

Ecclesiastical Metropolitanism and the Evolution of the Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto

by Murray W. NICOLSON*

Until 1850 the Catholic Church in the Diocese of Toronto was a mission-like entity, lacking priests, institutions and a communication system to unify it. Subsequently it underwent rapid change, adopting the traditional metropolitan form of Church government. Two major factors precipitated the change. The sudden influx of Famine Irish immigrants drastically increased the size of the urban Catholic laity, but required immediate aid and direction if it were to be retained. Through his organizational ability Bishop Charbonnel utilized the Church's ancient, external communication network, drawing upon it for funds, personnel and ideas to assist the laity. Thereby the Church was strengthened and the Irish preserved as the Victorian Catholic laity.

Manquant de prêtres, d'institutions et de communications appropriées, l'Église catholique dans le diocèse de Toronto ressembla à une mission jusqu'en 1850. Elle connut par la suite de rapides transformations conduisant à l'établissement de structures métropolitaines de type classique. Ces transformations furent accélérées d'abord par la venue soudaine d'immigrants irlandais fuyant la grande famine, qui exigèrent un encadrement immédiat. En second lieu, l'évêque Charbonnel utilisa ses talents d'administrateur et les structures établies de l'Église pour lever des fonds et recruter du personnel. Ainsi, l'Église se raffermi et les Irlandais catholiques furent maintenus en son sein.

Between 1800 and 1850 the Roman Catholic Church in Toronto and its controllable hinterland functioned as a mission entity. Although the Diocese of Toronto had been formally created in 1842 the Church did not begin to operate in the traditional manner of a metropolitan institution until 1850. Several factors predetermined functional and organizational change within this embryonic institution. One was the rapid influx in 1847 of Famine Irish into Toronto and its vicinity. This peasant population needed priests and institutions if it was to be retained as Catholic. Without social institutions, organizations and an obedient personnel, the Church was incapable of assisting this new and ever-growing laity. In 1850, however, the arrival of Toronto's second bishop, Armand de Charbonnel, precipitated change. Charbonnel utilized the Church's existing external communication system from which he obtained money, personnel, models and ideas to establish institutions which formed the internal network of the diocese. Concurrently he re-organized the diocese and controlled, motivated and directed the parish priests, the representative figures of Church

* Newmarket, Ontario.

authority and elements in the communication linkage at the local level. This mechanism, when fully formed and operational, could be described as a metropolitan system for it united metropolis and hinterland into an interacting unit. Without this communication network Toronto and its diocese might have remained a mission entity. But consolidation in Toronto precluded an ecclesiastical shadow throughout the whole of central Ontario.

The ancient communication system of the Church utilized many linkages that the parallel commercial system used. Although both systems dealt primarily with the transfer of culture and ideas from an external metropolis and described relationships among urban centres and interaction between metropolis and hinterland, they differ. The commercial system that J. M. S. Careless stamped indelibly on Canadian history is concerned chiefly with what occurred outside of and between cities. On the other hand ecclesiastical metropolitanism seems related more closely to the internal character of cities, especially to the development of social institutions and their effect upon the development of both urban and rural society. Within this definition the metropolis is weighted against the hinterland for a number of historical reasons.¹

Christianity, in its institutionalized form, was an urban phenomenon, born and developed in the urban centres of the Roman Empire.² The Empire was a vast hinterland, an extension of the City of Rome, with common laws, language, citizenship and commerce. Authority and power were centralized in Rome and trickled down to various, local urban nuclei which, in turn, administered specific areas organized as Roman provinces. Organizational links bound City and Empire together as an interacting unit.³ The early thrust of the Church to create an universal society throughout the known world required the adoption of Roman administrative and governmental forms.⁴

Like the Emperor, the Pope or Pontifex Maximus, supreme spiritual leader, resided in Rome, the central see of the Empire. Under papal direction a constituted hierarchal institution governed a large territory which was systematically divided into administrative units and linked by a vast

¹ A description of the commercial metropolitan system can be found in J. M. S. CARELESS, "Frontierism, Metropolitanism and Canadian History", *Canadian Historical Review*, XXXV (March 1954): 1-21. The ecclesiastical system has been constructed from elements in: T. L. BOUSCAREN and A. C. ELLIS, *Canon Law A Text and Commentary* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1951), pp. 122-377; G. D. SMITH, ed., *The Teaching of the Catholic Church* (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1948), pp. 691-732; W. G. DEBURGH, *The Legacy of the Ancient World* (London: Penguin Books, 1953), pp. 382-84; and the various entries of the hierarchy, territorial units and Church government in F. L. CROSS, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957).

² N. LEWIS and M. REINHOLD, eds, *Roman Civilization Sourcebook 11: The Empire* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 584.

³ DEBURGH, *The Legacy of the Ancient World*, pp. 382-83.

