

Reaction of the Toronto Globe to the Vatican Council – Dec. 1869 – July 1870

Richard C. KINSKY, C.S.B.
St. Basil's Seminary, Toronto, Ont.

While research work on this paper was being done, the present Holy Father proposed that a new ecumenical council be convoked. The first official act of this new assembly will likely be to declare the General Council of 1869-1870 dissolved (it was only prorogued at that time), and then to vote itself into existence as the Second Vatican Council of 1962. The paper will certainly be of interest to the present-day citizen of Toronto. He will see how his ancestors of 90 years ago reacted to the First Vatican Council, and then judge for himself how different or similar the reaction is to the Second Vatican Council. Though it has become the fashion nowadays to be indifferent to religion, to keep Church separate from State, it will be surprising if Toronto remains neutral towards the new General Council.

The aim of this paper is to see how one little corner of this world, namely Toronto, Ontario, in Canada, as seen through the columns of the *Globe*, was affected by, and reacted to, the Vatican Council. Much has already been put into print about the Council. Writers of all shades of opinion have remarked on it. Books and pamphlets, mostly of a polemic nature, have appeared which discuss its sessions and its decrees. All textbooks in Apologetics and Fundamental Theology treat of the Council, and especially its declaration of Papal Infallibility. The present paper proposes to avoid such disquisitions, and hopes rather, after some preliminary remarks on the background of the Council, to limit itself to the reaction of the Toronto *Globe*.

Pope Pius IX's announcement on June 26, 1867 that he was going to convoke a General Council aroused the interest of the whole world. Ecumenical Councils are not called very often. The 300 year gap between the Vatican Council and the Council of Trent only the more served to excite men's interest and perhaps anxiety. Tremendous changes – religious, political and social – had taken place in Europe and in the world in those 300 years. How would the Council act in the face of these changes? The eyes of the world focused on Rome for the reply of the Catholic Church. Newspapers and periodicals sent correspondents direct to Rome to get first-hand information on it. The telegraph wires, only recently laid on the Atlantic floor, never failed to carry items of interest concerning it from European centers to American and Canadian newspapers. Practically all this, at least as it regards historical accuracy, was ink wasted. Often only rumours and whispered untruths could be sent. More often what was relayed flowed from excited, prejudiced minds and imaginations. Yet,

they indicate true attitudes, in spite of their inaccuracies, and they did cause people to react.

The decade 1860-1870 was a vital period for Canada and for Toronto. It falls just about midway in the period 1850-1890, described as "of crucial importance in the development of the two."¹ Originally, Toronto was a trading post established by the Sulpician Missionary Père Joseph Mariet around 1690 at the mouth of the Humber. Later, forts were built on the site, first French and then British. In 1793 it was named York by Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe who established it as the capital of Upper Canada. Staunchly Loyalist at this time, it became even more so in 1813 when York was captured and burned by the Americans. Yet by 1837 there was a radical movement, neither Tory nor Loyalist, strong enough to precipitate the Rebellion of that year. Professor Frank Underhill, in a lecture of some five years ago, described it as "the shooting up of some taverns on Yonge Street."

The details of the conception and birth of the Canadian nation are another story. Officially, Canada became a nation by the proclamation of the British North America Act of 1867. The nationalism that paved the way for it had been strong and vigorous in Toronto and in Upper Canada. The new nation faced severe trials during the next few years following Confederation. Externally, there were the Americans and the Fenians to contend with. These Irish revolutionaries actually made raids on Upper Canada in 1870 through the St. Lawrence River valley. Internally, the Louis Riel rebellion and the natural rivalry, religious and political, between Upper and Lower Canada also contributed to the situation.

