was given to go to a modified habit, then into secular dress.<sup>25</sup>

As highlighted previously in chapter one, Sister Sampson's remarks certainly support the notion that there were many significant changes impacting universities everywhere during the 1960s and the 1970s – Mount Saint Vincent was no exception to this phenomenon of radical change in a fairly short period of time.

The secularization of Saint Mary's University followed closely after the introduction of co-education, officially becoming a reality in 1970. The following passage is taken from a Saint Mary's University news release dated August 1<sup>st</sup>, 1970:

Saint Mary's new status as a self-governing university is the result of a cooperative effort between the school and the Archdiocese of Halifax, spelled out in the Saint Mary's University Act, 1970. The power and authority to conduct and control the university has been given to a newly reconstituted board of governors. Previously, the Archbishop of Halifax and his consultors had that legal power and authority, though in practice they executed it on the board's advice. Also, SMU has purchased university lands and the administration

---

<sup>25</sup> Sister Rosemarie Sampson, Interviewed by Amy Nickerson, *Oral History Project* (Mount Saint Vincent University Archives) June 18, 2008.

building from the archdiocese. Financially and legally, the university is now responsible for its own future.<sup>26</sup>

As mentioned in Chapter One, there were many and diverse reasons behind the decision to transfer control of the university from the Catholic diocese to a lay Board of Governors. For instance, the sweeping changes brought about by the Second Vatican Council – which had a large impact on all aspects of the Catholic Church – certainly must have had some effect on the implementation of a new secular governing body at Saint Mary's University.

Another important factor to consider, and one that has already been examined in a limited fashion, is that traditions in the Atlantic region ran deep as they pertained to denominational post-secondary education. For instance, in the Roman Catholic tradition, it was simply expected for the most part that Catholics would attend Catholic institutions whenever and wherever possible. Saint Mary's was no exception to this rule. Once again, Father Murphy provided an important insight on what was really the sectarian framework for university education in this region and beyond,

You see it was unthinkable for a Catholic student to go to Acadia or Mount Allison. You just presumed they were no longer Catholic and vice versa. A Baptist from the valley from Acadia to come to St. Mary's was unthinkable. I can still remember when the Baptist kids used to come up from Acadia for a basketball game and there would be almost a brawl at the front door where they bought the tickets and they would even throw fish on the floor out of contempt for the Catholics you see.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> News Release, August 1, 1970, Saint Mary's University Archives, in Burke Gaffney Fonds. Saint Mary's University Academic Series 1999.17.

<sup>27</sup> Father Larry Murphy, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 26, 1993.

A radical and pointed lecture entitled “The Nature and Role of Catholic Higher Education” had been presented by a US-based Professor of Sociology, John Donovan, to the Boards of Governors of Saint Mary's University and Mount Saint Vincent University on the 19 of January, 1969. This lecture centered on Donovan's contention that the involvement of the Catholic Church in post-secondary education had an overall negative impact on universities. Donovan argued that there was no need for Catholic education in a secular society and that, historically, Catholic education had been designed to provide spiritual training to men and women destined for the clergy and the sisterhood. Donovan went on to elaborate:

The historical emphasis has been upon the adjective “Catholic” rather than upon the noun “higher education”. And that emphasis was pronounced, indeed so pronounced, that the curriculum of yesterday in fact, if not in title, was skewed toward a Catholic theology, a Catholic philosophy, a Catholic history, a Catholic literature etc. Indeed it is only within the past two decades that we have been able to escape the horrors of a Catholic Sociology and a Catholic psychology. In sum, the integrity of intellectual disciplines was violated and vitiated by an interpretative focus explicitly sectarian.<sup>28</sup>

Donovan then discussed the limitations of Catholic higher education given that Catholic universities were only capable of educating a small proportion of Catholic students. He argued that due to the rising costs associated with post-secondary education, only affluent Catholic students would be able to attend university, thereby impeding participation in university education for a significant portion of Catholic students. One could speculate, in relation to the timing of Donovan's lecture, that the

---

<sup>28</sup> John D. Donovan, “The Nature and Role of Catholic Higher Education”, Lecture, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, NS, January 19, 1969, Saint Mary's University Archives, in Burke Gaffney Fonds, Saint Mary's University Academic Series 1999.17. 3.



university was already deeply engaged in taking serious steps toward secularization, so that inviting a speaker such as Donovan was no coincidence at a time when the institution was faced with a major transition to public status.

Student discussion at Saint Mary's University surrounding secularization was rather low key as compared to the volume of dialogue pertaining to co-education. Prior to the time that the new university Act received final assent in 1970, there did not appear to be any articles or submissions in the *Journal* which indicated student opposition or even opinion to the changes underway. Possibly this was because these changes for the most part were unobtrusive for students, or even invisible, whereas the introduction of women would have been impossible to ignore. It is also likely that the changes were seen (by those who noticed) as being beneficial to students, given that the university was opening up to larger numbers, and that growth in the student body may simply have been exciting to witness at the time. Of interest in one *Journal* article of February, 1970 was the revelation that the transfer of power to the secular board brought with it a significant change which students apparently understood was to appear in the act itself: "The proposed act will incorporate students into the legal definition of the university for the first time. They are not mentioned in Bill 113 (1962) which was the definition of the university."<sup>29</sup>

Valuable again are the views of faculty members who were at Saint Mary's during these times of immense change. Elizabeth Chard, one of the first female faculty

---

<sup>29</sup> "Board Passes New Structure", *SMU Journal*, February 25, 1970, 1.

members at the university as well as the first Dean of Women, provided an interesting assessment of both secularization and co-education:

I think that a number of things happened at roughly the same time. Mainly becoming co-educational and therefore growing much more quickly than any other institution was at that juncture, and so that rapid growth and the withdrawal of obviously, of the very strong influence of the church, created a fairly unstable period, in my opinion at the University in terms of trying to establish a philosophy that was relevant for the students that we had and also capable of being managed within the institution because there was still a lot of archdiocesan tradition at the university, some still exists. Two things I think happened, one was the very rapid increase in the population of the university which was one of the reasons why we went that way, but I am not sure if the other thing ever materialized, and that was a sort of, I suppose a crude way that we needed to improve the locker image and language of some of our students and by introducing the women we would do that. I am not sure it's really happened but if anything it may have gone the other way.<sup>30</sup>

In the view of Father Stewart, which invariably reflected a more "Jesuit" perspective, "When you go from a direction of religious order to lay-president and lay-board of governors and so on, things are bound to change. Course requirements and so forth, well they became much more lenient in the lines of the ordinary public institution for a university."<sup>31</sup>

A further insightful comment perceptive was contained in a 1993 oral history interview with former Saint Mary's faculty member Dr. Kathleen Tudor. The comment is revealing regarding her perception of the lack of interest on the part of the administration with regard to her religious affiliation:

---

<sup>30</sup> Elizabeth Chard, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 22, 1993.

<sup>31</sup> Father William Stewart, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 8, 1993.

So I made that clear. I'm an atheist. I'm coming to a Catholic university. Do you think that's ok? Didn't bother whoever hired me. They didn't care. And so, in a sense, I have not been a part of the religious side of the university and it was never a problem for me. There were times when I certainly... I would have preferred a completely secular university. It doesn't seem any good reason to me for the continued attachment to the Catholic Church. But because I am completely outside that Catholic community, it may be meaningful for some students. It may even be meaningful for some faculty. There's no question it must have had a fair effect on the university because when I first went there we had one priest in our department, Father Power who was a very sweet man who died of cancer in the mid-70s, I guess and there was a professor of Chemistry, a father and there was a... maybe there's still a father in the Physics department. You know, there were maybe 8 or 10 of them around. In fact, just before I came, the President was a priest: Father oh, I've forgotten his name. So obviously, just the sort of disappearance of these religious figures.. these Jesuits has had some influence. But to me it was always a secular college. I was never..it never mattered to me. I never had any...I mean we didn't have a situation where they demanded prayers or anything of that sort. So, from my point of view, it really didn't have much effect unless I looked at things like the Constitution or the financial setup where certain monies came from the community, the Catholic community and these things, as far as I was concerned. I'm not aware that it was anything but a secular university while I was teaching there.<sup>32</sup>

As discussed in Chapter One, Dalhousie, Mount Allison and St. F.X. had introduced women to their campuses, albeit in different ways, from the early days of their founding, while Saint Mary's University responded to the introduction of co-education in a fairly short timeframe and without the benefit of a slow process of integrating the female students into the campus community. One would think that at face value this was more challenging for Saint Mary's than for the other institutions, but based on the information presented in this chapter, this may not have been the case. It

---

<sup>32</sup> Dr. Kathleen Tudor, Interviewed by Angela Baker, *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 18, 1993.

has been noted that women at Mount Allison and St. F.X. were marginalized in the sense that they were introduced to the university life under a very rigid and separate framework from their male counterparts – although it should be noted that this took place during a very different era. At Dalhousie, as pointed out by Twohig and Fingard, women were accepted into the university community from the very early years of the university's origins, but their collective experiences within the university were marginalized in many respects.

As highlighted in this chapter, the introduction of co-education at Saint Mary's was not an entirely smooth transition. One could say that for the most part women were certainly "wanted" as students within the institution – despite the dissent of some male students – as evidenced by numerous reports from the oral histories of faculty members and student views as expressed and reported in the *Journal* newspaper. In the end, this demonstrates that Saint Mary's University was able to facilitate the introduction of women to its campus without any major issues or disruptions – and ultimately, the secularization of the university was carried out again with little to no objection from the Saint Mary's community.

Chapter Three will endeavor to examine more closely a wide range of issues relevant to co-education and secularization at Saint Mary's University and Mount Saint Vincent University; once again, primarily during the years 1967-1970. The chapter will present oral history evidence obtained by this author from former and current students, faculty and staff. More specifically, a small number of interviews have been conducted with current staff and faculty who were employed at the university during the years

pertinent to this study. Questions in Chapter Three are centered on uncovering individual experiences and perceptions surrounding co-education and its impact specifically at Saint Mary's University. For instance, this chapter will explore the perceptions of individuals who were not in favour of co-education as well as those who were supportive of the introduction of women. In addition, questions were posed to several of the women who comprised the first group of females to officially and formally enroll as students under the auspices of "co-education" at Saint Mary's in 1968.

## Chapter Three

### Later Perspectives

As noted in Chapter Two, almost twenty years have passed since efforts have been made on the part of Saint Mary's University to obtain new oral history evidence reflecting key events in the history of the institution. The oral history interviews cited earlier in this thesis were obtained for the most part in 1993. While they undoubtedly contributed significantly to achieving a better understanding of the university's history, it is the intention of this chapter to offer new insights based on twelve additional testimonies by former students, faculty and staff of Saint Mary's University. These more recent interviews – conducted by the author between December 2009 and September 2011 – were focused specifically on the interviewee's experiences and memories of co-education, secularization and the protest culture at Saint Mary's University, whereas the older interviews were more diverse in the scope of their questioning. Among the nine interviews in the older body of evidence which addressed issues associated with co-education, none were testimonies from women who were part of the 1968-69 group officially introduced under the auspices of co-education. In a corresponding limitation, while eight interviews in the existing archives dealt with secularization, they included only one faculty member and one administrator. The subject of student protests at Saint Mary's was covered by only two interviews, both expressing the views of members of faculty.

The more recent oral history evidence gathered for this thesis will serve to draw attention to a variety of views on topics such as resistance to co-education by faculty and students. In addition, the newer oral history evidence highlights the relevance of the student protest culture on campus as well as providing new insights pertaining to the secularization of the university.

This chapter will begin with an interpretive analysis of oral history testimony taken from three of the women who were among the first group to attend Saint Mary's in the context of formal co-education. Testimony from three current administrators, and three current faculty members who were also students in the 1960s and early 1970s, will also be scrutinized. Finally, the views of a current member of the Saint Mary's University Board of Governors, who also happened to be a student between 1966 and 1970, will be examined, as well as those of first lay faculty member at Mount Saint Vincent University. The latter interview was deemed relevant to this thesis because of the tumultuous relationship between Mount Saint Vincent and Saint Mary's regarding the issues surrounding the introduction of co-education.

As mentioned previously, there are three former co-eds who will be featured in this study. Ann MacGillivray was born in Ottawa and attended Sydney Academy and Xavier College prior to enrolling as a student at Saint Mary's in 1969 – the year following the official introduction of co-education. She was one of two women to receive her Bachelor of Commerce degree in the graduating class of 1971. MacGillivray obtained her CA designation in 1975 and then returned to Saint Mary's for her Master's in Business Administration in 1995. Heather Harris was born in Halifax, Nova Scotia and was

among the first fifty women to enroll at Saint Mary's in the autumn of 1968, although she had studied part-time in night courses at the university from 1965 to 1967. Ms. Harris graduated in 1970 with her B.A. and her Master's in Arts (History) in 1972. Mary Ann Hotchkiss (née Boudreau) was born in Meteghan, Nova Scotia and graduated from Saint Mary's University with her Bachelor of Science degree in 1972. She then went on to graduate from Dalhousie University with a Master's in Science in 1973. Hotchkiss was among the second group of women to enroll at Saint Mary's in 1969 – one year following the official introduction of co-education in 1968.

