The years 1850 - 1900 marked the apex for Irish Catholic journalism in Toronto. During these years identification was on the basis of both ethnicity and religion. By century's end, however, the importance of ethnic identification waned and religion became the most important element. The rivalry between the last two Irish Catholic journals which ended with their replacement by a publication which was Catholic is indicative of this process.

Les années 1850 jusqu'à 1900 représentaient l'apogée du journalisme Catholique irlandais. Pendant ces années l'ethnicité et la religion étaient les fondations de l'identité. Mais à la fin du siècle la religion était plus importante que l'ethnicité. La l'émulation entre les deux derniers journaux Catholiques-irlandais cessait avec l'établissement d'une publication seulement Catholique.
The Irish Catholic press in Toronto flourished in the second half of the nineteenth century. There were a variety of reasons for this, not the least of which was the massive influx of immigrants during and immediately after the famine. Among these groups there was also a national pride which demanded an ethnic press. And the Irish press, like all journals benefited from the general rise in literacy and a strong interest in current events. By 1863, the market was strong enough to support two journals, the Irish Canadian and the Canadian Freeman. Each reflected a dominant train of thought within the Irish community. The Canadian, edited throughout its lifetime by Patrick Boyle was described as "essentially unsectarian and has even opposed the leading authorities of the Catholic Church" (Mulvany, 1884, 200). The Freeman was, by contrast, linked to the Church hierarchy. Editor James G. Moylan, espoused the views of Bishop John Joseph Lynch. Lynch had gone so far as to arrange a subsidy for the paper from his political ally John A. Macdonald. However, by 1873, the Lynch-Macdonald relationship had deteriorated and the subsidy was withdrawn, forcing the Freeman to cease publication (Doherty, 1975).

Even as Moylan made the decision, church authorities sought a replacement to offset Boyle’s extreme views. The Toronto Tribune and Catholic Vindicator was funded by the Liberals, with this support the paper survived until 1887 despite disappointing circulation. It, in turn, was superseded by The Catholic Weekly Review (Stortz, 1980, 41 - 52). Again the intention was to battle Boyle. The first edition appeared in February 1887 almost two months before the final demise of the Tribune. While editorials
claimed independence, the publication was "a Roman Catholic weekly ... endorsed by Archbishop Lynch" (Toronto Mail, 27 February 1887). One of the archbishop's own correspondents termed it "Catholic" and the Chicago New World termed it "in every sense, a good Catholic paper" (Catholic Register, 3 February 1893). At the time of Lynch's death in May 1888, an editorial acknowledged that "a kind of relation and confidence existed, a relation when looking back it is some consolation to think has never disturbed and a confidence which the Review never abused" (19 May 1888). The Review was concerned about Catholicism and did "much good work in defence of the Church" (Register, 19 January 1893). Since the Canadian cared not for Catholicism but for Irish nationalism, it was inevitable that the five year co-existence of the two journals would be less than peaceable.

A feud between two newspapers in a five year period, in itself, deserves only a passing reference in the typical nineteenth century antiquarian local history. But for Irish Torontonians, the period 1887 - 1892 was significant. The demise of the Irish Catholic press marked the end of an era. Whereas during the earlier period Irish consciousness had been sufficiently strong to support two journals, by 1892 there was no longer any need for a single Irish journal. While a vociferous minority, which had to a large extent broken with the church continued to identify themselves with nationalist causes, the vast majority had, as the turn of the century approached found their identity in their religion rather than their ethnicity.¹ This process, was an ongoing one, was reflected in the replacement of what had consistently been over a twenty - nine year period, a strong Irish
press with a journal which rejected the hyphenated status and referred to itself only as Catholic.