⁴ E. GILSON, "Forward", in *Saint Augustine, The City of God*, ed.: V. J. BOURKE (New York: Image Books, 1953), pp. 13-35; D. SOPHER, *Geography of Religions* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1967), pp. 64-65.

communication network.⁵ Hinterlands were evangelized from urban centres and the contrast of Christianized towns with unconverted hinterland areas is exemplified by the preservation of the words pagan and peasant, both derived from the Latin *pagus*, a rural district. The advance of the Church depended upon a continual fostering of towns to supply methods and trained personnel to Christianize the hinterland of this ever-growing, spatially organized institution.⁶

Central urban places became the sees of bishops who governed not only their own see but a rural hinterland called a diocese, which also included many lesser urban centres. To improve administration each diocese was subdivided into urban and rural parishes under the direction of priests. Several dioceses, usually four or five, composed an ecclesiastical province and this larger entity fell under the general supervision of an archbishop or provincial metropolitan.⁷ The archbishop was responsible for the administration of one of the dioceses in the province, the archdiocese, and therefore its see became the metropolitan see. The authority of the archbishop over his suffrage bishops was purely administrative, but the authority of the suffragans over the diocesan priests was both administrative and spiritual.⁸

To operate successfully this hierarchically controlled and spatially organized institution needed a refined communication system. From a diocesan viewpoint the external system included the various sacred congregations, including the Holy Office and the tribunals, offices and commissions which were part of the Roman Curia. In addition there were available linkages with the offices of all pontifical institutes not subject to the local bishops and with all the other dioceses and archdioceses in the world. However, the Roman Curia made major decisions, established rules, gathered and despatched information, and sent financial aid and clergy to undeveloped dioceses. The internal communication linkage of any diocese was, and still is, composed of priests, synods, councils, chancery, deans and vicars-general. Through their own networks, institutions, societies and religious orders gather and interpret information which is available to the bishops. It is through this highly organized, classical association that the Church attempts to direct and motivate its laity in secular society.⁹

Certainly in the period 1800 to 1850 the Church in Upper Canada and Toronto did not function in this classical manner. When Father Alexander Macdonell arrived in Upper Canada in 1804 it was a neglected mission, an appendage of the Diocese of Quebec. There were only three churches and two priests in the whole province. The Catholic population did not exceed a few thousand in number and was concentrated in two areas — the Scots in Glengarry in the East and the French in Sandwich in the West. Although

⁵ DEBURGH, *The Legacy of the Ancient World*, pp. 382-83.

⁶ SOPHER, *Geography of Religions*, p. 65.

⁷ BOUSCAREN and ELLIS, *Canon Law A Text and Commentary*, pp. 153-87.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 173-87.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 177-87.

Macdonell was made vicar-general in 1807 he was often the only priest in Upper Canada. His consecration as Bishop of Resina, *in partibus infidelium*, in 1819, was not as a response to any increase in Catholic population, for by it he was not made suffragan, assistant or coadjutor, but simply given the spiritual power to confirm the laity and a title which gave him some stature to deal with the colonial government.¹⁰

Although the colonial government had divided the old Province of Quebec into the two political and national entities of Upper and Lower Canada in 1791, no division of the Diocese of Quebec had been anticipated. Out of fear of multiplying the hierarchy, requests for ecclesiastical division, even within Quebec proper, had been denied. This impeded the development of the metropolitan system because there was no opportunity for the creation of an ecclesiastical province.¹¹ But Irish immigration in the 1820s increased the Catholic population in the central area of Upper Canada. It created an Irish fact at the time that York became the seminal metropolis of the province.¹² In response to the rise in Catholic population, the colonial government acquiesced and in 1826 allowed the creation of the Diocese of Kingston, which covered the whole of Upper Canada, with Macdonell as bishop.

As a prelate Macdonell was subordinate to the Bishop of Quebec. Yet his ecclesiastical position was an isolated one because there was no archbishop in Quebec, no ecclesiastical province, and therefore no one in authority with whom to confer. In his mistaken belief that the Rideau Canal would promote Kingston (which was close to his beloved Glengarry Scots) as the leading metropolis of Upper Canada, Macdonell chose it as the see of the new diocese, and thus isolated himself geographically. York and the Home District where the population was expanding was the true central area of his diocese. His mode of operation was, in effect, suited to the conditions of a mission church in the colonial period.¹³

Politically, Macdonell was a Tory and a Compact member. He based the continued development and existence of his Church and its laity on pensions for the clergy and land grants in return for absolute loyalty to the colonial administration. This show of loyalty placed Macdonell in favourable positions and intimate relationships with not only the colonial administrators but also the military establishment. Macdonell utilized to mutual advantage a far-reaching Catholic Compact which included his fellow clansmen, especially the Loyalist heads of the cadet branches of clan Donald who, through service, were connected to the military and were established as placemen, land speculators and Compact members. Of great assistance to the bishop was the influential Baby family of York and

¹⁰ W. J. MACDONELL, *Reminiscences of the Late Hon. and Right Rev. Alexander Macdonell, First Catholic Bishop of Upper Canada* (Toronto: Williamson, 1888), p. 23.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-24.

¹² Archdiocese of Toronto Archives (hereafter ATA), Macdonell Papers, A Report on the Missions in the Diocese of Kingston, 22 June 1835.

¹³ In general, see: L. J. FLYNN, *Built on a Rock, The Story of the Roman Catholic Church in Kingston 1826-1976* (Kingston: Brown and Martin, 1976), pp. 12-31.