There were many factors contributing to Toronto's growth in size and importance in the nineteenth century. Geographically, its situation gave it inestimable advantages over other cities and ports in Upper Canada. Behind it was the immense hinterland which produced the grain, lumber and minerals which made possible the development of the country. In front were the markets of the United States, and the rest of the world. Close political ties with England undoubtedly contributed to her economic advantages. Immigration was almost exclusively English, Irish and Scottish. Out of a total population in 1881 of 86,000 over 80,000 were of those three races.²

Besides being strongly British, the Toronto area was also strongly Protestant. The strength of the Orange Order and the strong Tory bent in her local politics are clear indications of the city's attitude to French Canada and Roman Catholicism. Her antagonism toward Lower Canada was equalled only by her anti-Americanism. "The play of forces – geographic, economic, political, and religious – to which Toronto was subjected has produced a social structure which is in some ways distinctive. Such derisive terms as "Tory Toronto" and "Toronto the Good" are much too sweeping, but they contain an element of truth.

¹ Masters, D.C., *The Rise of Toronto, 1850-1890*. (Toronto, U. of Toronto Press, 1947), p. 2.

² *Ibid.*, p. 211.

Charles Dickens was merely setting the keynote for many subsequent dicta when he wrote in 1842, “the wild and rabid Toryism of Toronto is appalling.”³

Culturally, Toronto in 1830 was still a frontier outpost. Her culture, like her trade goods, was imported and distributed. But within 20 years great strides forward had been taken by the founding of now-important universities and colleges, learned societies, publishing houses and newspapers. In 1844 the *Globe* was established as a weekly Liberal newspaper by George Brown. It was devoted to the cause of reform in Upper Canada, “a crusading paper which always sounded a stern moral note.”⁴ By 1870 it was a daily, and in the style of the times, was largely given over to parliamentary debates and political editorials. Only four pages were printed. Local news was kept to a minimum; advertisements were short but indicative of what was going on in the city. It was also the practice to publish poems and novels in serial form. The *Globe*’s two novels running in 1870 were “Man and Wife” and “Gwendolyn’s Harvest.”

The *Globe* was George Brown’s personal political organ. “The high moral tone of the paper, and its growing excellence as a newspaper, did much for its circulation among all classes of the population. George Brown and the *Globe* became, in fact, convertible terms.”⁵ George Brown, both because he was editor-in-chief of a leading newspaper, and an important citizen of Upper Canada and of Toronto, became a key figure. He invariably took a stand on every controversial political and religious issue. He was a strong advocate of separation of Church and State, particularly as it applied to the established churches, the clergy reserves, and religious education. As might be expected he antagonized a large majority of Roman Catholics, in Toronto and in French Canada. Once, the latter, so enraged at the support Brown was giving to an apostate priest, stormed the legislature in Quebec City shouting dire threats against him. Catholics in, Toronto were not quite so outspoken, but they certainly must have taken offence. One biographer has tried to temper this:

It is not to be denied that deep offence was taken at many articles in the *Globe* by a large majority of Roman Catholics, who did not come into personal contact with Mr. Brown personally and appreciate his kindly and honest nature. Looking back, it is impossible to deny that many harsh words were

³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁵ Mackenzie, Alexander, *Life and Speeches of Hon. George Brown* (Toronto, Globe Printing Co., 1882), p. 53. None of the earlier biographies of Mr. Brown quite measures up to the standards of modern historiography. *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, for instance, cites this one as being “decidedly partisan.” (Vol. IV, p. 264, art, on Brown, George). A more adequate, and more up-to-date, biography on Brown by Professor Careless of the U. of Toronto History Department is now in print and will soon be published.

written which had better not been written; but no one article ever appeared which bore the character of intolerance.⁶

Brown would even go out of his way to put his views on the Roman Catholic Church into print. In 1850 he printed Cardinal Wiseman's pastoral letter which divided England into sees of the Roman Catholic Church and gave territorial rights to the bishops. It of course threw England into a ferment of religious excitement, and Brown had no qualms about bringing the same over to Canada.