This "last hurrah" for the Irish-Catholic Press was reflected in the tone of articles, the nature of news coverage and unseen with social position of the Irish in Toronto. The Canadian was much more international in scope. The Review while not ignoring Irish or American issues, was more concerned with the local Irish and the effects of various events would have on their lives. The Review tended to be more conservative than the Canadian which reflected Boyle's often belligerent behaviour. After one undignified episode the Canadian editor was scorned as "a paissant figure among tap room politicians" (24 November 1888). Usually, however, it was Boyle's position rather than his personal foibles which the Review considered worthy of comment.

II Political Affiliations and Issues

Politics was the area in which the difference between the two papers became most apparent. The Review claimed to be neutral. In an editorial in the first issue this neutrality was guaranteed "until questions of Catholic interest are at stake." Only then, would the newspaper "array itself against either of the contending political parties" (19 February 1887). Since this was the era of "No Popery" for William Meredith's provincial Conservative party and such matters as the Jesuit Estates Act and the dispute over Manitoba schools were dominating the Federal scene, there was never a time when Catholic interests were not involved.
"No Popery" posed the most direct threat to Catholics. Although a recent article has claimed that the adoption of the policy was, for Meredith, "a matter of conscience" (Dembski, 1981, 131 - 145), the Review saw the policy in quite a different light and as the provincial election of 1890 approached, launched an anti-Meredith campaign. The attacks were certainly not subtle. When the Toronto World, for example, argued that provincial representatives were overpaid, the Review agreed, citing Meredith as proof that this was the case. When the Sentinel, the newspaper of the Orange Order, predicted a Conservative victory, it was termed unsurprisingly, for in such a event, "the Grand Lodge would be in session when his executive was called together" (12 April 1890).

Such comments led to charges that the Review was "stumping" for Liberal premier Oliver Mowat. The Review replied that to be anti-Meredith was not necessarily to be pro-Mowat but given that the Tories were "directly opposed to their notions of parental right and liberty of conscience," Catholics had little choice but to vote Liberal (10 May 1890, 31 May 1890, 28 June 1890). The Liberals were simply "less objectionable" (7 June 1890). When as hoped Meredith lost the election, the Review crowed: "For a second time organized fanaticism has failed Mr. Meredith ... the lesson of 1886 has been taught to him over again." The Review also claimed that the defeat was a setback to the so-called Equal Rights movement which had grown out of the federal Conservative party because "it didn't secure him [Meredith] an extra vote. On the contrary, it ruined him..." (26 July 1890).
The Review warned the Conservatives that to continue "No Popery" in any form could be ruinous. The three leading anti-Catholics, Meredith, D'Alton McCarthy, and C. W. Bunting, editor of the Toronto Mail were described as "astride the famous Protestant horse, enfeebled with age." The Catholic vote, it was claimed "was massed to keep out the three champions of Orangeism and massed it shall remain until W. R. Meredith and company show evident signs of repentance" (19 December 1891). The Equal Rights Association itself was described as "fraught with very serious consequences ... as unwise as in circumstances of the Dominion, it is unpatriotic" (8 March 1890). D'Alton McCarthy's activity in opposing Catholicism and forming the Equal Rights Association brought the comment "he has produced evil" (1 March 1890).

The possible accession of Roman Catholic, John Thompson to the Prime Ministership also provoked the Review. The editors were angry that although Thompson was clearly the most competent man available, his appointment was viewed as "a popish plot for the ruin and extermination of the poor persecuted Protestants." In the Conservative party, it was charged, "If then a Catholic is not competent for the position he is justly excluded: If he is competent he is unjustly excluded" (20 June 1891). When J. C. Abbott was chosen over Thompson, the Review predicted "the time is not far distant when the needs of the country will necessitate his [Thompson's] great abilities being utilized (27 June 1891).