Sandwich, with relatives in Lower Canada. More importantly intermarriage with Catholics gained the services of the powerful Sherwoods, Boultons, Crawfords, MacNabs and Elmsleys. Macdonell's friendship with Bishop Strachan and his own position as a legislative councillor placed him in a pre-eminent position with the élite and the Protestant majority. His loyalty during the Rebellion of 1837 even gained him the support of the Orange Lodge.¹⁴

As the Catholic composition of the province became more Irish and less Scottish the laity began to question the bishop's loyalties. It seemed that his power base lay in friends in high places and not in the common people. As well, his attachment to the Glengarry Scots, probably due to the difficulties he had had in trying to settle these Highland Scots first in industrial Glasgow, then in Glengarry, was obvious.¹⁵ He preferred to reside among them at St Raphael's, which resulted in frequent absences from his see in Kingston. Glengarry received preference over any other area in the diocese — for priests, for schools, for nuns. In 1833 four of the five Catholic schools in Upper Canada were situated in the Glengarry area to serve 11,000 of the 60,000 Catholics in the province. Of the two orders of nuns brought to Upper Canada during Macdonell's tenure, one was obtained for Glengarry, the other for Sandwich. Until the foundation of Regiopolis College in Kingston in 1838, the only Catholic school of higher education was an addition to the seminary located at St Raphael's in Glengarry.¹⁶ The limited correspondence between Macdonell and his superior in Quebec, or with the Holy See, indicates that Macdonell virtually ignored the external network of his Church. The exception was his relationship with the wealthy Bishop Thomas Weld of England upon whom he relied for information and financial assistance and who, he hoped, would succeed him as Bishop of Kingston. His loosely structured diocese denied him any real, internal communication system. For information Macdonell relied upon the two appointed vicars-general with whom he frequently quarrelled, upon the parish priests, few of whom he trusted, and chiefly upon his confidants among the élite. These sources provided information which was often biased or erroneous, little of which related to the problems of his Irish laity.¹⁷

Toronto, the future metropolitan see and cultural centre of the Irish Catholics, had been as neglected as the remainder of the province outside of Glengarry. York was without a Catholic church until 1822 and without a resident priest until 1827. Macdonell was an infrequent visitor; however,

¹⁴ J. E. REA has written an excellent volume on Bishop Macdonell, *Bishop Alexander Macdonell and the Politics of Upper Canada* (Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1974). However there were additional elements utilized by Macdonell to form his overall power base. For considerable detail on the Catholic Compact see M. W. NICOLSON, "The Catholic Church and the Irish in Victorian Toronto" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Guelph, 1980).

¹⁵ MACDONELL, *Reminiscences*, pp. 5-19.

¹⁶ Province of Ontario Archives, Macdonell Letters, Vol. 7, p. 1012; E. KELLY, ed., *The Story of St. Paul's Parish Toronto* (Toronto, 1922), pp. 32-66.

¹⁷ See Macdonell Papers, Correspondence between Bishop Weld, W. P. O'Grady, W. P. Macdonald and Bishop Macdonell between 1828 and 1832.

he had presented himself in 1826 to collect a personal debt from the Irish laity. After 1831 Macdonell, in his capacity as legislative councillor, was required to spend more time in Toronto.¹⁸

From 1820 to 1842 the administration of the Church in Toronto was delegated to lay vicars who were supported by an interlocking group of Catholic Compact families. This élite group, some Catholic and others of mixed religious background, controlled the Church and set the tenor for religious discipline and standards of practice. In their view it was socially acceptable to be married in both an Anglican and Catholic service, to raise the male children of mixed unions as Anglican and females as Catholic, and to belong to the Masonic Order even though membership was banned by the pope. There was little consideration given to provide social, educational or ecclesiastical institutions which might benefit the majority Irish laity, many of whom were very poor.

The reform-minded Irish were led, at times, by the journalists Francis Collins, Charles Donlevy and James King. These men remembered Macdonell's appointment as a military chaplain during the suppression of the Irish Rebellion of 1798. They disliked his Tory allegiance and his attempts to use ecclesiastical censure to curb political dissent. As well the Irish objected to the involvement of Macdonell and his priests in the purchase and sale of Church lands which, in their view, could lead to land speculation for personal gain, not for the benefit of the Irish laity. Because Macdonell persisted in this practice the Irish missions began to demand that Church lands be held by the people, not personally by the bishop. They objected to the lack of diocesan clergy and the fact that no control was exercised over the few priests available; they also resented the scarcity of churches, schools and teachers. With the exception of Glengarry, much of the diocese was at times in open rebellion with the bishop by 1830.¹⁹

Most critical was the revolt in Toronto under the leadership of William O'Grady. This enigmatic Irish priest and vicar-general, appointed by Macdonell, at first attempted to make the bishop's system function. Through personal effort O'Grady gained government support for a school and financial aid from the Protestant élite to pay off the debts on the parish church of St Paul. Travelling throughout the hinterland O'Grady promoted the advance of the Church in the Home District by encouraging the Irish laity to contribute to the construction of schools and churches. O'Grady was disturbed by the lack of control in the central and growing area of the diocese and encouraged Macdonell to take up residence in York. He also suggested that a synod of priests be called as a prelude to the formation of a diocesan curia. He demanded that the laity practise their religion and obey the doctrines of the Church. In his report on the parish he noted the lack of externals required to aid in the creation of a devout laity. These

¹⁸ KELLY, *The Story of St. Paul's Parish*, pp. 32-66.