Another sphere in which Brown entered into combat with Catholics was the school question. The present-day system of separate schools was being hotly debated, Brown opposing the denominational schools "because he feared they would weaken or destroy the general system of free education for all."⁷ Brown loved to fight and he recognized in the Catholic Church a formidable opponent. Another biographer states:

It would be doing an injustice to the memory of Mr. Brown to gloss over or minimize a most important feature of his career, or to offer apologies which he himself would have despised. His success in the election of 1857 was largely due to an agitation which aroused all the forces and many of the prejudices of Protestantism. Yet Brown kept and won many warm friends among Roman Catholics. His manliness attracted them. They saw in him, not a narrow-minded and cold-hearted bigot, seeking to force his opinions on others, but a brave and generous man, fighting for principles.⁸

Perhaps all the foregoing helps to explain why the *Globe* relative to its limited space had so much to say about the Vatican Council.

Before analyzing the views expressed in the *Globe*, it may prove useful to say a word regarding the format of the paper at this time. As mentioned above, there were only four pages to it. In length and width it was just about the same as our papers of today. However, there were more columns and the print was smaller. Large headlines were not used, and there was little variety in the size of type. There was advertising but it was most unattractive, as was the paper as a whole, according to modern standards.

Page one consisted of want ads in the columns on the left, while to the right were *News of the Day*, *Latest by Telegraph from Europe*, *Telegraph from Montreal and Quebec*, and finally on the far right the *City News*. Page two was the editorial page. Usually the editorials were long, taking up sometimes three or four columns. The rest of the page was filled up by reprinting editorials or articles from other newspapers, mostly American.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 34.

⁷ Lewis, G., *George Brown* (Toronto, Dent., 1910), p. 122.

⁸ Lewis, G., p. 123-124.

Page three was for special articles, novels in serial form, and store advertising. If Parliament was in session or some convention happened to be meeting, it would be reported here, word for word. Often this page was for *Special Correspondence*. Page four was commercial. The *Globe* hardly ever deviated from this format.

Remarks and reports on the Vatican Council were found in four places in the Toronto *Globe*. Two features on page one invariably contained news of it, *Latest by Telegraph* and *News of the Day*. The former printed the despatches as they came in over the telegraph wires and placed them under the source from which they originated England, France, Italy, etc. – along with the date and city of origin. The *News of the Day* was situated immediately to the left of the *Latest by Telegraph*. It was a simple digest of longer articles, or a paraphrasing of shorter ones. Almost always, the writer (it is assumed to be the editor, or someone close to him) commented on the news items and this was done in various ways. In the eight month period studied such comment was omitted not more than six times. The reason for the feature seemed to have been two-fold: 1) to enable the reader to see what was reported inside the paper, thus saving him the trouble of reading it thoroughly, and 2) to give the reader a ready-made opinion (of the editor) on the subject.

Pages two and three also occasionally reported the Council. There were in all 7 editorials, ranging in length from 2 columns to a quarter-column. All but one dealt directly with it, the exception being an editorial on a church property dispute in Quebec which mentioned the Pope in council only incidentally. Lastly, there were a number of special articles on these two pages, consisting of letters from foreign correspondents or reprints from other newspaper editorials.

The frequency of articles touching the Council month by month is as follows:

MONTH AND YEAR	NEWS OF THE DAY	LATEST BY TELEGRAPH	EDITORIALS	SPECIAL ARTICLES
Dec. 1869	7	15	2	
Jan. 1870	9	11	1	7
Feb. 1870	12	15		4
Mar. 1870	9	16		
Apr. 1870	7	10	1	
May 1870	5	4	1	
June 1870	13	12	1	1
July 1870	10	9	1	2
Totals	72	92	7	14

The *Globe*'s editorials can be compared with other North American newspapers. Its total of seven was small in comparison with all the New York City papers which averaged 25 for the eight month period, except for the *Herald* which had 106. In the Mid-West, the Mid-Atlantic, and the New England areas

the average was 10, while in the South it was 4. The Boston *Advertiser*, Chicago *Times*, and Richmond *Whig* also had 7 editorials.⁹

The *Special Articles* will be treated first. Though they may be classified as reactions, strictly speaking they were not the paper's own. Most of the articles were letters dated from Rome from the correspondent of the London *Times*. He must have been a controversial figure since on 22 February, 1870, he was ordered to leave Rome. No reason was given in the despatch. The *Globe* surmised that it was most likely for his "rather startling suggestion that the Pope will probably promulgate the doctrine of Papal Infallibility by a decree, and so avoid hazarding the discussion of so delicate a subject by the Council."¹⁰