Municipal politics were also a cause for concern principally because the Review claimed the Orange Order ran Toronto. A particular
target was E. F. Clarke, the mayor and editor of the Sentinel. His administration was likened to "an Orange Tammany." The Review charged that "incompetence and extravagance have marked every branch of the administration." City departments were "no better than so many Lodge rooms ... the password and the grip are the essential prerequisites for either municipal 'deal' or emolument or civic position." In this view, the Review received the support of the Globe which regretted that "views respected the Battle of Boyne" decided political contests. In such cases it was ridiculous that voters would then as "why it is that the city is misgoverned" (Globe, 20 December 1891).

On this occasion, the Review was happy with results as three Catholic aldermen were elected. Six month later the Review claimed as a result Catholics were "being better looked after and provided for than has been the case for some time," citing, in particular, increased grants for Catholic charities (20 June 1891). However, the paper's satisfaction did not last long. In the next election the Review endorsed mayoral candidate, E. B. Osler and aldermanic candidates on a ward by ward basis. Despite their efforts, only two Catholics were elected to council. Undaunted, the Review vowed to continue the fight because "the respectable and intelligent people of Toronto are tired of Orange rule, and it is quite evident they will not long submit to it" (31 May 1890).

Although it too claimed neutrality, the Irish Canadian was much more blatant than the Review regarding politics. Between 1867 and 1887 the Canadian, supported both Liberals and Conservatives at various times. After 1887, the
journal proclaimed it would not take either side but would seek to represent Irish Catholics in politics. This consisted primarily of insisting on adequate representation for Catholics in cabinet. An angered hierarchy replied through the Review that they had been doing just that for years all the while being criticized by Boyle for their efforts. Now this "common huckster whose stock in trade was the Catholic vote" was trying to claim credit for the same measures for which he had castigated the Review (31 May 1890). When one of Boyle's political meetings turned into a riot in the 1890's, the newspaper commented that most Catholics would rather be without representation than be identified with "political brigands and ... be bartered about between one party and another for the purse they will bring: they will have accomplished a steep descent and an infinite degradation" (31 May 1890).

Boyle argued that the Review was not sufficiently adamant in pressing Catholic claims. He argued, "while Catholics never seek the suffrage because they are Catholics they are almost invariably denied the suffrage because they are Catholics" (31 October 1889). He cited as proof of the Review's indecisiveness praise for their stand from the notoriously anti-Catholic Montreal Gazette and the Sentinel (Canadian, 7 November 1889).

Ironically, despite his claims of neutrality, the Irish Canadian joined the Review in support of the Liberals during the period in question in both federal and provincial contexts. Although Boyle had been a paid supporter of the federal Conservatives from 1876 to 1886 (Stortz, 1980, 50), the Meredith tactics had
completely alienated the Catholic voters and "until that support is again available, there can be no hope for the Conservatives." "No Popery" advocates, it was charged, were "disintegrating the Conservatives party by their fiery harangues" (12 June 1890). When the provincial Conservatives continued their policy in the 1890's, the Canadian warned Irish Catholics, "A Reform defeat means opening the gates of the 'No Popery' flood." This was no time for neutrality, for the enemy "is thundering at the gate" (19 June 1890).

The Canadian reacted similarly in the 1891 federal contest against the "Orange Tory party." "Is it strange or unnatural," asked the Canadian, "that ... the Catholic electorate should have more confidence in the Liberal party led by Laurier than in the implacable gang led by an Orange Prime Minister" (26 February 1891).

Despite such efforts Boyle never received what he considered just compensation from the Liberals. In 1891 when the Canadian "did its full duty to the Reform party" by not raising the thorny issue of Catholic representation, the Liberals were warned that Catholics would not continue to vote en bloc for the party without representation (9 April 1891). The Review, on the other hand, was quick to deny that Catholics did indeed vote as a group (20 February 1892).

While the two papers did agree on which party to support, they were at odds over a municipal issue -- the introduction of the ballot in separate school board elections. The issue arose in the 1870's but came to a head only in 1887 when Nationalist members of the Toronto Separate School Board argued that the
only way to prevent Archbishop John Joseph Lynch from fixing trustee elections was the introduction of the secret ballot. The Review disagreed and gave its full support to Lynch when he utilized his influence to ensure election of an anti-ballot candidate in a school board by-election (18 February 1888).