Lawrence Hood was born in Amherst, Nova Scotia and obtained his Bachelor of Commerce from Saint Mary's in 1970. Hood also holds the distinction of being the second longest serving member of the Saint Mary's University Board of Governors. Another interviewee, Michael Larsen, was born in New York City and graduated from Saint Mary's University with his degree in Arts in 1966, having arrived on campus in 1961. He then continued his education at Dalhousie, graduating with a Master's degree in English followed by the completion of his PhD. at the University of Toronto in 1970. Larsen began teaching at Saint Mary's in 1971.

Donald Harper was born in Moncton, New Brunswick and enrolled as a student in the fall of 1968, graduating with a Bachelor of Science degree in 1972. Harper returned to Saint Mary's as an employee in 1980 and presently is the manager of the Saint Mary's bookstore. Keith Hotchkiss was born in Ontario and obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree from Saint Mary's in 1973 and is presently the Director of Student Services. George Nahrebecky was born in Montreal and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts from Saint Mary's University in 1972, followed by his Master's degree at Dalhousie



and a PhD. at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario. Nahrebecky eventually returned to teach at Saint Mary's and is presently a full professor in the Department of Modern Languages and Classics. Patrick Crowley was born in Newfoundland and graduated from Saint Mary's University in 1971 with a Bachelor of Arts. He returned to Saint Mary's in 2007 as the Director of Alumni.

Terrence Murphy was born in Halifax, Nova Scotia and was a student at Saint Mary's University between 1965-1968. He then went on to earn his Master's of Arts at Fordham University and his PhD. from Newcastle. Murphy eventually returned to Saint Mary's in 2003 to assume the position of Vice-President Academic and Research.

Alleyne Travis Murphy was born in Saint John, New Brunswick and graduated with her Bachelor of Science degree from Saint Francis Xavier University followed a Master's of Science from the University of Montreal. She originally came to teach at Mount Saint Vincent in 1951 and at that time was the first and only full-time lay professor. Murphy left the university in 1956 and returned ten years later in 1966.

In mid-January, 1967, the *Saint Mary's Journal* printed an article titled "Campus 66 Turmoil," written by one of its staff, Reid Barry. The article stated that, "If any word can describe the state of North American campuses in 1966, that word is probably "turmoil".<sup>33</sup>

The article then went on to describe Saint Mary's as responding to this protest culture on a smaller scale. As such, this article serves to validate what will be suggested more explicitly: that Saint Mary's students had been much slower than other university

---

<sup>33</sup> Reid Barry, "Campus 66 Turmoil," *SMU Journal*, January 13, 1967, 4.

students to challenge the administration actively and publicly, even when it was clear that more radical protests were happening at universities across the country. Barry suggested petitions had been circulated and signed but also went on to describe the Saint Mary's students as apathetic and divided on issues related to student rights.<sup>34</sup>

Yet again, in early 1967, the *Journal* announced that there would be new regulations regarding personal attire at Saint Mary's. But it was a top-down policy, in that the President and the Deans ultimately determined what students could and could not wear to class:

New Attire Rules Announced – “Proper Attire” rules have been changed by a re-definition of the term. The change was announced January 11 after a meeting between Fr. Fischer, the SRC Executive, Father Hennessey and the Deans of the Faculties. The new rules emphasize dignity and neatness rather than the old prescribed formula of a shirt, tie, and sports-coat. Such things as jeans and sneakers are still forbidden. Students repeatedly warned about wearing “improper” attire will henceforth be subject to expulsion rather than the application of a \$1 fine, as was the case formerly.<sup>35</sup>

Approximately three weeks later, *the Journal* printed its own editorial response to the new rules:

Dress Regulations – Of importance here is that a student and not student government made the initial move in changing the ruling on “proper attire”. Many Santamarians showed themselves to be ultra-conservative, and expressed the fear that the University would turn into a jungle. Since the Administration removed the regulation, the University has not turned into a jungle. Indeed, to many it has just received the university image; previously SMU could be compared to some grammar schools in Britain.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> “New Attire Rules Announced”, *SMU Journal*, January 20, 1967, 2.

<sup>36</sup> “Dress Regulations”, *SMU Journal*, February 17, 1967, 4.

This modest debate on “appropriate attire” serves to illustrate a dramatic shift from 1967, when students – in theory at least – could expect that expulsion may have resulted from breaking dress rules on one too many occasions and the fall of 1968 when it seemed the clothing regulations had been totally dismissed by the university. The transition also extended to a more general search for new freedoms. In fact, Terrence Murphy suggested that the expectation of wearing a shirt, tie and blazer still prevailed when he graduated in the spring of 1968.<sup>37</sup> One could then speculate that within four months things had shifted dramatically given Don Harper’s recollections below.

In this context of “appropriate attire” Harper shared the following about his first impressions of the university campus:

Back then, um, I can remember for example getting ready to come down to Saint Mary’s – like I made sure I had nice clean clothes on and I even got a haircut before I came down. Anyway, I can remember getting off the train and walking up Inglis street and getting on campus and ah I was in for a bit of a shock right away because this was the late sixties and there was a lot of American influence at that time in Canadian universities – meaning like it was the age of the student revolution, student protest, ah hippie influence, that sort of thing. So I arrived on a campus where most of the students or a lot of the students were into the long hair and jeans and I was saying wow this is not quite like Moncton High! So I just quickly took off my tie and tried to look as casual as possible.<sup>38</sup>

Lawrence Hood described the dress code that reflected a conservative culture at the university in 1966: “Another thing at that time too was that you had to

---

<sup>37</sup> Terrence Murphy, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) September 22, 2011.

<sup>38</sup> Donald Harper, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) January 20, 2011.

wear a shirt and tie and a jacket to class and certain parts of campus. So the first thing you did was threw all your socks away because you had to be rebellious in university, you couldn't follow the lines so nobody wore socks. But that's how, you know at the time, that's how strict they were.”<sup>39</sup>

In his work on students and academic freedom in Canada, Michiel Horn states, “Before the 1960's, the academic freedom of students was largely a non-issue. Administrators and governing boards, usually conceding academic freedom to professors while trying to limit its scope, would not grant any aspect of it to students, typically seen as adolescents who should stick to their studies and to ‘safe’ extracurricular activities. Above all, in no way should they cause embarrassment to the university or endanger its sources of support.”<sup>40</sup> Horn also points out that the Canadian Union of Students (CUS) issued a very strongly worded statement in 1968 encouraging students and faculty alike to become more active in the fight for academic and university freedoms.<sup>41</sup> At the time, student protests at Saint Mary's (between 1967-1970) were relatively few in number and, some might suggest, relatively trivial in nature – especially when compared to students at other post-secondary institutions who were consistently and actively protesting about war, civil rights and academic freedom. The abovementioned statement further described student apathy toward important issues and encouraged students to stand up for their

---

<sup>39</sup> Lawrence Hood, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) February 8, 2011.

<sup>40</sup> Michiel Horn, “Students and Academic Freedom in Canada”, *Historical Studies in Education* 11:1 (1999):1.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

rights and the rights of others, reflecting the relatively slow emergence of student dissent at Saint Mary's and at other Maritime universities.<sup>42</sup>

Student protests at the University of Toronto, meanwhile – although drawing on a lengthy tradition of student dissent extending back into the nineteenth century – were more characteristic of the counter-culture movement of the late 1960s. A prime example was the controversy over the planned visit of Dr. Timothy Leary to University College, Toronto, in 1967: Comments the historian Charles Levi:

By inviting Leary, the students of University College had moved from traditional extracurricular pursuits into a new realm, that of the counter-culture. Leary was more than a controversialist, and more than a politician with a subversive world-view – Leary represented a culture of LSD and dropping out of society far beyond what most Canadians considered an “acceptable” level of controversy.<sup>43</sup>

Given what we know about the state of Saint Mary's “protest culture” in 1967, one can imagine that neither the administration nor the student population were at all prepared to engage actively with issues such as Leary's right to lecture on the relevance and importance of psychedelics. That, at the time, Saint Mary's students were not even permitted to wear sneakers and jeans to class spoke of a very different and more conservative climate. Yet the *Journal*, drawing on the Canadian University Press (CUP) did offer some coverage of Leary's failed attempt to enter Canada to lecture at the University of Toronto:

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 2-10.

<sup>43</sup> Charles Levi, Sex, “Drugs, Rock & Roll, and the University College Lit: The University of Toronto Festivals, 1965-69”, *Historical Studies in Education* 18:2 (2006): 2.

High Priest Denied Entry – TORONTO (CUP) --The psychedelic arts festival at the University of Toronto's United College will open this weekend without Dr. Timothy Leary -- the high priest of LSD. Student organizers for Perception '67 were notified Tuesday by manpower minister Jean Marchand that Dr. Leary, slated to appear at the festival, would be denied an entry permit into Canada. The American psychologist is free on bail pending appeal of a thirty year prison sentence for possession of untaxed marijuana transported from Mexico.<sup>44</sup>

The same issue of the *Journal* contained another CUP item entitled "Lectures in Pubs" -- an article highlighting the importance of academic freedom for faculty to employ alternative teaching methods. The focus was on a faculty member from the University of British Columbia -- later a famous environmentalist -- who was keen to offer his students the opportunity to engage in class discussions in pubs and write exams through an honor system:

Vancouver (CUP) -- a University of British Columbia zoology professor is seeking new ways to humanize the multiversity for his students. Discussions in the nearest pub, and all-night honor system exams are two of the unorthodox teaching methods employed by Dr. David Suzuki in his attempts to improve the existing lecture exam system. Suzuki maintains "students should be willing to experiment" and his students appear to be interested in doing just that. When science dean V.J. Okulitch last year circulated a memo forbidding professors to give take-home or unlimited-time examinations, 200 of Suzuki's 225 students signed a petition asking the dean to withdraw the ban and examine the exam system for other courses. Dr. Suzuki was allowed to continue giving his exams -- exams which begin at 7 p.m. and end only when the buildings close at midnight. The relaxed conditions will hopefully eliminate the time pressure on students writing exams, said Dr. Suzuki.<sup>45</sup>

Thus, although the articles on Suzuki and Leary reflected a different climate of student dissent at other universities, clearly the student staff of the *Journal* felt it important and

---

<sup>44</sup> "High Priest Denied Entry", *SMU Journal*, February 17, 1967, 6.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

relevant to cover these issues even in the absence of active protest on similar matters within their own university community.

As will be shown in more detail, students at Saint Mary's in the late 1960s appeared to have a fondness for protesting against the quality of food and the regulations associated with residence life. Even prior to the actual protests which took place regarding food in 1968-69, there was student disdain for the quality of food communicated through the *Journal* at the beginning of 1967 – this disdain was clearly based on student dissatisfaction with food throughout 1966 and likely earlier. It should be noted however that student complaints about food have surely been reflected on campuses as long as universities have existed! On January 20, 1967 the *Journal* reported the following:

During the everyday activities of the term the resident students tend to forget the great debt of gratitude that they owe to our devoted kitchen staff for their unvaryingly high degree of poor service. They seem to feel that they have in us a captive audience that will take any form of abuse they wish to hand out, and not say anything about it. Well, the time has come when something must be said, and more important than that, something must be done about the situation. Perhaps the only people not to blame in this situation, are the ladies that serve on the steam counter. They, out of everyone on the kitchen staff, are the only ones who face the students, and since they are not the ones who actually prepare the garbage that is called food, it is only natural that the students are reluctant to give them the brunt of the discontent the food arouses. By this time of the year, the cooks should know how much food is needed, and yet without fail, they run out of something at each meal, and, as a result, the students have to wait in line while the cooks lethargically begin to mull over what they are going to do about the situation. When the food reaches the state that you can walk away from the table three times a day suffering from galloping-indigestion, and, even have to go and spend money in a vending machine in order to refrain from expiring from malnutrition, the situation has passed the stage of talking.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> L.G.A., "Happiness is a Full Stomach", *SMU Journal*, January 20, 1967, 5.

Although this article was written in early 1967, it appears that it did indeed take a while before students were prepared and organized to actively and collectively protest over this matter. In this context, as will be explored in more detail, two of the oral history interviewees, Patrick Crowley and Ann MacGillivray recalled that by the time of their arrival at Saint Mary's, well over a year after this particular *Journal* article had appeared, the food situation in residence was no better, forcing both individuals to seek advice from their family physicians regarding their nutritional health. The abovementioned reference to students suffering from "malnutrition" - which may well have been a humorous reference - certainly adds credence to what we will see are Crowley and MacGillivray's claims that they too were "malnourished" as a result of their residence diet during their first semesters at Saint Mary's.