¹⁹ See the various available issues, printed in Toronto between 1825 and 1835 of: Francis Collins' *The Canadian Freeman*; W. J. O'Grady's *The Colonial Advocate and The Correspondent and Advocate*; and Charles Donlevy's *The Mirror*. As well, see Bishop Macdonell's correspondence in Macdonell Papers.

actions made him unpopular with the Compact élite. O'Grady could not come to terms with Macdonell's methods; he despised a pensioned clergy controlled by an autocratic government which, in his opinion, negated any ecclesiastic progress. O'Grady gained the support of the majority of the Irish laity in Toronto and its environs, but his reform politics brought him into open revolt with his bishop. When O'Grady's followers took possession of St Paul's Church in Toronto, the bishop placed it under interdict, excommunicating O'Grady and the offending parishioners and withdrawing the services of his priests. The revolt failed. The parishioners were pardoned, but O'Grady died unshriven.²⁰

O'Grady became a leader in the Reform Party of Upper Canada. Although Bishop Macdonell was credited with restraining the Irish Catholics in the Rebellion of 1837 it seems hard to conceive that Macdonell, with his Tory allegiance, Compact background and Orange support, could have done so. On the other hand O'Grady, like Baldwin, departed from the extreme element before the rebellion and most likely was influential in convincing his Irish countrymen to remain neutral. But O'Grady's revolt, and the support it received from the Irish, signalled to the Holy See the need to divide the Diocese of Kingston into smaller, more manageable units to foster the development of the traditional system of Church government.²¹

Macdonell might be looked upon as a great mission prelate. However, the mission age had ended, leaving him an anachronism in an age of change which he failed to come to terms with. He had settled his countrymen in Glengarry, built churches and some schools, opened a minor seminary, established Regiopolis College, and with great hardship travelled his vast diocese. He had brought in orders of nuns and went to Europe to obtain priests and funds to aid his people. In 1828 Macdonell attempted to have the Catholic Church made a corporate body, to hold and sell land in its own name, but his Tory friends did not support him in this endeavour.

What Macdonell failed to perceive was that the Scots and French were no longer the sole Catholics in Upper Canada. Like the French-Canadian bishops, he held the growing Irish laity in contempt. For their part the Irish disliked Macdonell's Tory associates who reminded them of the Dublin Establishment, and expected the same benefits he had given the Glengarry Scots. Above all, in an age of change and institutional growth, Macdonell failed to develop an ecclesiastical organization beyond the appointment of vicars-general to whom he gave little authority. He had no plan to control his unruly Irish and Scottish clergy and, after 1833, left the problems to be solved by an unstable assistant who either ignored them or referred them back to Macdonell.²²

²⁰ There is little unbiased information on the career of W. J. O'Grady. For some detail see NICOLSON, "The Catholic Church and the Irish in Victorian Toronto".

²¹ C. LINDSEY, *Life and Times of Wm. Lyon Mackenzie and the Rebellion of 1837-1838*, 2 Vols (Toronto: P. R. Randall, 1862), 1: 253, 350, 356, and 2: 17.

²² FLYNN, *Built on a Rock*, pp. 12-25; KELLY, *The Story of St. Paul's Parish*, pp. 32-83.

Macdonell wanted a titled or wealthy Englishman, rather than a Scot or an Irishman, to become his coadjutor for he no doubt believed that an English cleric would be more readily accepted by the colonial administration and the Compact élite. He had hoped to obtain Dr Weld as his successor but Weld was made a cardinal. Macdonell's preoccupation with the selection of what he considered the most favourable candidate lost him the services of several qualified clerics, especially Joseph Quiblier, a Sulpician from Quebec, John Larkin of the Seminary of Montreal, and John Murdoch, suggested by the Congregation of the Propaganda. In 1833 Jean Jacques Lartigue, the influential cleric from the Diocese of Quebec, was able to gain the position of coadjutor of the Diocese of Kingston for the French-Canadian priest, Rémi Gaulin, chiefly because he spoke French, English and Gaelic. Through this appointment Quebec expected to re-establish ecclesiastical dominance in Upper Canada.²³

When Macdonell died on 14 January 1840, Gaulin became bishop of the Diocese of Kingston, but he could not cope with the administrative responsibilities the position entailed. Gaulin suggested a division of his diocese and asked that the bilingual Michael Power, the vicar-general of Bishop Ignace Bourget of Montreal, be made coadjutor to assist him in the Diocese of Kingston. In 1841 Bourget and Power were in Rome and, at Gaulin's request, discussed the division of the diocese with the Congregation of the Propaganda. Pope Gregory XVI agreed and sent Bourget and Power to London to obtain the assent of the British Government.²⁴

Power had written Lord Stanley that Kingston was too large a diocese to deal with the present Catholic population. In attempting to gain British approbation for the proposed division Power had the foresight to explain that a metropolitan institution was the antithesis of frontier missions.

A Catholic bishop in case of emergency will provide more authority over those committed to his care than an ordinary clergyman, his presence and his advice may also prove highly serviceable to Her Majesty's Government in quelling that spirit of insubordination and fierce democratic spirit which unhappily exists in a formidable degree in many parts of the frontier line.²⁵

The British Government wanted the continued loyalty of Catholic subjects and welcomed the proposal of additional supervision in an area which had been the centre of previous political upheaval. Bishop Bourget and Father Power were encouraged to proceed with the plan for division.

On 16 December 1841, Pope Gregory issued a bull dividing from the Diocese of Kingston all that part of Upper Canada lying west of the District of Newcastle. On the same day Michael Power, born in Halifax in 1804, ordained in Montreal in 1827, was named the first bishop of the new diocese.

²³ FLYNN, *Built on a Rock*, p. 27.