In contrast, Boyle and the Canadian championed the secret ballot. Lynch's interference by referring publicly to the pro-ballot candidate's lukewarm religious practices was deplored. So too was Lynch's assertion that the election was "a religious affair," rather than "a purely temporal affair provided for by the civil law." The Canadian also ridiculed a claim by the Review that "representative Catholics" would settle the question in Lynch's favour. Boyle claimed the Review might be truly shocked at what "representative Catholics" might indeed decide (Canadian, 19 January 1888).

The two journals were similarly at odds over the Irish question. Two particular incidents, both in 1887, underscored this difference. The first concerned an open letter from Archbishop Lynch to Lord Randolph Churchill asking his assistance in finding a solution for Irish problems. The published letter provoked widespread response from Toronto's anti-home rulers. The Dominion Churchman, the Anglican journal, charged "that his [Lynch's] game was to excite Fenian passion against Canada" (31 March 1887). The Week deemed "fixed bayonets and ball cartridges," an appropriate response to the letter causing the Review to call the editor, "if not wholly a blockhead, unpleasantly like a blackguard" (Catholic Review, 7 April 1887). Lynch's views, it was claimed, would end the
Irish troubles "more effectively ... than by the speeches of forty patriots or the resolutions of forty leagues" (24 March 1887). The Irish Canadian in turn, abhorred the negative reaction but accused the archbishop of naivete in contacting someone like Churchill for assistance instead of working through Irish nationalists (7 April 1887).

A few months later, the dichotomy became even more apparent when William O'Brien, a leader in the Plan of Campaign, decided to visit Toronto to confront Lord Lansdowne, Canada's Governor-General and an Irish absentee landlord. The Review reflected Lynch's assertion that the visit was a tactical error: "good sense apart from the propriety of the proceedings [is] suggesting that what was contemplated so far from manufacturing the anticipated sympathy would excite rather than bad spirit and bad feeling which all classes, we trust, would prefer to allay" (28 April 1887). The Canadian dismissed such a view claiming that if violence did ensue it would not be O'Brien's fault but that of Toronto's Orange Order. Boyle further argued that only the cruelty of Lansdowne's proprietorship had made the visit necessary (5 May 1887). When violence did occur, not only in Toronto but in Hamilton and Kingston, the Review blamed O'Brien for damaging the nationalist cause (25 June 1887). Boyle, on the other hand, saw the violence as a great victory underlining the failure of Britain's much ballyhooed system of fair play (7 June 1887).

The papers also differed in their method of dealing with the "stage Irish," those caricatures which often appeared on the stages of Toronto theatres as the butt of cruel jokes.
The Review simply ignored their existence while the Canadian reacted in vehement fashion. Typical was the response to a newspaper column about an American barkeep, Miles Grogan described as "an offensive caricature of the Irish American" (14 November 1889). George H. Hessop who wrote the column was dismissed as a "Know Nothing" and his work as "the offspring of a mind tainted with the ethics of a dark lantern" (18 April 1889).

Canadian national questions also found the two journals at odds. Although both papers had a Liberal bias, the Review rejected the party policy of unrestricted reciprocity. The Canadian only disapproved of reciprocity because they thought the policy too conservative. Their attitude was that to protest British policy in Ireland, Canada should agree to annexation by the United States.