On the subject of student protest or rebellion on campus, Anne MacGillivray explained the following in relation to student agitation against the existing rules prohibiting male visitors in residence:

We were successful within about six weeks after moving into residence of being allowed to have male visitors in our rooms. The Mount didn't get that until maybe fifteen years ago! And guess what? I was on the committee at the time. But you know, we petitioned to Dr. Chard and ah she listened to us and then we had limited visiting hours. You know certain hours on the weekends mostly. I forget exactly what they were but you know it was really...we had a sort of town hall meeting and people spoke up for it and some spoke against it and so a compromise was reached that there would be certain hours you could have men in your room.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Ann MacGillivray, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) March 30, 2011.



As mentioned previously, several of the interviewees described the quality of food offered on campus as being the subject of protest at Saint Mary's in the 1960's and 1970's, and MacGillivray related this form of protest – which in itself had many precedents among students of earlier generations – explicitly to the student culture of the late 1960s:

We did protest about the food at one point. We did. I don't remember exactly how we did it or what we did but I remember going home at Christmas to Ontario and the Doctor saying to me you need more fruits and vegetables and, ah, more, you know, nutritious food. So I think a lot of us went home sick after the first term and so I think in that next term we were really pushing for the cafeteria to give us more balanced food. It certainly was a culture of protest in those days. I mean we were hearing about the protests in US schools and, ah, we never had anything like that, that I recall but we were very aware of speaking up for our rights so we did! You know, we wanted men in residence to visit us and so we asked, we insisted...and the same with the food.<sup>48</sup>

Although she recalled being too innocent and naïve to engage readily in any rebellious types of behavior, Mary-Ann Hotchkiss recalled the following as it pertains to her participation in protests on campus during the late sixties:

I know in my first year here the rules and regulations were very very strict like our curfews etc. I remember there was some sort of rally in the cafeteria and if we all showed up they would change the hours and it was like oh this so exciting...I felt like a real rebel like oh my gosh I am going to break the rules! So yeah we all had to break the rule for five minutes then no one could be disciplined. This was successful and the hours were changed from 10pm curfew to 12 am curfew.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Mary-Ann Hotchkiss, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) March 29, 2011.

Terrence Murphy conveyed his overall perspective on Saint Mary's during the protest era as being a post-secondary institution lagging behind many others when it came to active and vocal student dissent: "I mean it was the age of civil rights protests and anti Vietnam campaigns and I would say that the protest culture here was pretty mild – I mean it was a conservative college by and large with a pretty strong disciplinary environment so we weren't behaving like Ryerson or Concordia."<sup>50</sup> Murphy went on to describe the student body as being very engaged even if not in the more classic "protest" manner. He suggested that strong opinions and lively debate occurred with great frequency at Saint Mary's despite the lack of overt and active dissent found at other universities. Murphy also recalled that anti-war sentiment among Saint Mary's students was much more prevalent than was concern over issues related to civil rights.<sup>51</sup>

Don Harper was easily able to recall a number of specific events and issues associated with protests and secularization that were publicized by both the *Journal* and the *Santamarian* yearbook. When he was asked about his level of awareness of secularization, Harper responded as follows:

For example, there was a lot of criticism in the student newspaper at the time - in the *Journal*. There was a lot of criticism of, ah, the administration – that was just a throwback to the American influence really. The American campuses were in turmoil. Canadian campuses, I mean a lot of the more radical students loved to pick up on that and of course the students who were running a newspaper would be the ones to pick up on that more than anyone. So they saw themselves as the journalists, the revolutionaries, the ones leading the, you know, the anti-administrative cause. That was just the thing to do back then. So in my second year for example, I think when Father Labelle was President, the *Journal* used to run articles, ah, satirical articles on Father Labelle. Oh yeah, they had this cartoon

---

<sup>50</sup> Terrence Murphy, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) September 22, 2011.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

of ah Father Labelle and they used to call him “Mother Tucker”. I don’t know what the relationship was, I think Mother Tucker was a comic figure back then or something in political satire or something but they linked it to Father Labelle – but he was very very upset about this and I only heard through the grapevine, ah like I didn’t physically see him ranting and raving about it but I heard through different sources that it caused a lot of stress in his last year as President. He had a very difficult time coping with the articles in the *Journal* that would criticize the administration, decisions that were made at the university, the academic programs, ah, policies, university policies. I mean the Jesuits ruled here for years in administration without that type of ah critical feedback from students. All of a sudden with the sixties and student protest and everything like that it was all coming to the forefront.<sup>52</sup>

Harper believed that the *Journal* was a fairly radical paper in the late sixties and early seventies, and, as such, was staffed by students who were also radical in what he described as their left-wing and anti-administration disposition. As an example, he cited a student protest over the dismissal of a history professor, Keith Sutherland, because of what Harper described as his “radical methods in the classroom”.<sup>53</sup> He goes on to say: “The student newspaper, they picked up on this. They took his cause and just championed his cause you know they had sit-ins in front of the President’s office over there you know, reinstate Professor Sutherland! That was the type of student protest that you saw on the Saint Mary’s campus.”<sup>54</sup> It appears as though this particular protest was actually captured in the 1969 Santamarian yearbook with numerous photos of students sitting outside the President’s office, and in various other areas on campus with placards

---

<sup>52</sup> Donald Harper, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) January 20, 2011.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

in hand saying things like: “We want and demand Sutherland” and “Students support Sutherland.”<sup>55</sup>

In addition, there was a citation in this yearbook which referenced this particular protest: “The axe falls! Why? Keith a Sutherland, history professor, b.s., ed., ma., university of Maine; ph.d., cornell university. It’s the ole’ chop the good ones trick. Students reacted. Months later they’re still asking – why?”<sup>56</sup>

Indeed, Saint Mary’s students seemed to do a more effective job of reporting on other protests nationally and internationally than they did in protesting about similar issues themselves. This phenomenon was documented in April 1969 – not just for Saint Mary’s but for other Maritime campuses as well – in an article by Nick Fillmore entitled “First Protests Reach Maritime Universities” on the front page of the first issue of the alternate Halifax newspaper *The 4<sup>th</sup> Estate*. Student protest, Fillmore noted, had been somewhat delayed in reaching academia on the east coast of Canada. “Are maritime universities on the verge of a wave of demonstrations and violence that has swept through many other areas of the world? Not likely, but still, times are changing – even in the Maritimes.”<sup>57</sup> Fillmore went on to describe three different protests impacting Saint Mary’s, Dalhousie and the University of Moncton respectively. All three protests were student led and focused primarily on faculty/administrative issues. At Dalhousie, thirty graduate students protested against the appointment of a Chair in Sociology whom they accused of overruling a democratic faculty/student policy committee. The students

---

<sup>55</sup> *Sanatamarian*, (Yearbook), 1969, 42-45.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>57</sup> Nick Fillmore, “First Protests Reach Maritime Universities”, *The 4<sup>th</sup> Estate*, April 17, 1969, 1.

protesting at the University of Moncton were incensed over the termination of four sociology professors. They marched in support of the university retaining these professors but ultimately stepped back when the matter was referred to the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). At Saint Mary's, as highlighted previously by Harper, the protest took the form of students challenging the dismissal of Sutherland. Again, this event was obviously significant for the general student body as it was deemed worthy of several pages of coverage in the 1969 yearbook. Fillmore summarized the dispute as follows:

At Saint Mary's, a popular history professor Keith Sutherland, was told his contract would not be renewed following a 2 to 1 thumbs-down vote by other members of the department. About 300 students out of a total student body of 1,500 voted in favor of a sit-in, but when it came time to sit fewer than 100 took part. The effort was later called off but the students said they would take further action if an appeal by Prof. Sutherland for a review of his case by the Canadian Association of University Teachers is not handled to their satisfaction. The students want a student-faculty committee set up to review future hiring and firing decisions by the university. What frustrated the students was that the administration would not give a reasonable explanation for the failure to renew Prof. Sutherland's contract.<sup>58</sup>

In the same context, the 1969 -70 yearbooks also included sections on the activities of the *Journal* wherein the captions below the photos clearly denote a passion for challenging the administration. For instance, challenges specifically to President Labelle are mentioned in various sections of each year, challenges such as: "What else did we push? The sublime thought of our great leaders and teachers, Chairman Mao and Labelle...."<sup>59</sup> A large cartoon picture entitled "Mother Tucker" adorns one of the center

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

<sup>59</sup> *Sanatamarian* (Yearbook), 1970, 80.

pages in the 1969 yearbook which again, according to Don Harper, was a direct dig at Labelle.

Harper also described one particular protest against the food on campus. “So I remember there was a big demonstration where students all dumped their food in garbage cans out in the parking lot.”<sup>60</sup> It should be noted that this memory coincides with several other interviewees, such as Ann MacGillivray, who also recalled protests on campus concerning the quality and quantity of food. In addition, in the 1969 yearbook, there is a large picture of a student dumping a plate of food in a garbage can and although there is no citation to accompany the photograph, one can speculate with some confidence that this was indeed the protest referred to by Harper.<sup>61</sup>

Harper also discussed his perception that males were dominant in student politics at Saint Mary’s in the late 1960s and early 1970s and that there were numerous radical ideas thrown around on campus through the medium of student politics:

I sort of came in naïve. I didn’t come in as you know the streetwise student radical. I was pretty naïve, I was fairly conservative you know, but I loved all this! I thought it was great. I loved to see the long haired bearded guy running for student council you know and out there shouting against the administration.<sup>62</sup>

Indeed, the *Journal* and the 1969-70 yearbooks included many pictures and citations of “long haired bearded guy[s]” shouting at the administration. Overall, Harper

---

<sup>60</sup> Donald Harper, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) January 20, 2011.

<sup>61</sup> *Sanatamarian* (Yearbook), 1969, 16.

<sup>62</sup> Donald Harper, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) January 20, 2011.

concluded that things eventually materialized rather well in the realm of secularization and co-education:

I must admit, the transition at Saint Mary's from an all male university to what we would call a co-ed university and then from the Jesuit institutional model to the secular – ah, it was accepted. People just knew that the time had come and so it evolved without a lot of resistance. There might have been a few pockets of resistance among diehard conservatives who thought traditions were being lost but in actual fact I think most of the changes that came about with more women on campus and fewer Jesuits and more of, you know, a secular institution – it was something that was accepted.<sup>63</sup>

George Nahrebecky was most certainly familiar with student protest and dissent on campus as he was employed by the *Journal* during his time at Saint Mary's, in this respect he stated: "I worked for the Journal which was a bit of a hot bed of... I don't know if you would call it radical thought but it was quite left. There had been an article written at one time which caused a bit of a furor, ahh, which was 'administration as pig'. The Journal was not shy about criticizing admin."<sup>64</sup>

Nahrebecky's recollections regarding the negative impact student dissent had on President Labelle were similar to those of Don Harper. More specifically, Nahrebecky also remembered Labelle as being put under stress by the scope and depth of student criticism which was frequently launched through media such as the *Journal*.<sup>65</sup>

Patrick Crowley indicated that he was very conscious of the protest era on campus. He referenced a personal memory about his own foray into the hippie culture:

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> George Nahrebecky, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) February 9, 2011.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

“We weren’t allowed in high school to grow our hair long and your parents didn’t allow you to grow your hair long. So then when I came home at Christmas with hair down to here and a moustache – that was, everybody said what happened to him!”<sup>66</sup> Crowley further surmised that students were protesting over just about anything given that student demonstrations were so prevalent during this time in history:

You know every time you turned on the television there were always university demonstrations, especially in the United States because of the anti-war demonstrations. At that time we didn’t have ah ARAMARK, there was a German guy, Heinz Morsstat and he had the catering contract here. So he looked after the food and that, and we all thought he was great. It was institutional food, it wasn’t like your mother’s cooking but it was pretty good. What happened was we had this big demonstration protesting about the quality of the food and then all the residence kids were looking around saying hey we’re not protesting it was all the day guys. We couldn’t understand, like here we were having this big march against poor Mr. Morrstat and all the people marching went home to Mom’s cooking and we had to go up and felt so sorry for him, we had to go up and get supper that night and we didn’t know if he was going to throw something in the supper but there were no residence students up protesting. That was the thing, they’d protest against anything.<sup>67</sup>

In the context of a protest culture at Mount Saint Vincent during the sixties and seventies, Alleyne Murphy indicated: “The students at that time were beginning to understand that they had a voice, a significant voice in what they were being taught and in the running of the university.”<sup>68</sup>

Murphy also discussed the some of the challenges faced by members of the Mount Saint Vincent Board of Governors with respect to student dissent and protest

---

<sup>66</sup> Patrick Crowley, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) March 23, 2011.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> Alleyne Murphy, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) January 17, 2011.



against the establishment in the sixties and seventies. More specifically, she described how members of the Board represented the business world, and, as such, were not accustomed to either the faculty or the students, telling them how to run the university.<sup>69</sup> Of interest is the fact that a similar dynamic was described in relation to the Board of Governors at Saint Mary's University in the interview conducted with Michael Larsen.<sup>70</sup> Murphy also made it clear she associated the protest era at Mount Saint Vincent as being directly linked with what was taking place on university campuses in the United States.<sup>71</sup>

One of the most compelling acts of student dissent - which did take place on the Saint Mary's campus in April, 1968 - combined both the protest culture and the subject of co-education. Unfortunately there was no yearbook published in 1968 nor was the *Journal* operating as it was the end of the academic year; hence, there is scarce evidence existing beyond the oral history testimonies of those who were there. According to Terrence Murphy – who was there – this particular protest was quite heated. He explained, “My memories are kind of episodic. I remember students gathering in the gym and a number of us speaking about the issue and how we had to make our feelings known.”<sup>72</sup> Murphy then went on to describe moving from the gym to the student centre cafeteria where the protest continued:

My mental image is of us being on the first floor in a cafeteria setting – um, not as modern as the current one but something like that. The strategy was that we

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> Michael Larsen, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 26, 2011.