²⁴ H. F. MCINTOSH, "The Life and Times of the Right Rev. Michael Power, D.D., First Bishop of Toronto", in *Jubilee Volume, The Archdiocese of Toronto and Archbishop Walsh*, ed.: J. R. TEEFY (Toronto: G. T. DIXON, 1892), pp. 109-40.

²⁵ ATA, Power Papers, Power to Lord Stanley, 27 Septembre 1841.

Power was granted permission to choose the city and title of his see. In 1842 he was consecrated Bishop of the Diocese of Toronto, with Toronto the seat of his see.²⁶

The formation of the new diocese did not necessarily imply the beginning of traditional Church government. The absence of an ecclesiastical province restricted communication among the various dioceses under the supervision of the Bishop of Quebec. Power and the other bishops of Upper and Lower Canada petitioned the pope to create an ecclesiastical province. By 1844 the four dioceses — Quebec, Montreal, Kingston and Toronto — were united into a single ecclesiastical province under the name and title of the Metropolitan Province of Quebec, wherein the Diocese of Quebec became the archdiocese under the jurisdiction of Archbishop Joseph Signay. In a pastoral letter Bishop Power advised his laity of this achievement.

Let us pray that this complete Ecclesiastical organization may tend to the more rapid progress of the Catholic faith, bind together more firmly all the members of the Church, afford to Her now well established hierarchy, the means of labouring together in more perfect unity of design, and by the united efforts of her first Pastors, of infusing new vigour and fresh energy to the most remote and most infant portions of the Catholic Church in this Province.²⁷

Canada had achieved, more than a decade earlier, what the British Catholic Church desired and Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman congratulated the Canadian bishops: "You, on your side, have experienced the blessing of a properly constituted ecclesiastical government, sufficiently to understand our eagerness to obtain the same privilege."²⁸

There were immediate positive results from the formation of the ecclesiastical province. This arrangement strengthened the communication linkage, established lines of authority with delegated responsibility and provided the opportunity for the interchange of ideas. Archbishop Signay ruled between Bishop Patrick Phelan of Kingston, who had replaced Gaulin, and Bishop Power over the division of the pension granted to the whole of Upper Canada by the civil government. In this way official matters regarding Church policy did not become public knowledge and avoided unpleasant secular reaction.²⁹ More pertinently, through this expanded organization Power, and later Charbonnel, had confidential contact with Bishop Ignace Bourget, the enemy of Gallicanism in its many forms and one of the architects of Canadian Catholic ultramontaniam.

Bishop Power's attempts to organize and modernize the Church in the Diocese of Toronto were limited by a short tenure of five years. From his

²⁶ *The Cross* (Halifax, N.S.), 23 October 1847; McINTOSH, "The Life and Times of the Right Rev. Michael Power", pp. 109-40.

²⁷ Power Papers, Pastoral Letter, 8 May 1842; Gregory XVI, Sovereign Pontiff, 12 July 1842; Pastoral Address on the Occasion of the Erection of the Four Dioceses of Canada in an Ecclesiastical Province, Having Quebec for the Metropolitan See, 29 December 1844.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman to The Right Reverend The Bishops of Canada, undated true copy.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, Power to Bishop Phelan, 5 March 1844.

works one can discern a growing interest in the formation of institutions, the control and increase of clergy, the centralization of power in a cathedral city, the stimulation of the laity towards a renewed devotionism and the furthering of education. Power brought the Jesuits to Toronto, but they directed their efforts to the mission field among the Indians. He invited the Christian Brothers and the Sisters of Loretto to come to the city to establish schools. The Sisters did not arrive until the time of Power's death and the Christian Brothers, after 1846. Power introduced the Association of the Propagation of the Faith into the diocese in the hope of expanding the knowledge and concern of the laity in the problems of the world-wide institution.³⁰

When Power arrived in Toronto there was a single church, St Paul's. Land was secured to build a cathedral and a bishop's palace. It was an age of cathedral building in North America and Power was stimulated by similar projects undertaken in Kingston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Mobile and Louisville. For this cathedral, which was to become a monument of Irish faith and zeal, Power asked for a contribution of at least five shillings from each worker, which amounted to a day's pay for a skilled worker such as a printer. As well he invited the investments of funds on loan to build the cathedral.³¹

The building of St Michael's Cathedral created accounting problems and the need for monetary and fiscal control. Surviving subscription lists show that the Church was partly dependent upon a transient, labouring population. The majority of addresses were unknown; some subscribers were denoted as having become Protestants. Nonetheless, among those who contributed, there was a spirit of voluntarism and co-operation. The Irish donated what money they could afford, paid half-yearly, quarterly or monthly; some provided labour, usually a half-day's work; and others provided materials such as stone and brick or services like carting. The old Compact families, Catholic and Protestant, including Bishop Strachan, received donations at their homes, as did the few members of the rising middle class. Upper Canada College, the House of Parliament, banks and firms accepted contributions on behalf of the Cathedral debt. This venture showed the need for fiscal organization for the Catholic institution.³²

The condition of the secular clergy was a major concern of Power's, and of successive bishops' throughout the nineteenth century, because the success of the metropolitan structure depended upon the submission and loyalty of the parish priest at the local level. The bishop's authority in administrative and spiritual matters had to be accepted or the connection

³⁰ MCINTOSH, "The Life and Times of the Right Rev. Michael Power", pp. 109-40.