The correspondent's letters were printed in bunches of three or four and disappeared entirely in the *Globe* after February. Besides the "Startling suggestion" which probably did get him expelled from Rome that month, his letters contain only interesting little side-lights on Rome, the Council, and those in attendance. In all, the letters took up about 10 columns which is quite a lot of space. Other special articles were reprints from the editorials of the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *New York Times*, and were on the Infallibility issue. Neither the letters nor these imported editorials took any special direction, other than just being unfavorable to Catholicism in general, to Rome and Papal Infallibility in particular.

The editorials, however, did take a definite stand on certain issues and are better indications of the mind and thinking of the editor. The first and longest, entitled "The French Emperor and the Council," appeared on 14 December 1869 and served as a vehicle for the expression of Brown's idea of separation of Church and State. Strangely, it hardly referred to either the Emperor or the Council. Its chief topic was Gallicanism, "that system... which, while it recognizes the primacy by Divine right of the Roman Pontiff over the universal Church, yet asserts the independence of national churches, ... and limits the exercise of Papal prerogatives." It described the four articles of the declaration of the French clergy in 1682 as "the charter of Gallicanism," with greatest emphasis on the third article wherein were contained the "Gallican liberties." Brown was definitely on the side of the national French church, and was opposed to any interference by Pope, Council or Roman Chancery.¹¹

If Brown's exact meaning was veiled in the first editorial, in the second he was more outspoken. It was a two column editorial, appearing on Christmas Day 1869 so that every Christian of leisure would read it. It consisted of a long history of the ecumenical councils, and he had choice comments for each. Regarding Nicea: "the principles of Christianity seem to have been well nigh

⁹ Beiser, J. R., *The Vatican Council and the American Secular Newspapers*, 1869-1870 (Washington, Catholic University Press, 1941), pp. 303.304.

¹⁰ *Globe*, 8 Jan. 1870.

¹¹ *Globe*, 14 Dec. 1869.

forgotten in the bitterness of the struggle, and the orthodox and heterodox vied with each other in the exhibition of a spirit of uncharitableness, intolerance, and blood.” “If half of what Gregory says about the members of this Council (Constantinople) is to be reckoned as correct, they were a questionable set of persons.” “The scenes at Ephesus during the sittings of the Council were simply horrible.” “Chalcedon also raised the See of Constantinople to an equality with that of Rome, a proceeding not relished or accepted by Leo, the Pope who then was.” Pope Vigilius who called the 2nd Council of Constantinople was described as “a very worthless person, who was more in his element among the intrigues (*sic*) of Court ladies, than in the midst of theological controversies.” The next councils, Brown goes on, “present in a more melancholy light the disastrous influences of religious bigotry combined with a very great degree of ignorance and worldliness.” Trent “dealt very largely in ‘Anathemas’ having apparently any quantity of that article at command.” His final words were: “The present Council, to be known as the first of the Vatican, assembles in very different circumstances from any of its predecessors. It would be vain at present to speculate on its possible results.” Brown was positively antagonistic towards all ecumenical councils that preceded the Vatican Council, and a little apprehensive of the present Council. Perhaps he already had an inkling of the Infallibility issue.

The editorial of 12 January, 1870, entitled “The Proceedings of the Ecumenical Council,” was the last of the lengthy editorials. It complained of the Council’s secrecy, and exclusion of the public. Msgr. Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, a very controversial figure, was praised for having “risen in Council to protest a decree of the Pope.” The Bull excommunicating those who appeal to a Council against any decree of the Pope was described as “very curious.” Final mention was made of the “difficulties of Pio Nono, who is already sufficiently perplexed with his endeavours to secure a majority in the Council for the opinions which he himself favours, and more especially for the doctrine of Infallibility.”¹² Brown was quite tame here, though certainly his opinions of the Council and Infallibility were still the same.