<sup>71</sup> Alleyne Murphy, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 17, 2011.

<sup>72</sup> Terrence Murphy, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) September 22, 2011.

would not go to class – I don't remember any big march – there might have been. I remember more the scene in the student centre, and I thought we had been approached to have our picture taken while we appeared to study so that we would be seen as very responsible student protesters.<sup>73</sup>

Murphy's description of students being photographed whilst studying certainly captures the type of "conservative" student dissent that has been discussed throughout this study. Murphy also remembered Father Labelle meeting with the students to inform them that the Bishop was dealing with the matter and that they should get back to class, which they did without further protest or resistance.<sup>74</sup>

The 20 January, 1967 edition of the *Journal* featured a special section entitled "Cherchez La Femme," arguing for the presence of female students at Saint Mary's. Although this was an opinion frequently represented in the *Journal*, this particular contribution was distinctive in having a female authorship to provide an "outsider's perception" of the all- male institution. The editorial note at the beginning of the column is also enlightening:

The feminine influence seems to be discouraged on the Saint Mary's campus. Apart from the night students and our two treasured co-ed's, women are not to be seen among the students here. But we of the JOURNAL believe that much (if only defensive tactics) is to be learned from observing the fair sex. Hence we turned to some young ladies to help fill this gap in our education which is so painfully obvious in our university life.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> "Cherchez la Femme", *SMU Journal*, January 20, 1967, 4.

The exact meaning behind the suggestion that “the feminine influence seems to be discouraged on campus” was ambiguous. Could this have meant that the students themselves were openly divided about the issue at this juncture in early 1967? Or it may have been a simple observation pointing to the obvious limitations of a single-gender institution. This excerpt is an excellent example of the documentary evidence that problematizes the degree to which women felt “comfortable” as students in the early days of co-education and, indeed, preceding the formal introduction of co-education.

When asked about her first memories of the Saint Mary’s campus, Ann MacGillivray described arriving in Halifax by train and being picked up at the station by a Saint Mary’s student who brought her to the university. She recalled most definitely feeling that she was in the minority as a woman within the university community. Although she felt that overall women were welcomed at Saint Mary’s, she did encounter a few situations whereby the opposite sentiment was conveyed: “There were a lot of comments from the guys saying oh you are here for your ‘Mrs’ degree. – you know there were those kinds of comments made.”<sup>76</sup> Another example of this less than welcoming and rather sexist attitude is detailed in the following:

I did have a problem with a faculty member who said to me one day you know because there were maybe two women in the classes in business and that I was in and he said to me “how are you liking it” and I said oh I’m really enjoying it and he said see how you like it when you fail the course and I said I have no intention of failing the course and he said well women don’t succeed in business. (laughs) So I got moved out of his class in a hurry. I only here a week or so and he was saying this to me – so that was about the only really negative thing that happened

---

<sup>76</sup> Ann MacGillivray, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) March 30, 2011.

with one particular faculty member way back when...and the Dean who was, ummm, well he was an acting Dean or Chair of the accounting area - I don't remember - was Paul Cormier who went on to become the Auditor General for the province, he was a wonderful teacher, but anyway, I spoke to him and no problem I was moved immediately - you know so that was good.<sup>77</sup>

Of special interest in MacGillivray's case was that, although she graduated with many others who went on to obtain their CA designations without obstacles, she herself was not able to obtain a job in a CA firm due to her gender. In this respect she describes one of her experiences in a job interview with a CA firm in Halifax: "Then they said insulting things like well hiring a woman would be like hiring a Chinese and I thought well here they are insulting women and the Chinese – because our clients wouldn't accept these people as auditors. And so I moved back to Ottawa and got a CA job there."<sup>78</sup> When asked if she realized she was a "pioneer" at Saint Mary's in being part of the first groups of female students to attend the university, she responded:

Yes I did. I did. I realized that this was a men's school and it was a, you know, men's world in accounting. I knew that. But I've always been one where...you know, to me, I did not feel it was fair to be held back because of your gender. So I was willing to take on the fight. The reason I didn't go to Dal was I thought – at that time Dal was ranked as one of the highest schools of Commerce in Canada. And I thought, you know, and I did a lot of preparatory work and sent off course outlines and you know had it in writing that they would accept all these courses and they backed down. So I thought I don't want to deal with a school that is not good to its word. And so to me Saint Mary's was very good as well in terms of its reputation for commerce and business and so I said well then I am going to Saint Mary's.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

Heather Harris recalled her delight at attending Saint Mary's full-time as part of the new group of co-eds in the fall of 1968 and indicated she felt Saint Mary's to be more flexible and accommodating than Dalhousie University. With respect to issues related co-education, Harris did not recall experiencing any discriminatory or negative behavior (based on gender) either toward herself or any other women on campus while she was a student. She expanded on this topic in the following comment:

I think anybody who, ah, who was at any other institution of the female persuasion at that time certainly would have thought it was great to be one of several hundred in which the rest were all male! That's the way everybody looked at it! We used to say, oh of course, 'eat your heart out!' And we knew, as far as the guys go, everybody knew they were in seventh heaven! I mean here they had been at this all male school etcetera at a very hormonal age.<sup>80</sup>

Mary Ann Hotchkiss described her first impressions of Saint Mary's in the context of having grown up in Meteghan, a small fishing village. She remembered the university campus – and Halifax as a city – seeming huge, certainly as compared with her own community. She acknowledged that it was a little less intimidating because she arrived to study at the university alongside her sister and brother. Mary Ann noted that: “it was big but it was friendly – I felt as if we counted.”<sup>81</sup>

Hotchkiss stated that she was just so excited to be attending university that the notion she was a “pioneer” (being among the first cohorts of women enrolled at Saint

---

<sup>80</sup> Heather Harris, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 17, 2011.

<sup>81</sup> Mary-Ann Hotchkiss, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) March 29, 2011.

Mary's) simply had not dawned on her. Having said this, she was well aware that women were few in numbers:

We were definitely small in numbers. The ratio was six to one and it was a little intimidating. . . . well, you know there weren't as many women as you were used to like in high school where it was more fifty-fifty. Not that it was a terrible thing and of course in science there were even fewer women, sometimes there were like only two of us in class. And I mean when I look back it's sort of funny but you drop your eraser and its like the typical five guys running to pick up your eraser – it was sort of neat in that way. But then you tended to be a little shy too cause there were only a few of you like if you walked in the cafeteria sometimes, you know, if you walked in late cause I had science classes and they were a bit late and if I walked in late there might have been two women and the rest would be men. You hated to walk across the room you know but not that anyone was rude or anything you just felt like whoa a little overwhelmed with the numbers but it was good too, there were benefits and it wasn't a bad thing.<sup>82</sup>

One of the benefits Hotchkiss referred to was the opportunity she had to study without disruption in one of the female bathrooms on campus. Due to the fact that there were so few women on campus, she described being able to have a peaceful and quiet environment in which to study in one of the larger bathrooms in the McNally Building. She indicated that this was extremely advantageous as the other locations for studying on campus were frequently quite crowded and noisy.<sup>83</sup>

When asked if she was aware of any negative reactions toward women on campus Hotchkiss stated the following:

You felt that a little but you just let it roll off your back - even Father Hennessey, I have to laugh, he used to be Dean of Men, he wasn't Dean of Men when we came, but he was still very much a presence, and he used to say 'Saint Mary's will

---

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

never be the same again' with a little smile on his face – we knew that he knew in his heart of hearts that it was time.<sup>84</sup>

In his oral history interview, former student and present day senior administrator Keith Hotchkiss described the Jesuit reaction to co-education. He shared a similar memory of Father Hennessey's perspective on co-education to that of his wife, Mary Ann Hotchkiss:

But I think Father Hennessey and some of the Jesuits had a hard time with it initially ummm just from some of the, and then I can't remember specifically, I do remember having conversations and a couple of times as we got to know Father Hennessey and actually my wife and her sister who were going here at the time used to cut his hair. I don't know how it happened but they were two French Canadian girls and good church going girls, they went to mass every Sunday umm, so they started cutting his hair so I guess when I started going out with Mary Ann that's how I kind of got a little bit closer to Father Hennessey. Although he kind of followed the sports so he knew me as an athlete on campus but I remember he'd often kind of tease the girls and say that Saint Mary's will never be the same and they should never have let women in and he would say it jokingly but he said it often enough that I think you know there was probably a little bit of a sense that Saint Mary's lost something in his mind and in some of his colleague's minds when it changed from being an all male institution to being co-ed.<sup>85</sup>

The following excerpt is focused primarily on Keith Hotchkiss's perceptions of some of the challenges faced by women in the early days of co-education at Saint Mary's:

I guess it was probably male dominated. That first year I think there were only about one hundred women in residence. They took over A and B House and then C and D House had male students and then they opened Rice residence. So...um, yeah I think I was sharing this story maybe with you or somebody yesterday that I had come down for training camp and, uh, you know we had

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Keith Hotchkiss, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) December 17, 2009.

been here for a week and we were the only ones on campus and then all of a sudden students were arriving for orientation and moving in and women started coming in the cafeteria you know then when they first started walking in the boys were hooting and hollering and I said oh my god haven't they ever seen a woman before! (laughs) Ah, that's kind of, then I realized for the older guys on the football team they had been here three or four years and there hadn't been women on campus so it was a new experience for them. Um, but you know other than that I mean I guess you know all the guys had their eyes on the pretty girls and I was lucky enough to find one and marry one so it worked out well for me in the end (laughs).<sup>86</sup>

The overwhelming majority of the interviewees were supportive of the introduction of women to Saint Mary's, although -- as noted previously -- there were certainly those on campus who did not relish the idea of females arriving. Lawrence Hood provided fascinating insight into this particular mindset concerning resistance to the introduction of co-education, in large part because he himself was not initially a supporter:

There were lots of rumors around about you know, the girls were coming and ah, if there were votes or referendums I don't remember but I do remember us having conversations about, well you know, what are the girls going to do for the place -- distract us? I knew at the time when the girls were coming and I knew it was going to pass and don't get me wrong I liked them and I would have been happy to have them but we were unique as a boys school, you know we were like Notre Dame without the chicks at the time. It was never any worry about getting dates or whether there any girls around because they would flock down here from the Mount and high school and Dal. If they had a dance at Saint Mary's you couldn't get in the thing.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Lawrence Hood, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) February 8, 2011.



Overall, Hood was clear that he was not inclined to protest against women coming to Saint Mary's despite not being pleased with the idea. Ultimately he concluded that, "When the girls came it was seamless."<sup>88</sup>

When Mike Larsen arrived at Saint Mary's in 1961, he remarked that the McNally building was the only building in existence on campus, and added that it was still under construction. He also noted that the first students he met were international and that he enjoyed meeting such a diverse group of students with different accents and cultural norms.<sup>89</sup>

On the topic of co-education, Larsen pointed out that Aileen O'Leary Carroll and Jocelyn Grassby were the first two female students to attend Saint Mary's officially, in the early 1960s – although they had needed special permission from the Jesuit administration to enroll in classes. He further suggested that they proceeded to study at Saint Mary's without difficulties – he felt they just went to class and focused on their studies. When asked what level of discussion on co-education was taking place by 1966, Larsen replied: "Insofar as it was, our expectation as a student was that this would evolve and happen and why not?"<sup>90</sup> Larsen again provided insight into co-education at the university as it related to the bigger changes brought about by Vatican II:

To be honest I don't think we should forget about the impact of John XXIII really and that whole era of opening up and reaching out – ah, there was a fair amount of momentum to break out of the old paradigms. There were new roles being envisaged for women and you know, some people resisted but some people were sympathetic to it and from my sense as a student here then,

---

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

<sup>89</sup> Michael Larsen, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 26, 2011.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid.

there was just no problem, there was quite a bit of support. Probably there were some who thought it was not a good idea – I mean in residence a lot of us were from the US and we were used to co-ed you know, so it wasn't a big deal.<sup>91</sup>

As regards the senior faculty member Father Hennessey, Larsen's perception was that Hennessey was happy with the arrival of women on campus – a different nuance from the impression of both Mary Ann and Keith Hotchkiss that he had mixed feelings.