With annexation would come still more widely diffused advantages. Canada politically united to the States and exercising sovereign rights would form part of a powerful nature full of life and activity and offering rare inducements to those seeking an outlet for their capital or labour. Canada as a free state of the American union would be the prosperous home of millions who now avoid her shores or leave her because of the impoverishment brought upon her by a corrupt government in the hands of Boodlers and Monopolists. (24 March 1892)

In common, both papers bore the brunt of anti-Catholicism although the Irish Canadian, so
often at odds with the Church hierarchy, was less frequently the target. In a typical incident, the Sentinel attacked Catholic doctrine on such subjects as miracles, practices such as pilgrimages and questioned the loyalty of Irish Catholics because of their refusal to carry the Union Jack in parades (30 July 1891). Similar charges were frequently made in other publications such as the Mail, Saturday Night, the World, Grip, and the Presbyterian Review. Often the critics were themselves criticized. Sentinel readers were described as "a rubble" and of the newspaper itself, it was declared "no respectable or intelligent person is influenced by it." Stories in the Mail were termed "a model of improved premises, vastly drawn conclusions, perverted history and good round falsity" (4 August 1892).

In the most extreme cases, there were calls for boycotts. Such tactics were used against both Grip and Saturday Night after particularly offensive issues. While there is no way to gauge the impact on Saturday Night, J. W. Bengough, the publisher of Grip complained publicly of the negative effects of the boycott on circulation (Review GR, 8 August 1891).

Anti-Catholic celebrities were the target for both papers. These were described as "social pariahs and outcasts ... [who] have been taken by the hand and honored." These included Joseph Widdows, "who is now undergoing a term of imprisonment for an unnameable offence," [buggery], Edith O'Gorman, a former nun who had to leave her lecture because she was too drunk to deliver it, and Father "Filthy" Fulton, a defrocked priest (Review, 8 August 1890). Also cited was Doctor Joseph Wile, a notorious anti-
Catholic (Stortz, 1980). Such men, the Review argued were full of "bigotry and jealousy" and had encouraged violence at Moss and Queen's Parks (8 August 1890, 11 July 1891). Both journals joined in a campaign to prevent such individuals and the groups they headed from using Queen's Park as a public forum for their views (Review, 1 August 1891).

In the early 1890's the two newspapers came increasingly closer to one another in their viewpoints. There were several factors which made this possible. One was the gradual abandonment of the annexationist philosophy by the Liberal Party and, in turn, by the Irish Canadian. Another was a shared view on the issue of woman suffrage. The Review argued that the family unit "must be held together by one head; if it have [sic] two heads with distinct feelings and clashing interests, it becomes like any other monster a thing to be dreaded and gotten rid of" (12 December 1891). The Canadian concurred: "The proper sphere of women is not hustling at the poll booth." Rather, they were meant to be "a good wife and affectionate mother means and do the voting" (31 March 1887).

The two papers also agreed on the labour question. Both shared Archbishop Lynch's sympathy for the Knights of Labour and their problems with the Quebec hierarchy (19 March 1892). Neither was, however, sympathetic to more radical unions from the United States who would lead to agitation among Toronto workers (Review, 14 July 1892). Both also objected to the "radical demands" of these unions such as the eight hour day which the Canadian believed would be a "temptation to squander a share, if not the greater part of a week's wages. Well, it would
be better when the whole instead of half of Saturday is a holiday" (6 November 1890). Both also agreed on opposition to Sunday streetcars. In each case the rationale was that "both man and beast needed a day of rest" (Canadian, 6 August 1890).

Although a convergence of views was certainly a factor, clearly the merger of the two journals in 1893 was spurred by economic considerations. By then, both newspapers were in financial difficulty. The Canadian was the more stable of the two as the continuous thirty years of publication demonstrated. Boyle's ability to survive in the 1880's, however, had been aided by now unavailable Conservative party funds. There was also an abundance of delinquent subscribers and almost every issue featured an appeal for payment of overdue accounts (25 August 1887). The Irish Canadian seized gratefully, as did the Review, on a circular letter which had been written by Lynch urging Catholics to support their press and arguing that those who did not were "on a level with a thief" (Review, 28 March 1892).