For the next two and a half months there was no editorial comment on the Council. Then, on 29 April, 1870, Brown published, as an editorial, a letter of protest against Papal Infallibility. He thought that it was “important on account of its being signed by some of the most influential of the American bishops, and by a few English and Irish.” That was his only comment. He allowed the letter to speak for itself. The bishops thought the declaration of Papal Infallibility to be inopportune at the time for the adverse effects it could have on their work among Protestants in America.

The May and June editorials dealt specifically with Papal Infallibility. Both said the same but with greater or less emphasis on certain aspects. The appeal was to “the consciences of a large number of most intelligent and sensible

¹² *Globe*, 12 Jan. 1870.

persons, holding the Roman Catholic faith,”¹³ that they will see the folly of the Pope in proclaiming the dogma. The tenor of the May editorial can be seen in the following:

One is ready to ask, why all this? (Infallibility) – what difference can it make? Though any number of men should declare another, either personally or officially, infallible – it would leave matters exactly where they were. Perhaps, if the Pope and his friends actually think that he is so endowed, it is quite as well for them to assert it. The world will go on as usual afterwards.¹⁴

The exasperation that characterized the May editorial was replaced in July by the fond hope that Infallibility would discredit the Pope in the eyes of the world. Though Brown stated that its promulgation was “of no particular interest to those who hold other creeds,” and will likely not “produce any immediate political results,”¹⁵ the rest of the editorial belied this profession. There was no doubt that Brown was particularly interested in it. But it was his hope that England, France, Spain and Austria would each in its own way draw away from the Papacy:

It is too late for the Pope to hope to recover the ground the Church he presides over has lost in relation to other nations than his own, and in arrogating to himself fresh powers he can hardly fail to widen the breaches that have been already opened.¹⁶

Brown also hoped that the new dogma would “induce them (Catholics) to favor the greater independence of their country from ecclesiastical intervention.”¹⁷

It remains to say a word about *Latest by Telegraph* and the *News of the Day* as illustrative of the *Globe*’s reaction to the Vatican Council.

As long as the Council was in session, and telegrams reporting it were available, there was news of it in the *Globe*. Undoubtedly, minor insignificant reports were received but left out of the paper. This is an editorial prerogative. The cable news showed several characteristics. Many were published with such expressions as “rumoured,” “it is reported,” “it is said,” “it is rumoured.” Identical cables were often sent from Rome on one day, and from Paris or London on the next, and the *Globe* usually printed these duplications. “In general, the news showed hostility to the Council. Evidence for this is the

¹³ *Globe*, 11 July 1870

¹⁴ *Globe*, 16 May 1870.

¹⁵ *Globe*, 11 July 1870.

¹⁶ *Globe*, 11 July 1870.

¹⁷ *Globe*, 11 July 1870.

consistent policy of relaying all reports of opposition, purported interference, lack of freedom for the bishops and the like.”¹⁸

The very first report in the *Globe* on the Council was:

London Dec. 9/69 Letters from Rome assert that the majority of the French bishops, including Msgr. Dupanloup, and many of the German bishops will oppose the declaration of Papal Infallibility.

Reports of an obvious anti-Infallibility nature appeared often, and consistently from May to July.

Because of the Council’s secrecy, anything at all, extra or intra-Council, was news and was reported. The health of the Pope, the official list of those attending, papal relations with France, the Syllabus, Dr. Dollinger, and many topics were reported over and over again. Many things that embarrassed the Church and the Council were noted by the *Globe*, e.g. the Council of Deists in Naples, the dissident Armenians, French objections to Infallibility. A typical report of such kind was:

Florence Apr. 25 The citizens of Florence have instituted a subscription for a statue to Savonarola, as a protest against the Ecumenical Council, and a large sum of money has already been subscribed.¹⁹

Other reports selected at random will show what was news, and in what way the *Globe* reflected public opinion or was attempting to direct it:

Rome Feb. 20 Placards against Papal Infallibility were found on the walls last week, and were torn down by the police.