When Larsen returned in 1970 to teach he acknowledged that – as also noted by several other interviewees -- it was still a campus heavily dominated by male students:

It would have been predominantly....it would have been probably about 80% male. And so I can see, just by sheer numbers, um, that that might have been a problem. Also, you know, the early seventies, there was a kind of 'let it all hang out', male thing, among the young guys teaching who probably were pretty edgy, ahh and thought this was really going over well with the guys which it probably was, but it may have been pretty offensive to some of the women too, who didn't really appreciate some of the edginess of ah you know these young hot shot PhD.'s or soon to be minted PhD.'s who were young and full of vim and vigor.<sup>92</sup>

Larsen felt that resistance to the introduction of women into Saint Mary's was not primarily influenced by preserving the "all male" institution, but rather reflected a more generalized discomfort with adapting to modernizing trends in society. He explained further: "You know, Catholic schools had women in them for a long time – I don't think that was as big of a deal. Personally, I think that was an easy transition but I do think moving away from that sort of world I guess you'd say, you know the warm

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.

embrace of that orthodoxy into the much more contested, open, freewheeling, windy world of modernity. It was a tough go.”<sup>93</sup>

Harper was one of the few interviewees who were familiar with the attempts to amalgamate Mount Saint Vincent University and Saint Mary’s University. He also readily acknowledged that it still felt like an “all male” campus for the first couple of years following the introduction of co-education. For instance, he recalled that there was only one woman enrolled in his math and physics classes all the way through his degree.

Harper recognized that this gender imbalance had righted itself in large part by 1972.<sup>94</sup>

With respect to the lack of visibility of women on campus Harper suggested:

They were few and far between when I was here though – as a matter of fact, they weren’t living on campus, so, I mean, I can even remember for example on a weekend we’d go down to dinner in the residence and somebody would come back and say oh there’s women in the cafeteria. So I mean the presence of women on campus outside the classroom back then was kind of rare.<sup>95</sup>

With regard to co-education at Saint Mary’s, Terrence Murphy indicated that as a student he was aware of the negotiations which were taking place between Saint Mary’s and Mount Saint Vincent:

Yes we probably were misinformed but we had lots of rumours and lots of talk about it and part of it was, you know, the move to admit women to Saint Mary’s was perceived by the Mount or we perceived the Mount to perceive it as a threat and I think they probably did. What was really going on in the confidential negotiations we hadn’t a clue but we realized it was

---

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

<sup>94</sup> Donald Harper, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) January 20, 2011.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

an issue. It was all tied up with the question of whether women would be admitted to the regular programming at Saint Mary's.<sup>96</sup>

Murphy indicated that what he remembered distinctly was the division of opinion on campus regarding co-education. He further suggested that this may have been somewhat complicated by the existing divisions between the day students and the residence students on campus. He certainly qualified this suggestion as not being universal, however, he indicated that regarding co-education, some of the residence students were potentially more likely to have opposed the introduction of women given the all embracing male oriented environment which existed within the residence culture at that time. Murphy implied that there were prominent students on campus who were both for and against the introduction of co-education.<sup>97</sup> This is of particular interest as there were few examples in the *Journal* supporting those who were against co-education and no other oral history interviewees recalled any prominent individual students on campus purporting this view. Overall, Murphy indicated that the resistance which did take place was based those more prominent students simply wanting to preserve the all male environment at Saint Mary's. Similar to Keith and Mary-Ann Hotchkiss, Murphy also suggested that people like Father Hennessey were apt to be displeased with the introduction of women at some level given his support for the more male-centered and athletic focus on the campus.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Terrence Murphy, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) September 22, 2011.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.

When asked what stood out about the campus when he arrived in 1969, George Nahrebecky indicated it was: "Much smaller, everybody smoked, and there were far fewer female students."<sup>99</sup> On the subject of co-education, Nahrebecky noted that women were certainly noticed and welcomed in a positive manner at Saint Mary's. He did not recall any negative response to the arrival of females on campus.<sup>100</sup>

Patrick Crowley described his arrival at Saint Mary's in the fall of 1968:

Getting into residence I think the big thing was I was meeting people from everywhere. Like growing up in St. John's you know it's an island, you don't get to see too many people. My roommate was a black guy from Newark, New Jersey who came up here to play basketball and of course in Newfoundland there was no black population, so this was all new to me. There were an awful lot of Americans here at that time.<sup>101</sup>

With regard to co-education, Crowley acknowledged that there were very few women around the campus when he arrived in 1968. He suggested there was a marked difference in female visibility within the university by the fall of 1969:

When the girls came in 69, ah, like half the residence, half the low rise was a women's residence; and they were the real trailblazers because you have to remember that this university was built for men. So...there's all kinds of little things like if they went to the gym there were no changing rooms, little things like that you know, there were no public washrooms for them – everything was built for men.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> George Nahrebecky, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) February 9, 2011.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> Patrick Crowley, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) March 23, 2011.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

It should be noted that Crowley was not aware, however, of the negotiations between Mount Saint Vincent University and Saint Mary's respecting co-education.<sup>103</sup>

As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, one interview was carried out with a former faculty member at Mount Saint Vincent University, Alleyne Murphy. Given the connection between Mount Saint Vincent and Saint Mary's, specifically as it pertains to the introduction of co-education, it was thought to be important to reflect some of the views of at least one individual who was present at Mount Saint Vincent during the years covered in this study. Murphy was a professor of home economics and dietetics and in 1966 the university had built a new department in home economics; so upon her return, she was given freedom to run the department as in her words, "she saw fit."<sup>104</sup> When asked about some of the most significant changes she observed upon her return in 1966, she indicated that the student population had both grown and diversified.<sup>105</sup>

Murphy was a member of the Senate and sat on the Board of Governors at Mount Saint Vincent at the time co-education and amalgamation with Saint Mary's was being discussed and negotiated. She recalled there was a level uneasiness about the prospect of co-education. She also noted that the concept of merging with Saint Mary's University would have been discussed more regularly at the level of the Board of Governors, although it was also discussed at Senate for its potential academic implications:

---

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

<sup>104</sup> Alleyne Murphy, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 17, 2011.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid.

It would come up because of course there would be the question of who was going to teach what you know if you're going to amalgamate that means some people give up on both sides and do the students move into Saint Mary's to take courses do the Saint Mary's students come out here so I mean it personally affected the professors. So certainly ... I just think it was taken seriously and there was some relief when they decided to stay independent of one another.<sup>106</sup>

One interesting article from the *Journal* in early 1967 was centered on presenting the views of female students from Mount Saint Vincent toward the male dominated campus at Saint Mary's:

Sermon from the Mount – “Greetings to the great big “Huskie” men at Saint Mary's from the Mount. Under the auspices and (hopefully) the protection of the JOURNAL staff, we, the “Mounties of the Woods” would like to make a few comments on life at SMU as we see it. Having had a guided tour of Saint Mary's , featuring the JOURNAL office, and the coatroom in the back of the gym, and having taken several volumes of notes on happenings and on the treatment we received, we feel well qualified to comment on our general impression of the place. Before starting we would like to say that we do NOT represent the Mount officially. We don't want anyone to get into trouble – especially us! SMU has two beautiful buildings, soon even more, we hear. And it must be nice not having to worry about getting wet walking to classes on rainy days. But it seems to us that everyone was at each other's throats. Perhaps that's because everyone had been kept in cages so long they didn't know how to behave when they were allowed out. We were well received, however, and quite flattered at the number of double takes and wolf - whistles that followed us down the halls. The highlight of our evening was a visit to the common lounge, where we were immediately surrounded by a group of guys who had previously been watching TV. We were plied with questions about where we were from, what we were doing at SMU, who we were, and what we did for excitement etc. We must say we thoroughly enjoyed our visit and meeting all kinds of wonderful people.”<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid.

<sup>107</sup> “Sermon from the Mount”, *SMU Journal*, January 20, 1967, 4.

This account, while not necessarily representing any one general experience of women at Saint Mary's – the three women cited previously made no mention of “wolf-whistles” or the like – does correspond with the recollection (also noted previously) of former student and current administrator Keith Hotchkiss.

In February 1967, the *Journal* published an article entitled “The other side of Prof. Sarabia”. The intent of this article was to “foster student-faculty relations”. Adolfo Sarabia was at Saint Mary's between 1963 and 1968 as an Assistant Professor in Spanish. Saint Mary's student, Bernie MacDougall conducted the interview and it is of interest to note that there was a fair bit of discussion regarding Sarabia's views on co-education. More specifically, Sarabia commented in question-and-answer format on the issue of co-education at Saint Mary's in the following:

J. There has been considerable discussion on the value of co-education at St. Mary's. Will you comment on this? S. A few days ago, I was talking to a lady who had attended a dance at Dalhousie University recently. She was complaining about the fact that, while dancing with a student from St. Mary's she thought she was going to have her dress literally ripped off her back. I don't think that any educational institution should put forward such a sexually unbalanced product. Taking into consideration the age of most of our students, the importance that a proper outlook has on sexual matters has on the whole life of the individual, and the lack of facilities our students have to establish proper relationships with the opposite sex, I would strongly recommend that Saint Mary's University be made a co-educational institution. Not only that, but things being what they are, I hardly believe that, in sexual matters, Saint Mary's University can be called an educational institution at all. If we didn't teach Mathematics or English at Saint Mary's University, we could hardly be called a university; the same is true if we don't give our students an education in such an important matter as sex. At this point in the interview we were joined by another student who proposed several stimulating and provocative questions. J. Are we correct in assuming that you are patronizing free love? S. Not only are you incorrect, but you are proving my point. What I am patronizing and asking for, is that the students of this University be given the opportunity of knowing, appreciating, and sharing their formative years with the women with whom they will, most likely be sharing their whole lives. Notice that I say ‘women’ not ‘girls’, ‘gals’ or ‘chicks’. One of the advantages that I see in a co-



educational system is that the male students may learn to respect their feminine counter-parts. Love, free or of any kind, if it is not based on the respect of the other mate's personality, cannot be called love.<sup>108</sup>

On the topic of secularization, it is of interest to note that between 1967 and 1970 notices regularly appeared in the *Journal*, to advertise “daily mass times” and also included were a variety of different prayers and other “Catholic” related items. These types of religious notices persisted during the entire period covered by this study, and the continuity may explain in part why students seem to have had limited awareness of the changes in the institutional administration and ownership. In late January 1967, the *Journal* showed the daily mass times – listed at 11:30am and 12:25pm respectively – directly under a detailed article entitled “Canadian Campuses Show Discontent”:

Students [the article began] plan to crash a closed board of governors meeting at Waterloo University. Glendon College Student Council calls for an assembly on the subject “whether or not the president of this university has the intellectual integrity to discuss his views publicly” At the same time, a Montreal newspaper predicts the University of Ontario could become Canada's Berkley. In Calgary, students at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology attack paternalism in administration which forces them to attend 90 percent of their classes and refuses to listen to their complaints about lack of adequate health services and residences at SAIT.<sup>109</sup>

The juxtaposition of these two distinctly different pieces in the student paper reflects the ambiguity of the *Journal* staff, who on one hand were certainly trying to communicate more left-wing student centered attitudes and furthermore encourage student dissent;

---

<sup>108</sup> Bernie MacDougall, “The Other Side of Professor Sarabia”, *SMU Journal*, February 17, 1967, 6.

<sup>109</sup> “Canadian Campuses Show Discontent”, *SMU Journal*, January 31, 1967, 3.

whereas they were also mindful of publishing information for those students who would have remained faithful to their Catholic traditions.