³¹ Power Papers, Pastoral Address, Inviting the Catholics of the Diocese of Toronto to Contribute Towards the Building of the Cathedral Church of St. Michael's in the City, 29 December 1846; KELLY, *The Story of St. Paul's Parish*, pp. 105-9.

³² ATA, Sundry Books and Records, Names and residences of defaulters of donations to the Cathedral building 1848-1849; The persons undermentioned have contributed information as to residence 1848-1849; St. Michael's Cathedral Fund, February, 1843 — August, 1845.

between the universal Church and the laity would be lost at the grass-roots level. There were obedient, selfless Irish priests who lived in poverty and gave their lives to the service of their people in the Diocese of Toronto. These early priests travelled from station to station, hearing confessions, performing marriages, blessing graves, baptizing children and saying mass wherever they could. They existed on the charity of the Irish peasant and were loved and respected in return.³³

Circumstances in Upper Canada had allowed for the development of a transient, independent clergy, isolated in parishes far from the control of the bishop. Many of these clergymen were priests who had been dismissed in Ireland and had been accepted in the Diocese of Kingston because of the scarcity of trained personnel. These priests brought with them the concept of Gallicanism which, in Ireland, could be defined as the belief that priests were beyond the control of their bishop, having autonomous rights in their own parishes. Gallicanism took a variety of forms with defiance of authority employed for different reasons. In the case of Father O'Grady it was utilized to evade dismissal from a parish. The wearing of green vestments at mass on St Patrick's Day during Lent, in defiance of the *ordo* which stipulated purple, signified nationalistic pride and was a minor infraction. However, defiance of the bishop's authority was used to cover a vast area of moral decay which included drunkenness and avarice.³⁴

Violence, drunkenness and disobedience among the clergy created scandal and disrespect which tarnished the image of the Church, but theft and avarice among some of the priests hurt the Church economically. Priests coming into the diocese were left to the mercy of a poor laity who could ill afford to keep them. Because of the poor economic state of the Church, Bishop Macdonell directed these clerics to use their honour and conscience to obtain what they thought was fair and just to maintain themselves. A good many Irish priests soon established a strong financial base by extracting what they could from the parishioners and by buying and selling Church land to such an extent that they became lucrative land speculators, leaving sizeable estates.³⁵ By 1835 John Elmsley observed of Irish priests: "The most that I have seen appeared to glory more in comfortable dwellings, more in rich apparell and in total freedom from the crosses and disagreeable circumstance of the priesthood."³⁶

³³ W. R. HARRIS, *The Catholic Church in the Niagara Peninsula 1626-1895* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1895), pp. 189-91.

³⁴ The dismissal of priests in Ireland, Irish Gallicanism, and the moral decay of some of the Irish clergy are well documented. See E. LARKIN, "The Devotional Revolution in Ireland 1850-75", *American Historical Review*, 77 (June 1972): 625-52; NICOLSON, "The Catholic Church and the Irish in Victorian Toronto"; Macdonell Papers, Power Papers, Charbonnel Papers, Lynch Papers, Priests' Files; and ATA, Kelly Papers, E. KELLY, "Priests' Records From Laboureau On; Parish History, Volume A; Parish History, Volume B; Parish History, Volume C; Biographical Notes — Priests", unpublished manuscripts, circa 1910.

³⁵ The illicit economic and social activity of the Irish priesthood is well documented in ATA, Macdonell, Power and Charbonnel Papers.

³⁶ Macdonell Papers, J. Elmsley to Macdonell, 29 June 1835.

Few priests lived lavishly but many attempted to increase their meagre incomes. Some falsified records, sold wood from Church property, held bazaars and picnics without recording the proceeds, left graveyards and Church buildings in disrepair, and allowed pigs and cattle to graze in cemeteries. So keen was the desire for monetary gains that some priests refused to feed older retired priests; others competed with one another for parishioners, and sued one another in court for debts. Those assigned to new parishes often collected the pew rents from the parish they were leaving, and left their successors to subsist on nothing.³⁷

The Irish laity became less tolerant of the clergy who did not fulfill their roles in the generally prescribed manner. They were ashamed of priests who did not know the basics of their own religion. They complained of irregularities in the ceremonies of the Church, that sermons provided no direction and that children were ill-prepared for communion or confirmation. As well they resented the frequent absence of priests from the parish.³⁸ They disliked priests who competed with them in business ventures, whether it was competition in racing horses, secret partnerships, promotion of specific taverns or the manufacture of illicit spirits. The laity were especially perturbed when a priest's actions seemed callous. The refusal of the last rites to a dying person, and refusal of burial because of personal vindictiveness, the revealing of confessed sins (even though the sinner was not identified by name) and the non-appearance for mass were deemed unforgivable actions of ordained men to whom the people had entrusted the care of their souls.³⁹

In 1842, soon after he took possession of his see, Power called the clergy of the diocese to a retreat and synod in St Paul's Church to institute control measures. Sixteen priests attended a five-day retreat under the guidance of a Jesuit. At that time the diocese was consecrated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus in order to encourage a more spiritual life among priests and people. At this synod Power drew up statutes for the government of the diocese which were adopted by the clergy, and announced that a seminary college was a prerequisite to educate native priests for the diocese.⁴⁰

To obtain qualified priests either locally or from abroad was essential to form the linkage in the emerging metropolitan system of the Diocese of Toronto. Power, in writing to Bishop Kinsella of Ireland in 1844 emphasized the lack of elements needed to form a modern Church.