Rome Feb. 20 Abbé Frederich, Theological Adviser to Card. Hohenloë, suspected of furnishing correspondence concerning the Council to the *Gazette d’Augsburg*, has received orders to quit the Roman Territory.²⁰

Paris Mar. 15 Forty members have signed a demand to the president of the Ecumenical Council that the order of deliberations be, changed, and the scheme relating to Infallibility be immediately discussed. Events in Rome are daily becoming graver.²¹

¹⁸ Beiser, J. R., *Vatican Council*, p. 27.

¹⁹ *Globe*, 27 Apr. 1870.

²⁰ *Globe*, 21 Feb. 1870.

²¹ *Globe*, 16 Mar. 1870.

Rome. It is asserted still that the American bishops at Rome refuse to assent to the proclamation of Papal Infallibility, and that every effort to conciliate them has proved futile.²²

Rome Mar. 31 At the meeting of the Council today the Schema de Fide was promulgated. The Holy See granted 3 days for the dissident Armenians to submit to its authority. That time has expired, and as the Armenians have shown no signs of yielding, a major excommunication will be pronounced against them.²³

Rome June 4 The Carmelite monk, Hetzel, who was summoned to Rome to excuse his defense of Dollinger, has refused to retract, and is therefore kept under close surveillance.²⁴

As explained above, the *News of the Day* summarized and commented on the news for the reader. Throughout these eight months Mr. Brown never allowed the Council to be forgotten. His daily comments are spontaneous; some are priceless. Quite often they were short and to the point. Many times they lead off the feature, e.g. "The report of the illness of the Pope is said to be confirmed,"²⁵ or "The Pope's influence with the Vatican Council is said to be growing weaker."²⁶ He leaves the reader to mull it over and fill in the picture by his imagination. A few comments were quite lengthy, going at times to around 200 words.

It would be dreary-going to simply give them in chronological order. Instead, the approach will be topical.

Infallibility was the main topic, treated most often and most seriously. Brown called it "That tough question."²⁷ He did not seem to have understood it theologically, but what he could fathom of it he despised heartily. "But if this little Bull (a minor papal bull which dissatisfied some bishops) is all wrong, why may not a big Bull be wrong, too and then what becomes of Papal Infallibility?"²⁸ When a rumor reached him that Pius was thinking of promulgating Infallibility by a decree, he urged him to do so, yet "the world jogs on, however, and it is not in the power of one mitred animalcule to do much towards stopping or retarding the revolution of the globe it crawls upon."²⁹ Another general area in which he liked to talk about Infallibility was in its effects upon Catholics. "A simple majority of Bishops may give the Pope the technical power to proclaim himself

²² *Globe*, 25 March 1870.

²³ *Globe*, 1 April 1870.

²⁴ *Globe*, 6 June 1870.

²⁵ *Globe*, 19 Mar. 1870.

²⁶ *Globe*, 30 Dec. 1869.

²⁷ *Globe*, 8 Feb. 1870.

²⁸ *Globe*, 16 Dec. 1869.

²⁹ *Globe*, 8 Jan. 1870.

infallible; but what majority would make sensible Catholics up and down the world believe in it?”³⁰

The Church-State issue was also prominent. Prussia, Austria, Spain, Turkey, Hungary and especially France were subtly praised for opposing Infallibility. Once, when hearing that a Cardinal told the French Ambassador that “the Pope would never hesitate to maintain the rights of the Church as equal to those of the State,” he answered “We never once doubted that this was the Pope’s determination, and are at a loss to discover whether this declaration was intended as a promise or a threat.”³¹

Brown could not understand why the Pope should have to sound out Louis Napoleon on Infallibility. He apparently thought that Pius should first hear if the French Emperor believed him infallible. Brown’s comment was:

Does he believe himself infallible? If so, why not out with it? All this beating around the bush, and sending to that very secular minded monarch at Paris to know what is to be done looks as if the Pope did not feel on very safe ground theologically in this respect. To talk of dogma and admit doubts... is very little like Infallibility.³²