Ann MacGillivray did not convey a strong sense of awareness that secularization was actually taking place at the time it was. This may well be related to her experience in a faculty that was traditionally staffed by lay people, as opposed to the religious who seemed to have had more of an active and visible role in teaching within the Arts and Sciences:

Well when I was here I actually did not ever have a Jesuit as a teacher. All of the commerce faculty were non-Jesuit...umm and I had to take a philosophy course because it was required of all students in those days and I had a Professor Monahan who was not a Jesuit. And so I really didn't feel their presence at all. Ah, Father Hennessy was involved of course because of the football team and all that and he was always around but really had no sense that there were many Jesuits left.<sup>110</sup>

Heather Harris described her respect and admiration for the high value she associated with a Jesuit education. Harris did not remember any significant impact on the student population concerning the secularization of the university. She did however provide interesting insights on why the secularization process may have happened so smoothly so as not to garner much attention from the student body. In this respect she highlighted the role of Edmund Morris, who had served as the interim President of Saint Mary's following the departure of the last Jesuit President, Father Henry Labelle:

What you had in Edmund Morris was an experienced politician okay who was vastly networked. So to me the smooth transition came because he was a Roman Catholic therefore sensitive – there was not an abrupt change there because he

---

<sup>110</sup> Ann MacGillivray, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Archives, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) March 30, 2011.

was a person of the community, extremely well networked, devout Roman Catholic but politically astute.<sup>111</sup>

With respect to the secularization of the university, Mary Ann Hotchkiss indicated that she had chosen Saint Mary's in part for its Catholic values and traditions. She suggested that the process of secularization was not overt, although she was aware on some level that it was taking place:

I was aware it was happening... I don't know that it affected me in any way or that all of a sudden the university changed. It was still a very caring and small university where the individual really meant a lot but it is funny cause over the years you know being still connected to the university through my husband, umm, I talked to a lot of international students and asked them what brought you here and what made you decide on Saint Mary's and still a lot of them say because it was a Catholic university that draws them still.<sup>112</sup>

When asked about the influence Vatican II may have had on the secularization process at Saint Mary's, Terrence Murphy responded:

I think Vatican II seemed hugely revolutionary at the time – you know, I mean while other campuses maybe were promoting Marxist / Leninist views and the protest culture and radical politics were much more defined than here – there was, within the limits of progressive Catholicism a tremendous sense of change, liberation and modernization. So it created a much more open atmosphere and I think, at least indirectly, that culture that came out of Vatican II, which was really much more liberal minded then than I think current Catholicism is in a way – probably served to phase out the mentality that had lasted for more than a century at least of separate religio-ethnic institutions to protect the integrity and the persistence of Catholic observance and Catholic belief. There was much less fear of openness to the rest of the world and that was largely the message of Vatican II, was of “aggiornamento” – you know, about updating and openness to the secular world and certainly to other faiths at least to other Christian denominations. So...um, I think it was a mindset that contributed, I don't think there was a kind of

---

<sup>111</sup> Heather Harris, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Archives, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 17, 2011.

<sup>112</sup> Mary-Ann Hotchkiss, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Archives, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) March 29, 2011.

cause and effect link in the sense that you could trace it in documentary terms or directives from one church authority to another but the mindset changed dramatically.<sup>113</sup>

Although he was not a practicing Catholic in 1966, Lawrence Hood recognized the high educational standards upheld by the Jesuit Fathers: “I did realize though, very quickly, that the Jesuits were very smart guys and that they came from a really broad range of backgrounds.”<sup>114</sup> Hood was admittedly unaware of Vatican II and the secularization process underway at the university, with the exception that he noted there were far fewer Jesuits on campus by 1968. He did however provide some interesting feedback with regard to the “Catholic” climate at Saint Mary’s in the earlier years of his education: “The first time I was in residence I was on the third floor and it had a priest on it and at seven o’clock you opened your door and knelt down on the hard goddamned floor for those who wanted to do the rosary - it was very Catholic, very umm Jesuit.”<sup>115</sup>

Mike Larsen was very much aware of the impact Vatican II would have had on the overall process of Saint Mary’s becoming a secular institution:

In that wave...some of the Jesuits were moving...I mean they were pretty smart guys. Some of them developed relationships with ah you know women and ah some of them moved out and got married. I think there was some thought of this becoming part of the, you know, a kind of a new Catholicism. A kind of more, should I say, tolerant and all embracing. I think you have to see it to some extent, that part of it, and then some of the things subsequently as a kind of reaction against that as the more conservative elements got panicky about this – more than

<sup>113</sup> Terrence Murphy, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Archives, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) September 22, 2011.

<sup>114</sup> Lawrence Hood, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Archives, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) February 8, 2011.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid.

a little panicky umm and some reactions set in because like I said some of the Jesuits were leaving.<sup>116</sup>

One interesting anecdote provided by Larsen is associated with the fact that he was awarded the Governor General's medal at convocation in 1966. The commencement address that year was delivered by Governor General Georges P. Vanier himself and Larsen indicated the irony in that he, an American, received the award that year. Larsen also referred to Vanier as someone who would have been viewed by many of the Catholics at Saint Mary's as a saintly, iconic, ultra-conservative figure, a devout Catholic. It is for this reason, Larsen speculated that at this time of great change within the Catholic Church, and by extension Saint Mary's as an institution, the university would specifically have wanted Vanier to deliver the address at convocation. Larsen commented in more detail in the following:

I think to some extent that, that represented an attempt by some, to ah sort of bring Saint Mary's back to its more conservative traditions. Even in the years when I was gone – either at Dal or in Toronto or New York you know the sense I had was that during those transition years there was a real desire among the Board members and ah some of the other movers and shakers at the time to see Saint Mary's change in some ways I guess to move toward a co-ed kind of thing but I think there was a real, ah, desire to hold on to certain things that they perceived as core values despite the fact that the university was going public, was going co-educational and so on.<sup>117</sup>

Larsen was asked about the impact secularization may have had on the university community in general. Although he acknowledged that the process of secularization may have materialized in a manner that was relatively unnoticed by the students, faculty and

---

<sup>116</sup> Michael Larsen, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Archives, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 26, 2011.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid.

staff population, it was certainly noticed by members of the Board of Governors. Larsen indicated that various members of the Board were alarmed at the scope of changes taking place at Saint Mary's and demonstrated their disdain by "interfering" in issues related to curriculum. One indicative example concerned the introduction of the Gestetner machine – a copying or mimeograph machine widely used during the 1960s. Larsen explained how the Gestetner provided a newfound freedom for faculty to bring new materials into the classroom; these materials were perceived by some on the university's Board of Governors, as highly controversial. Larsen explained further:

You could make copies of a variety of things for your class. The interesting thing about that was you weren't tied to a textbook totally. So I can remember people going into English class and you know, we might have a textbook, but, this is when I was teaching, but they may bring supplemental poems. I can remember one colleague of mine, faculty member was teaching, Philip Larkin, a great poet laureate, now dead, from England, and ah, one of his poems was about, was a meditation called "Church Going" and it was about, basically the demise of faith and so on and when it got out to some members of the Board that this was being taught in class I mean this was the subject of a Board meeting. So there was ah 'who are these people, what are they teaching and has this been cleared, we are a Catholic university, we have these values.'<sup>118</sup>

Another example provided by Larsen, from slightly later in time, also illustrates difficulties in acceptance of the university's secular identity by members of the university community, in this instance, alumni serving on the Board of Governors: "I can remember Board debates, now this was later on, but um, some alumni members of the Board having absolute meltdowns because of when the residences brought in condom machines...it was a huge reaction."<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

Larsen elaborated on the various causes of resistance to the changes taking place at Saint Mary's with insights into the role of the greater Catholic community in creating the culture and traditions within the university:

The secularization was, from my perspective, was far more of a strain on the older world here, um the older Board members. I mean to give you an idea, in the fifties and early sixties I bet one of the biggest supporters were the women involved in various churches around town who had teas to raise money for the university, to buy the silver tea service that they would use. Ladies auxiliaries were really an important part of helping to support this institution in the fifties and early sixties and probably in the forties and god knows how long before that. But they were connected through the churches and they felt an intimate connection with the university and the people here, the Jesuits and so on. I think when this university was moving toward a secular identity that that was a strain on a lot of those older people with long term connections.<sup>120</sup>

Larsen also raised the matter of a significant financial contribution made to the university by a wealthy Haligonian, Norman Stanbury, to assist with the completion of the McNally building. Larsen explained that Stanbury opened a personal line of credit to help finish the construction of McNally when the university ran into financial trouble mid-construction.<sup>121</sup> This was confirmed in Brian Hanington's work entitled, "Every Popish Person: The Story of Roman Catholicism in Nova Scotia":

McNally, and St. Mary's for that matter, ultimately would owe a great debt to Norman Stanbury, a wealthy financier who had served on the Board of Governors of the University. Having access to an unused line of credit, which was worth a quarter of a million dollars, Stanbury presented the money to the Episcopal Corporation who in turn could pay off construction debts. These payments also saved the particular construction firm from bankruptcy and allowed them to continue to work on the new Gorsebrook project.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Ibid.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid.

<sup>122</sup> Brian Hanington, J. *Every popish person: the story of Roman Catholicism in Nova Scotia and the church of Halifax, 1604-1984*, (Halifax: Archdiocese of Halifax), 215.

With regard to secularization, George Nahrebecky was asked if he remembered a Jesuit presence on campus: “At that point, in the south wing of McNally there was a wing reserved for the Jesuits and they were still living there – I recall stumbling in there and looking around and thinking uh oh and stumbling back out.”<sup>123</sup> Aside from this particular recollection, Nahrebecky did not perceive secularization as an intrusive process: “I don’t remember it as being an issue. It just happened you know and that was that. I guess the students just took it as being a natural progression. I mean nobody was surprised. The times they were a changin’!”<sup>124</sup>

Unlike some of the other interviewees, Patrick Crowley remembered the Jesuit presence on campus very well and recalled that there were at least 25 – 30 Jesuits living in the South wing of the McNally building between 1968 -1972.<sup>125</sup>

There was undoubtedly far less student involvement and debate surrounding secularization, as compared to co-education. One article that does stand out was written in response to one that had recently appeared in the *Dalhousie Gazette*, which had been based on interviews with Saint Mary’s students in relation to their perceptions concerning the Jesuit approach to post-secondary education. The *Gazette* reported that Saint Mary’s students felt the Jesuits to be “conservative” and were displeased with the required study of theology. In addition, the author of the *Journal* article asserted that there was an

---

<sup>123</sup> George Nahrebecky, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) February 9, 2011.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid.

<sup>125</sup> Patrick Crowley, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Archives, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary’s University Archives) March 23, 2011.



implication on the part of the Dalhousie reporter that Dalhousie students received a higher quality of education. The article went on to evince a more sophisticated understanding of the division between the Jesuits and the Catholic diocese than would be evident in subsequent student commentary on the matter:

This university is run by the Jesuits, and anyone who has eyes in his head, can read the number of degrees attached to most of the names in the Calendar, and see that they have above-average educations even for professors. On the other hand, even our lay-professors also possess better than average educations and teaching qualifications. Another interesting aspect of this university is that we have more professors for fewer students than most other universities. All the recognized authorities feel that this is the ideal situation for getting a better education. The trouble with this university lies not with the Jesuit order, but with the fact that it is Church controlled. If this university was in the hands of the Jesuits, there would be a rapid development, as they have the money and the knowledge to turn this into the most respected university in the country. The church is what is strangling this university, and the sooner they realize they are hurting their own image, the sooner they will get out and let the educators go about their business. Therefore, I say to that young reporter from Dal that he should dig a little deeper next time, and then he might come up with something that closely, or even vaguely, resembles the truth about the matter at hand.<sup>126</sup>

Alleyne Murphy recognized that the Sisters of Charity, who had run Mount Saint Vincent University since its inception, had the most difficult adjustments to make during the 1960s and 1970s. This was a time of radical institutional change, as at Saint Mary's, where the Jesuits were being similarly challenged. In this respect, Murphy suggested:

Probably the most difficult ones were the sisters because the sisters were used to ...you know.. their whole life was ah 'you obey' whatever the Mother general says. In those days they didn't question things so much and I think probably in the early days of the Mount I don't imagine the students questioned things too much. So I suppose for them to have these young students questioning everything it probably was you know...they were used to well if this is the rule you obey the rule – well you know then you have to ask yourself is that rule right. Now probably they were helped – to go back to your other question –

---

<sup>126</sup> *SMU Journal*, January 20, 1967, 4.

helped by the Vatican because that was a whole series of questioning. The fact that there were questions in the church probably made it easier for the Sisters and everybody else to ask questions.<sup>127</sup>

It is unfortunate that no record of an oral history interview exists regarding the views of former President Henry Labelle. A glimpse into what he was thinking can however be gleaned from two letters he addressed to the graduating class in 1969 and 1970 respectively. One can infer in the first that he was indeed struggling with the nature of student dissent and in the second, he was clearly voicing his perception of the imminence of full secularization. In 1969 he wrote:

Dear Graduates, May I extend my congratulations and good wishes to the 1969 graduates of Saint Mary's University. I would like to emphasize my gratitude to them and to the whole student body and its organizations. This has been, in my view, a critically important year in our development because you, the students, have managed to steer away from the youthful kind of abusive confrontation towards the more mature approach of progressive dialogue. You go to your new lives with my blessings and prayers. Sincerely, Henry J. Labelle, S.J.<sup>128</sup>

In 1970, as noted, the focus of his yearbook address was on the impending secularization of the university:

Dear Graduates of 1970, Although the President's message in the *Santamarian* is primarily a farewell and God's speed to the Graduating class, I feel that this year I am saying farewell to the old Saint Mary's and greeting the new. The radical disengagement of the Diocese in higher education which has already taken place and will in all probability continue, with the thinning out of the Jesuit faculty and staff, must surely have some impact on the general atmosphere on campus. Contemporary trends do not easily take account of the lean years when the spirit of Saint Mary's was kept alive by the Jesuit Fathers and a handful of devoted laymen. Good things, however, are generally born

---

<sup>127</sup> Alleyne Murphy, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow, *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 17, 2011.