³⁷ The bishops' papers show clearly the monetary preoccupation of many parish priests throughout the whole period 1825-90. See for example ATA, Lynch Papers, W. McGinley to Lynch, 28 December 1887.

³⁸ The laity's dissatisfaction with the less-than-exemplary conduct of some members of the priesthood is well documented in the bishops' letters. See particularly the Lynch Papers.

³⁹ Power Papers, Power to J. O'Flynn, 14 February 1844; Lynch Papers, J. Timothy to Lynch, 22 June 1879.

⁴⁰ KELLY, *The Story of St. Paul's Parish*, pp. 84-95; MCINTOSH, "The Life and Times of the Right Rev. Michael Power", pp. 109-40.

I have but twenty clergymen throughout the whole country ... I have neither colleges, nor schools, nor men ... I pray to God most earnestly that the Irish College for Foreign Missions may prosper and fully answer all our expectations ... I am determined to have a whole district without any spiritual assistance rather than to confide the poor people into hands of improper or suspended men.⁴¹

But the building of the cathedral and bishop's palace, the external symbols of the metropolitan institution, took priority in both time and money and the needed seminary was neglected. Power realized that his priests' synod and retreat were not enough to bring about significant change in the existing personnel. On 31 December 1846, Power issued a pastoral letter to his secular clergy in which he announced reforms and regulations to effect more direct control. He stipulated that only he, his vicars-general or archdeacons could authorize priests to say mass or perform sacerdotal functions in his diocese. Also priests from his diocese would have to require his permission to perform similar functions in other dioceses. This regulation was intended to curtail the activities of wandering American clerics and the transiency among his own clergy. In order to curb a developing financial independence and allegiance to civil or military authority over that of his own, Bishop Power denied clerics the right to receive salaries from civil or military establishments without his knowledge of all arrangements. Any infractions of these regulations met with excommunication. As well, priests who organized or showed defiance of the bishop's authority to transfer or remove a cleric would be suspended immediately. Priests who falsely asserted authority or attested title from beyond the diocese were suspended.⁴² The purpose of the regulations was to bring an end to the Gallican proclivities of the clergy that thwarted the growth of the metropolitan structure.

In addition Power had been successful in obtaining a bill incorporating the Catholic Church in 1845 which ended the requirement for priests, individual groups or the bishop to hold Church property. This act placed Church land beyond the manipulation of clergy which often had jeopardized the Church's title or prohibited sale, but it did not grant the Church permission to mortgage capital assets.⁴³

Bishop Power divided the diocese into six rural deaneries under the supervision of senior clergy. These were: St Michael's for the Home and Simcoe Districts; St Mary's for the Gore, Niagara and Talbot Districts; St Ignatius for the Western District; St Gregory's for the London and Brock Districts; St Ambrose for the Wellington and Huron Districts; and St Francis Xavier's for the missions on the borders of Lake Huron and Lake Superior. The deans were authorized to hold meetings of the clergy through which local problems were solved and discipline effected. At this particular time the vast diocese was largely Irish but contained minority groups of French, Scottish, German and Indian Catholics. In these areas

⁴¹ Power Papers, Power to Bishop Kinsella, 8 July 1844.

⁴² *Ibid.*, Pastoral Letter, 31 December 1846.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, An Act to Incorporate the Roman Catholic Bishops of Toronto and Kingston in Canada, in *Each Diocese*, LXXXII (82), 29 March 1845.

the rural dean was also vicar forane, which extended his authority further to act more independently of the bishop.⁴⁴

But Power's tenure as bishop was too short and the reform he made in organization soon fell into abeyance. In 1847 Toronto was faced with the influx of a poverty-stricken immigrant group, the Famine Irish, who were nominally Catholic. These ill, starving and poorly clothed people were in need of immediate attention. City authorities in Toronto set up fever sheds to deal with the contagion they brought and fear of its spread made them an alien group from the moment of their arrival. Bishop Power, a few priests and one Catholic layman from the diocese, unprepared for these numbers, ministered to their needs and Power died as a result.⁴⁵

Power had become bishop in an era of social and political change in Upper Canada. The movement towards democratic representation and the diminishing of the old Compact influence left him with an uncertain power base. From his correspondence one senses a prelate who was capable of exercising authority but who was unwilling to become involved in public disputes which might compromise his office. To fix 1850 as the beginning of the age of rapid change in the Church might seem arbitrary, and unfair to Michael Power. But had he survived the typhus epidemic in 1847 it is not certain that the diocese would have been subdivided into its present pattern of interacting sees and hinterlands. As he left it, it was unlike the later Irish institution which not only governed its hinterland from Toronto, but became the metropolitan see of a Church province governing most of Upper Canada. His involvement, as chairman of the Board of Education for Upper Canada, with an emerging, secular educational system and his apparent belief that the impulse for Irish Catholic education should originate at the grass-roots level negated the episcopal thrust so necessary within a hierarchical system. With this approach it is doubtful whether the separate school system, so important to the socializing of the Famine Irish children, would have developed beyond an appendage of the public system.⁴⁶

Power's death as a martyr to the disease of the Famine Irish left Toronto a see without a bishop and the interregnum lasted three years. The immigrant Irish who arrived at this time were an unskilled, uneducated group and their numbers were such that by 1851 they formed one-quarter of the city's population. Their social needs were beyond the resources of the Church and the city. They crowded into the tenements and single dwellings in Cabbagetown and on the water front, or lived in the shanty towns in the Don Basin or in barns on the periphery of the city, subsisting on what they could grow, beg or steal. In addition they retained past forms of social adjustment, or defence mechanisms, which had been normative in Ireland. These included violence as a weapon against prejudice, drunken-

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, Pastoral Letter, 31 December 1846.