The Review, despite denials to the contrary, was in worse shape. As early as 1890 a reorganization into a joint stock company was effected in an attempt to raise extra revenue (Canadian, 28 March 1892). Although portrayed as an expansionary move, the reorganization reflected problems with subscribers. The Review, even more desperate than the Canadian, attempted to lure readers with the use of premiums such as easels, tricycles, bicycles, umbrella stands and the Saint Basil's Hymnal (28 March 1891). Such efforts obviously were not successful for the Board of Directors was soon
proposing a merger with the Canadian (Register, 5 January 1895). Fearing a rejection by Boyle, Toronto Archbishop John Walsh asked the editor of Saturday Night to act as a mediator in the dispute (Saturday Night, 9 June 1894). Walsh's desire was for "a Catholic organ speaking with authority."

The Catholic Register was formed with two thousand shares at twenty-five dollars each. Personnel from both papers remained. The Reverend J. R. Teefy, of the Review was the editor of the new paper. Boyle, who obviously still had not the trust of the Church hierarchy, was appointed printer. Because the Review had better facilities, the new paper was to be printed at their shop at 40 Lombard Street. The paper, according to Walsh's directions was to be a Catholic rather than a Toronto newspaper. To this end, the Board of Directors included the director of the Ottawa Catholic Truth Society as well as a Guelph lawyer (Review, 5 January 1892). To ensure financial stability, readers of the Register were asked to buy a share in the company, not as a financial investment but as a means of protecting Catholicism. A budget plan was even offered whereby the twenty-five dollar investment could be paid in three monthly installments (Register, 3 February 1895).

The Catholicism of the Register was apparent from the first issue. The first editorial argued, "The want of an earnest, thoroughly Catholic [emphasis mine] newspaper in Toronto has long been felt." Walsh declared he wished a forum for his views and to defend Catholic interests. The Canadian's preoccupation with Irish affairs was not to continue. Instead, the Register promised more direct relations with the
head of the diocese "whose imprimatur had been granted." As the Register asserted: "We are a Catholic journal - Catholic first, last and always" (5 January 1895).

CONCLUSION

This five year period in the history of journalism could be dismissed simply as the battle between two journals for a parochial market, a battle neither journal was able to win. There was, however, more to the battle than mere subscription lists. The Irish Canadian had always tried to represent Toronto's Irish. While this group was predominantly Roman Catholic it was to their ethnicity that Boyle and the Canadian made their primary appeal. By the 1890's, such philosophies had come to predominate within the city's nationalist groups. Religion played an important but secondary role as illustrated by the ongoing disputes of such groups with the Roman Catholic hierarchy over such matters as the introduction of the ballot in separate school elections and over much more readily defined "nationalist" issues.

However, such groups were in the minority. The vast majority of Toronto's Irish immigrants seemed by the century's end to be stronger in their faith and less concerned with the Irish national questions which preoccupied those such as Boyle. This was partly the result of what Emmet Larkin (1972) has described as "the devotional revolution" in Ireland at mid-century, the beginnings of which had some influence on the majority of famine and post famine immi-
grants to Canada. As Timothy Smith (1978) has shown this identification with Catholicism sought the solace and sanctuary of that most familiar of institutions -- the Church. Even their ethnic identification was tied to the Church. As they became more and more assimilated into Canadian life, it was the religious rather than the ethnic connection which survived. This process was reflected in the press as well as in the other constitutions. The replacement for the two journals under study here, *The Register* was not to be Irish Catholic but simply Catholic. Truly an era which had begun with the first famine migrants had reached its demise and the fate of the Catholic press in Toronto greatly reflected that fact.
FOOTNOTES

1 This is not an original idea with the author of this paper but one belonging to Dr. Murray Nicholson, Wilfred Laurier University. The idea is elaborated on in a paper "Irish Tridentine Catholicism: A Vessel for Ethno Cultural Persistence" delivered at the 50th Anniversary Conference of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association, Saint Paul's University, Ottawa, September 1983. The paper will be published in full in 1984 in a special edition of Study Sessions.
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