<sup>128</sup> *Sanatamarian*, (Yearbook), 1969, 106.

from the anguish of the past, and I suspect that the future Saint Mary's will be no exception to that rule. I take this opportunity to thank the Graduating class for the growing awareness they have given faculty, administration, as well as students, of the need for mutual understanding and dialogue. Sincerely yours,  
Henry J. Labelle.<sup>129</sup>

These letters reveal the distress faced by someone of Labelle's background and role within the university community, in coping with a time of fundamental change both for himself and – as revealed in the recollections of the interviewees cited above – for the university itself. Yet, another major theme of the first-hand accounts from students who attended the university between 1961 and 1972, of both genders, is that despite the student protests that took place on matters ranging from food quality to faculty dismissal nevertheless the institution made a reasonably smooth transition from a single gender denominational university to being co-educational and secular. Despite some opposition to co-education and some consternation among traditional Catholics regarding the implications of secularization, the interviews outlined in both chapters two and three indicate that despite the challenges, in the end, Saint Mary's University navigated through with seemingly minimal disruption.

---

<sup>129</sup> *Sanatamarian*, (Yearbook), 1970, 142.

## Chapter Four

### Conclusion: Managing Secularization and Co-education with Minimal Disruption

The final chapter of this study will summarize conclusions reached and questions raised regarding the impact of co-education and secularization at Saint Mary's University. In addition, there will be a final review of the protest culture given its obvious impact on the two abovementioned areas.

Oral history evidence is crucial to forming a comprehensive interpretation of what was happening at the university during this pivotal period of change. As at many other post-secondary institutions, there are detailed records of senate meetings, athletic achievements, and of course the development of infrastructure; however, little oral history documentation has hitherto existed describing the less visible “challenges” surrounding the institutional capacity for navigating significant change – as was the case with Saint Mary's having introduced co-education and secularization within such a short timeframe. This gap in Canadian post-secondary historiography is succinctly captured by Paul Axelrod: “The *struggle and survival* theme matters, and, in all likelihood, is a central part of the story of every Canadian university.”<sup>1</sup> Axelrod rightly insists on the importance of the social and cultural histories of universities, and it is in social and cultural contexts that this chapter will reflect on the struggles and survival of Saint Mary's University during one of its most volatile eras. According to Roberta Lexier,

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul Axelrod, “The University of Toronto Through Historian's Eyes”, *Historical Studies in Education* 14:2 (2002):1.

“Throughout the Sixties, student activists continued to draw inspiration from global, national, and provincial movements aimed at wider societal change and they became increasingly radicalized, seeking change both within the university and in the wider society.”<sup>2</sup>

Although this was certainly true at Saint Mary’s, the pace of change was slow by comparison with what was taking place at other Canadian post-secondary institutions. By the late 1960’s the protest culture had obviously taken hold at many universities across the Western world. Patricia Jasen noted that by 1969 the Canadian Union of Students was fairly vocal in its views about the inadequacies of social systems within Canada.<sup>3</sup> In this context, by 1969, Saint Mary’s students had become only slightly more radicalized.

A variety of protests at Saint Mary’s were covered in chapter three with dissent toward campus food being the most frequently cited both in oral history interviews as well as documentary sources. There was also of course the protest against the termination of Professor Keith Sutherland which was covered in the 1969 yearbook as well as the local alternative newspaper, *The 4<sup>th</sup> Estate*. Terrence Murphy also spoke of the protest surrounding co-education which occurred in April 1968 but unfortunately was

---

<sup>2</sup> Roberta Lexier, “The Backdrop Against Which Everything Happened”: English-Canadian Student Movements and Off-Campus Movements for Change”, *History of Intellectual Culture* 7:1 (2007):1.

<sup>3</sup> Patricia Jasen, “In Pursuit of Human values (or Laugh When You Say That)”: The Student Critique of the Arts Curriculum in the 1960s.” in Paul Axelrod and John G. Reid, eds., *Youth University and Canadian Society – Essays in the Social History of Higher Education*. (Kingston and Montreal:McGill- Queen’s University Press, 1989). 255.

not covered by the *Journal* nor the yearbook as there was no yearbook published in 1968. This protest would surely provide an opportunity for further research given that it seems it was the only substantial protest on campus concerning co-education.

On the topic of co-education, again, the oral history evidence is revealing. The three women whose interviews were cited in chapter three indicated that with the occasional exception they were treated with great respect as students who were among the first co-eds. However, there were other female students – those from Mount Saint Vincent – who had mixed feelings regarding the behavior of the males on campus during a visit to Saint Mary's in the winter of 1967, prior to the formal introduction of co-education. In this respect there was some corresponding oral history evidence - also highlighted in chapter three – where Keith Hotchkiss spoke of the inappropriate behavior of some male students in 1968 on occasions when women would enter the cafeteria on campus – this led Hotchkiss to wonder had they never seen a woman before! In addition, as discussed in chapter three, there was a strong message conveyed by former faculty member, Professor Sarabia who indicated there were some Saint Mary's students who were very badly behaved when in the presence of the opposite sex.

Debate persisted regarding gender roles in society and their implications for academic expectations of women students. As Charles Levi has pointed out, studies of women at Canadian universities “have noted the tension between those who accepted traditional social roles and those who believed that women should achieve something

significant with their degrees in the larger world, just as men were expected to.”<sup>4</sup> The latter view was highlighted in the experience, as cited in chapter three, of Ann MacGillivray, who wanted to ensure her degree was marketable and could be put to good use for career development. MacGillivray specifically spoke of trying to advance her career after obtaining her degree from Saint Mary’s and the challenges in doing so which ultimately forced her to leave the province. She also spoke of one isolated incident of discrimination towards women by a professor at Saint Mary’s. In general, however, she conveyed that a discriminatory attitude toward female students was not the norm and that for the most part she felt welcomed and supported by all students, faculty and staff at Saint Mary’s.

It is noteworthy that none of the three female former students interviewed in chapter three – nor any of the interviewees for this thesis – recalled male students acting particularly aggressively or in an overtly inappropriate manner as described in the interview with former Professor Sarabia, or behaving in any disparaging way towards female colleagues. Although this seems to contradict the impression of Saint Mary’s students acting like wild animals which was given by Sarabia, as well as the article submitted by the Mount Saint Vincent students, it may also be that the evidence indicates that there were parallel realities in this area rather than any uniform experience.

It is also important to remember the slow pace of integrating women into Saint Mary’s as has been highlighted by the oral history evidence in this study. The small

---

<sup>4</sup> Charles Levi, *Comings and Goings: University Students in Canadian Society, 1854-1973* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2003), 56.

number of female students on campus in the earliest days of co-education at Saint Mary's was reflected in the 1969-72 yearbooks. The majority of oral history interviewees also commented on the dominant male culture which remained firmly in place at Saint Mary's during the initial years of co-education. This was particularly evident in the Science and Commerce faculties. One can also appreciate the slower pace of change at Saint Mary's, especially in comparison to other, larger institutions. Paul Axelrod's description of the University of Toronto in 1950 no doubt applied also to Saint Mary's two decades later: "It was no longer ruled by religious authority but still privileged, at both the faculty and student levels, white Christian males."<sup>5</sup> The cultural hangover of male predominance may well indeed have been a contributing factor – from a male perspective, at least – to the rather smooth transition which the oral history interviewees indicated had transpired.

Secularization simply and rather quietly followed the gradual departure of the Jesuits from Saint Mary's throughout the 1960s. As suggested earlier in this study, the apparent lack of interest and certainly the lack of evidence of protest from the student body at Saint Mary's indicated the ease with which this significant change occurred, at least at the student level. A range of primary sources as well as various oral histories confirm the apparent smoothness of the transition from a Jesuit-run institution to that of a predominantly secular Board of Governors. Again, however, there were complexities beneath the surface. As cited in chapter three, Mike Larsen presented a compelling view

---

<sup>5</sup> Paul Axelrod, "The University of Toronto Through Historian's Eyes", *Historical Studies in Education* 14: 2 (2002): 2-3.



on his perception surrounding the “behind the scenes” impact of secularization at Saint Mary’s. For Larsen, it was those in the outside community who worked tirelessly to support Saint Mary’s as a “Catholic” institution who were most significantly impacted by the institutional change from the religious to the secular. In particular, controversies which arose among members of the Board of Governors (following secularization) in reaction to material taught to students which was deemed as inappropriate at best and in stark contrast to the fundamental teachings of the Catholic church. In this context, it would seem that members of the Board of Governors continued to struggle with the nature and number of changes which occurred as a result of secularization – with no Jesuit leadership, it may well have felt as if Catholic values were quickly stripped away from the educational model that had been in place at Saint Mary’s for its entire history.

For students, however, awareness of such issues was muted. Few articles on secularization appeared in the *Journal* or the yearbooks between 1967 and 1970, although one contribution to the *Journal* in early 1967 did suggest that some students were acutely conscious of the division between the church itself and the Jesuits who administered most of the day to day affairs of the university.

Respect and admiration for the Jesuit tradition in education was also clear in a number of the interviews cited in chapter three, and was attributed not just to hindsight but to a high regard felt at the time many of the interviewees were students at Saint Mary’s, which may indeed have influenced their decision to study at the university. Heather Harris, of Protestant background, praised the Jesuits for their excellence in

teaching – emphasizing that their high standards in education trumped any religious bias she may have had.

The influence of the diocese, however, was exerted in a different form. As noted in chapter two, for example, the Archbishop of the time, Rev. James Hayes, was responsible for the negotiations between Mount Saint Vincent and Saint Mary's – a difficult and somewhat awkward role given that he was Chancellor at both institutions concurrently. The Catholicism of the students, meanwhile, was also expressed in distinctive ways, especially in the period immediately prior to secularization. As discussed in chapter three, notices about daily mass times were at times placed alongside articles concerning radical student protests and one can readily imagine, of course, that the Jesuits and the church itself were well aware of the turmoil erupting on university campuses throughout the country and beyond during the earlier part of the sixties. It is therefore no wonder, that by 1968, with the decision to go co-educational, discussions were already well underway to resolve the ultimate decision of secularization of the university by the religious administrators of Saint Mary's. In the light of such complexities, the Saint Mary's experience offers a distinctive perspective on Canadian university history of this era, and one that hitherto has been only minimally researched. This study has attempted to provide greater insight into the recent history of the university with the incorporation of oral history evidence, which has allowed for a more detailed and personalized accounting of what it was really like to be a part of the introduction of co-education and secularization at an all male and religious post-secondary institution.

Inevitably, there are numerous areas identified in this thesis which could prove to be an interesting starting place for further historical research. For instance, a closer examination of the scope of student dissent directed at the introduction of co-education, the impact of secularization on the wider community, and the evolution of the protest culture at Saint Mary's are possible subjects that could repay more comprehensive study. In addition, if one were to utilize oral history for the purpose of continuing this research into the history of Saint Mary's it is also helpful to know that at the time of this writing, many potential interviewees may still be accessible and willing to contribute their memories to additional studies which may be relevant for potential researchers interested not only in the history of Saint Mary's University but also of other post-secondary institutions.

In the end, this thesis concludes that despite the challenges associated with such momentous events in the university's history – secularization and co-education – the students, faculty and staff at Saint Mary's were able to successfully navigate through these changes with minimal disruption in the overall operations of the university. As discussed previously, not only were these changes significant in and of themselves, but they were all the more challenging given the volatility of the student protest culture in conjunction with the dramatic changes resulting from the Second Vatican Council. Ultimately, Saint Mary's University has a demonstrated history of managing change through the most difficult of times while still being able to have provided an education and experience that is fondly remembered by those interviewees who were students at the time of such a significant transformation in the institutional culture.



## Appendix A

There was no pre-determined selection process for those interviewed for this study with the exception that each participant had a direct association with Saint Mary's during the years covered in this study. The intention was to select a reasonable number of individuals who had personally expressed interest to the author in being interviewed for this thesis. As such, there was no concerted effort to ensure a gender balance among participants.

The oral history interviews have been divided into two general categories. The first collection cited in this work are the oral history testimonies collected in 1993 through the Saint Mary's University Archives - Oral History Project. The timeframe for the second collection – interviews conducted by this author – is December 2009 – September, 2011. The 1993 collection are distinctly different from the later interviews in that the earlier interviewees were asked about a wide range of issues pertaining to their experience and involvement at Saint Mary's University. As such, the more recent interviews were qualitatively different in that the interviewer (this author) had conducted focused research on the key subject areas whereas the earlier interviews were not conducted with the same qualitative expertise on the part of the interviewer.