The *Globe* was not consistent in regards to its attitude towards the American bishops at the Council. At first it disdained them for being too generous with their money, and too conservative in their theology. Later, it praised them for their anti-Infallibilist stand, especially Archbishop Kenrick for his pamphlet, “What happened in Council?”³³ One amusing mistake occurred on 17 June, 1870 when the paper mixed up the Americans and the Armenians. The *Latest by Telegraph* reported that the Armenians were being threatened with excommunication. The *News of the Day* on the same date had this to say: “If the Americans do not acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope on or before July 22nd, they are to be accursed by His Holiness.”³⁴

The Pope and the attending bishops also came in for some sharp comments in *News of the Day*. A genuine interest in and respect for the Pope was exhibited at times, particularly for his health. However, it was a different story when Pius and Infallibility were mentioned in the same breath. Pius was referred to as “the Infallible,”³⁵ and great emphasis placed on his attempts to bulldoze the opposition.

Anything that discredited the Pope or the Council was included. After repeating a telegram describing a “violent scene in Council,” he added:

³⁰ *Globe*, 4 April 1870.

³¹ *Globe*, 21 Jan. 1870.

³² *Globe*, 29 Jan. 1870.

³³ *Globe*, 25 July 1870.

³⁴ *Globe*, 17 June 1870.

³⁵ *Globe*, 25 June 1870.

“Cardinal Bilio and Bishop Maret were inclined to carry their warm theological discussions to extremes, but eventually the affair was settled.”³⁶ One session was described as “a grand sitting. Nobody voted against the propositions. The scene was very impressive which means nobody dared to laugh.”³⁷ Once when a cardinalate became vacant, Brown commented that the Pope will have enough to do to keep the peace without throwing any scarlet hats to be scrambled for.”³⁸

The Jesuits appeared rarely in this feature. Once the *Globe* repeated a speculation of *L'Opinion Nationale* which asked “if such men as Bishop Dupanloup and Bishop Strossmayer, and the Archbishops of Paris and Rheims will allow the supremacy of the Jesuits and be struck dumb in their presence.”³⁹ Another remark had to do with the bishops leaving there for homes after the Council. These bishops “came as shepherds and leave as sheep well-shorn.”⁴⁰

Monseigneur de Charbonnel, “the well-known ex-Bishop of Toronto,” was reported in the *Globe* on 1 December, 1869 to be a delegate of Cardinal de Bonald of Lyons. Bishop Lynch of Toronto was mentioned only once in this period. His name appeared in the *Globe* on 21 January, 1870 for being named to the Commission on Eastern Rites and Apostolic Missions. The strange thing is that not a word was said when, very dramatically, Bishop Lynch was escorted by Bishop Charbonnel to a place among the Archbishops at the Council. This occurred on 20 March, 1870 when Toronto was declared an archbishopric. He also spoke later on in the Council in support of Infallibility. “Of the Archbishops and Bishops from British America, only he and the Archbishop of Halifax spoke in the Council on the great question of Infallibility.”⁴¹ News still traveled slowly in 1870, and perhaps this explains the *Globe*’s silence.

The general, over-all reaction of the Toronto *Globe* was anti-conciliar. Its antagonism cropped up in many ways. It attacked and it ridiculed. It often tried to discredit the Church by making it look like a subversive element in society. Infallibility was, of course, the main topic, Brown and the *Globe* being manifestly hostile to it. Through thick and thin George Brown stuck to his principles, this much must be said for him. As a private person and as a politician he recognized in Catholicism and Romanism a bitter enemy. The Vatican Council was just one skirmish in his crusade against the Church, and the *Globe* was his sword.

³⁶ *Globe*, 7 June 1870.

³⁷ *Globe*, 26 Apr. 1870.

³⁸ *Globe*, 21 Dec. 1869.

³⁹ *Globe*, 9 June 1870.

⁴⁰ *Globe*, 25 July 1870.

⁴¹ Teefy, J. R., *Jubilee Volume (1842-1892), The Archdiocese Toronto and Archbishop Walsh*, Chapter entitled Life and Times of Archbishop Lynch by Hon. T. W. Anglin, p. 183.