The following list of individuals will serve to outline the abovementioned rationale for those who were selected and interviewed for this thesis. The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured fashion with an emphasis on learning more about the interviewee's experiences in connection with their involvement at Saint Mary's

University, primarily between the years 1967 – 1970. As stated above, these interviews were conducted by the author between December 2009 and September 2011. The interview questions were focused specifically on obtaining a detailed account of the interviewee's experiences and memories of co-education, secularization and by association, the protest culture at Saint Mary's University:

1. Ann MacGillivray was born in Ottawa and attended Sydney Academy and Xavier College prior to enrolling as a student at Saint Mary's in 1969 – the year following the official introduction of co-education. She was one of two women to receive her Bachelor of Commerce degree in the graduating class of 1971. MacGillivray obtained her CA designation in 1975 and then returned to Saint Mary's for her Master's in Business Administration in 1995.
2. Heather Harris was born in Halifax, Nova Scotia and was among the first fifty women to enroll at Saint Mary's in the autumn of 1968, although she had studied part-time in night courses at the university from 1965 to 1967. She graduated from Saint Mary's in 1970 with a B. A. and went on to earn her Master's degree in history, also from Saint Mary's in 1972.
3. Mary Ann Hotchkiss (née Boudreau) was born in Meteghan, Nova Scotia and graduated from Saint Mary's University with her Bachelor of Science degree in 1972. She then went on to graduate from Dalhousie University with a Master's in Science in 1973. Hotchkiss was among the second group of women to enroll at Saint Mary's in 1969 – one year following the official introduction of co-education in 1968.

4. Lawrence Hood was born in Amherst, Nova Scotia and obtained his Bachelor of Commerce from Saint Mary's in 1970. Hood also holds the distinction of being the second longest serving member of the Saint Mary's University Board of Governors.
5. Michael Larsen, was born in New York City and graduated from Saint Mary's University with his degree in Arts in 1966, having arrived on campus in 1961. He then continued his education at Dalhousie, graduating with a Master's degree in English followed by the completion of his PhD. at the University of Toronto in 1970. Larsen began teaching at Saint Mary's in 1971.
6. Donald Harper was born in Moncton, New Brunswick and enrolled as a student in the fall of 1968, graduating with a Bachelor of Science degree in 1972. Harper returned to Saint Mary's as an employee in 1980 and presently is the manager of the Saint Mary's bookstore.
7. Keith Hotchkiss was born in Ontario and obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree from Saint Mary's in 1973 and is presently the Director of Student Services.
8. George Nahrebecky was born in Montreal and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts from Saint Mary's University in 1972, followed by his Master's degree at Dalhousie and a PhD. at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario. Nahrebecky eventually returned to teach at Saint Mary's and is presently a full professor in the Department of Modern Languages and Classics.

9. Patrick Crowley was born in Newfoundland and graduated from Saint Mary's University in 1971 with a Bachelor of Arts. He returned to Saint Mary's in 2007 as the Director of Alumni.
10. Terrence Murphy was born in Halifax, Nova Scotia and was a student at Saint Mary's University between 1965-1968. He then went on to earn his Master's of Arts at Fordham University and his PhD. from Newcastle. Murphy eventually returned to Saint Mary's in 2003 to assume the position of Vice-President Academic and Research.
11. Alleyne Travis Murphy was born in Saint John, New Brunswick and graduated with her Bachelor of Science degree from Saint Francis Xavier University followed a Master's of Science from the University of Montreal. She originally came to teach at Mount Saint Vincent in 1951 and at that time was the first and only full-time lay professor. Murphy left the university in 1956 and returned ten years later in 1966.



## Bibliography

### **Books:**

Cameron, David. *Higher Education in Canada*, Edited by Glen A. Jones. London: Garland Publishing, 1997.

Cameron, James. *For the People – A History of St. Francis Xavier University*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.

Corcoran, Teresa. *Mount Saint Vincent University – A Vision Unfolding 1873-1988*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1999.

Gellhorn, Walter. *An Independent Fordham: A Choice for Catholic Higher Education*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1968.

Gillett, Margaret Gillett. *She Walked Very Warily: A History of Women at McGill*. Montreal: Eden Press Women's Publications, 1981.

Hanington, Brian J. *Every popish person: the story of Roman Catholicism in Nova Scotia and the Church of Halifax, 1604-1984*. Halifax: Archdiocese of Halifax.

Levi, Charles. *Comings and Goings: University Students in Canadian Society, 1854-1973*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press, 2003.

Litt, Paul. *The Muses, the Masses and the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

MacDonald, G. Edward. *The History of St. Dunstan's University, 1855-1956*. Charlottetown: Board of Governors of St. Dunstan's University and the Prince Edward Island Museum and Heritage Foundation, 1989.

McKenna, Sister Mary Olga. *Charity Alive – Sisters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul, Halifax 1950-1980*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998.

Owram, Doug. *Born at the Right Time – A History of the Baby-Boom Generation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Reid, John G. *Mount Allison University: A History, to 1963, Volume I*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Santamarian. Yearbook, 1969.

Santamarian. Yearbook, 1970.

- Shook, Laurence T. *Catholic Post-Secondary Education in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
- Schlereth, Thomas J. *The University of Notre Dame – A Portrait of Its History and Campus*. Indiana: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1976.
- Schroth, Raymond A., S.J. *Fordham: A History and Memoir*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008.
- Twohig, Peter. *Challenge and Change- A History of the Dalhousie School of Nursing, 1949-1989*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 1998.
- Waite, Peter. *The Lives of Dalhousie University, Volume Two, 1925-1980*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998.
- West, Anne. *Saint Mary's University – An Anniversary Portrait*. Lockport, Nova Scotia: Community Books, 2000.

### **Archives:**

#### **Saint Mary's University Archives**

- Board of Governors Meeting Minutes, September 16, 1968. Saint Mary's University Archives, Burke Gaffney Fonds, Saint Mary's University Academic Series.
- Donovan, John D. "The Nature and Role of Catholic Higher Education", *Lecture, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, NS, January 19, 1969*. Saint Mary's University Archives, Burke Gaffney Fonds, Saint Mary's University Academic Series 1999.17.
- News Release, December 13, 1967. Saint Mary's University Archives, Burke Gaffney Fonds, Saint Mary's University Academic Series 1999.17.

#### **Oral History Project: Saint Mary's University Archives**

- Chard, Elizabeth, Interviewed by Angela Baker. *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 22, 1993.
- Crowley, Patrick, Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) March 23, 2011.
- Davis, Heather, Interviewed by Angela Baker. *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 22, 1993.
- Falk, Lillian, Interviewed by Angela Baker. *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University

Archives) June 1, 1993.

Harper, Donald. Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 20, 2011.

Harris, Heather. Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 17, 2011.

Hood, Lawrence. Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) February 8, 2011.

Hotchkiss, Keith. Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) December 17, 2009.

Hotchkiss Mary-Ann. Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) March 29, 2011.

Larsen, Michael. Interviewed by Angela Baker. *Oral History Project*. (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 22, 1993.

Larsen, Michael. Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 26, 2011.

MacGillivray, Ann. Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) March 30, 2011.

Murphy, Alleyne. Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) January 17, 2011.

Murphy, Terrence. Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) September 22, 2011.

Murphy, Father Larry SJ. Interviewed by Angela Baker. *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 26, 1993.

Nahrebecky, George. Interviewed by Bridget Brownlow. *Oral History Project, Brownlow Thesis* (Saint Mary's University Archives) February 9, 2011.

Seaman, Andrew. Interviewed by Angela Baker. *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 14, 1993.

Stewart, Father William SJ. Interviewed by Angela Baker. *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 8, 1993.

Sun, Mary. Interviewed by Hansel Cook. *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) May 17, 2006.

Tudor, Kathleen. Interviewed by Angela Baker. *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives, June 18) 1993.

Weeren, Donald. Interviewed by Angela Baker. *Oral History Project* (Saint Mary's University Archives) June 1, 1993.

### **Mount Saint Vincent University Archives**

Burns, Mary Jean. Interviewed by Amy Nickerson. *Oral History Project* (Mount Saint Vincent University Archives) July 9, 2008.

Gillen, Marie. Interviewed by Amy Nickerson. *Oral History Project* (Mount Saint Vincent University Archives) July 10, 2008.

Sampson, Rosemarie. Interviewed by Amy Nickerson. *Oral History Project* (Mount Saint Vincent University Archives) June 18, 2008.

### **Newspapers**

Barry, Reid. "Campus 66 Turmoil." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, January 13, 1967.

"Bishop's Veto Criticized." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, December 1, 1967.

"Board Passes New Structure." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, February 25, 1970.

Campbell, Francis. "As I See it: Campus Unrest." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, January 22, 1970.

"Canadian Campuses Show Discontent." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, January 31, 1967.

"Cherchez la Femme." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, January 20, 1967.

"Decision Expected." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, March 10, 1967.

"Dress Regulations." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, February 17, 1967.

Fillmore, Nick. "First Protests Reach Maritime Universities." *The 4<sup>th</sup> Estate*, April 17, 1969.

"High Priest Denied Entry." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, February 17, 1967.

"From the Editor's Desk." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, October 13, 1967.

L.G.A. "Happiness is a Full Stomach." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, January 20, 1967.

Lust, Wanda. "Residence Attacked in Massive Panty Raid." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, January 22, 1970.

MacDougall, Bernie. "The Other Side of Professor Sarabia." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, February 17, 1967.

"Mount Proposes Building Here." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, December, 1<sup>st</sup> 1967.

"Mount Won't be Effected." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, October, 13 1967.

"New Attire Rules Announced." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, January 20, 1967.

"Police oust 300 UPEI protestors." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, February 6, 1970.

"Sermon from the Mount." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, January 20, 1967.

Shaw, Robert. "Mount Won't be Effected." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, October 13, 1967.

"St. Mary's Students Object To Mount Plan." *Mail Star*, November 29, 1967.

"St. Thomas May Strike." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, February 6, 1970.

"Students Stage Sleep-in." *The Saint Mary's University Journal*, March 10, 1967.

### **Articles:**

Axelrod, Paul. "The University of Toronto Through Historian's Eyes". *Historical Studies in Education* 14:2, (2002): 299-308.

Fingard, Judith, "Dalhousie Coeds, 1881-1921." In *Youth University and Canadian Society – Essays in the Social History of Higher Education*, edited by Paul Axelrod and John G. Reid, 26-50. Kingston and Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press, 1989.

Fingard, Judith. "Gender and Inequality at Dalhousie: Faculty Women Before 1950," *Dalhousie Review*, 64:1 (Winter 1984-5): 688.

Horn, Michiel. "Students and Academic Freedom in Canada". *Historical Studies in Education* 11:1, (1999): 1-32.

Kelly, Joseph P. "Secularization – Public Trust: The Development of Catholic Higher Education in the United States". (1970): 70-85. [ERIC document ED047655]

Levi, Charles. "Sex, "Drugs, Rock & Roll, and the University College Lit: The University of Toronto Festivals, 1965-69", *Historical Studies in Education* 18:2, (2006): 1-28.

Lexier, Roberta. "The Backdrop Against Which Everything Happened": English-Canadian Student Movements and Off-Campus Movements for Change". *History of Intellectual Culture* 7:1, (2007): 1-18.

Jasen, Patricia. "In Pursuit of Human Values (or Laugh When You Say That): The Student Critique of the Arts Curriculum in the 1960s". In *Youth University and Canadian Society – Essays in the Social History of Higher Education*, edited by Paul Axelrod and John G. Reid, 247- 271. Kingston and Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press, 1989.

| Reid, John. "The Education of Women at Mount Allison 1854-1914". *Acadiensis*, 12:2, (Spring 1983): 1-31.

### **Unpublished**

| Fotheringham, George H., "A Comparison of Two Small Maritime Universities with Differing Religious Backgrounds: Saint Mary's University and Mount Allison University." M.A. Thesis, Saint Mary's University, 1972.

Kelly, Joseph. "Secularization – Public Trust: The Development of Catholic Higher Education in the United States," Paper Presented at the Wingspread Conference on the Contributions of the Church-Related College to the Public Good, December 1968. ERIC document ED047655.



**SAINT MARY'S**  
UNIVERSITY SINCE 1802

One University. One World. Yours.

**PATRICK POWER**  
**LIBRARY**

Department Office

T 902.420.5534

F 902.420.5561

## **Research Ethics Board Certificate Notice**

The Saint Mary's University Research Ethics Board has issued an REB certificate related to this thesis. The certificate number is: 09-120 .

A copy of the certificate is on file at:

Saint Mary's University, Archives  
Patrick Power Library  
Halifax, NS  
B3H 3C3

Email: [archives@smu.ca](mailto:archives@smu.ca)  
Phone: 902-420-5508  
Fax: 902-420-5561

For more information on the issuing of REB certificates, you can contact the Research Ethics Board at 902-420-5728/ [ethics@smu.ca](mailto:ethics@smu.ca) .