⁴⁵ KELLY, *The Story of St. Paul's Parish*, pp. 96-104.

⁴⁶ Although Power believed in the need for Catholic education, his detachment from the problem is evident from the paucity of correspondence on the subject. See Power Papers, Power to S. Sanderl, 28 June 1844; Power to T. Roothaan, 12 November 1842; Power to Monseigneur Reisache, 8 May 1847.

ness as an escape from a harsh environment, distrust of civil authority and reliance on their own forms of justice, all of which, when applied in the new urban milieu, resulted in crime, penal servitude and family instability. Lack of employment opportunities accounted for transiency, prostitution and abandoned wives and children. Because of a high adult mortality rate orphans were numerous. Having lost contact with their Church in Ireland, the immigrants carried with them older belief patterns, seen particularly in the practice of the wake, which made them appear a superstitious lot.

Detachment from the Church allowed the Irish to avail themselves of whatever aid was forthcoming in the Protestant city. Acceptance of many forms of material assistance required a denial of Catholicism and the Church feared the loss of its laity, for seepage into Protestantism was occurring. This created a dilemma for the Diocese of Toronto and threatened the existence of the Church for these Irish, in absolute numbers, were the Catholics of Toronto.⁴⁷

In 1850 there arrived in Toronto a unique individual, Armand François Marie comte de Charbonnel, D.D. This French Sulpician, who had been a professor of dogma and history in Lyons, was offered but refused the Legion of Honour and a seat in the National Assembly of France. He was no stranger to the Irish for, while assisting the Famine Irish poor in Montreal in 1847, he had almost died stricken with typhus.⁴⁸

Charbonnel was faced with a major task because Power had left a mission institution embellished with a Cathedral and debt. From his arrival in Toronto change was a *sine qua non* because he knew he had to salvage the remnants of the ill-adjusted, socially deprived Irish laity by providing for their religious, social and educational needs. His past experience with the Irish in Montreal had made him aware of their positive traits — voluntarism, love of associations and close kinship patterns. But he had to build an integral diocesan structure from which would evolve the social institutions and educational facilities helping the Irish towards methods of self-help.

Through the utility of the well-established external communication network of the Church, Charbonnel was able to import into the Diocese of Toronto necessary personnel, money, ideas and methods. Trained in Europe, he was aware of the social work instituted by St Vincent de Paul, the devotional and moral renewal of Alphonsus de Liguori and the effectiveness of the new religious orders which combined cloistered life with service to the poor. He saw in them possible models which could be em-

⁴⁷ The condition of the Famine Irish in Toronto is well recorded in ATA, Record Books, Minute Books and Annual Reports of the St Vincent de Paul Society. As well, see the Annals, Institutional Records and Letters in the Archives of the Sisters of St Joseph, Toronto, Ontario. Proselytism and Souperism is documented in D. BOWEN, *The Protestant Crusade in Ireland 1800-70* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978), and the Charbonnel Papers.

⁴⁸ J. R. TEEFY, "The Life and Times of the Right Rev. Armand Francis Marie Comte De Charbonnel, Second Bishop of Toronto", in TEEFY, ed., *Jubilee Volume*, pp. 143-60.

ployed to build the internal diocesan framework and to provide solutions for the pressing problems of the Irish Catholics. The models chosen had originated in France and had been constituted to perform one or a number of charitable, social or educational functions. For instance, the lay association of the St Vincent de Paul Society, and similar female organizations derived from it, were to aid the poor through charitable work. The religious orders of the Sisters of St Joseph, the Christian Brothers and the Basilian Fathers were introduced to provide schools and seminaries, hospitals, hostels, orphanages, homes for the aged and infirm, and corrective and rehabilitative facilities.⁴⁹

As a suffragan, Charbonnel attended the Quebec Provincial Council to consult with his metropolitan and, perhaps more particularly, with Bishop Bourget, a genius in central Church organization. As well he visited Baltimore several times to confer with Bishop M. J. Spalding and attended the Plenary Council of the Catholic Church in America held there in 1852. His friendship with Spalding, Archbishop John Hughes of New York and Bishop McKinnon of Nova Scotia, and with prelates in Ireland and Italy, gave him insight into problems of management and of the recruitment of priests.⁵⁰

Charbonnel soon realized that the adaptation of the classical form of Church government was dependent upon the extension of Church control through a programme of decentralization whereby local, urban nuclei would control more effectively their own hinterlands. In 1854 he wrote Father Elzéar Taschereau (later the first cardinal of Canada) with the proposal that the existing Diocese of Toronto be divided into three separate areas: Toronto with six counties and 40,000 Catholics; Hamilton with eight counties and 22,000 Catholics; and London with nine counties and 10,000 Catholics. He believed that there were sufficient resources for three bishops. All three needed twenty additional priests, churches and presbyteries, and forty schools. He warned that, as in the United States "wandering or vagabond priests are increasing like a disease" and that similarly, "mixed schools are the burial place of children".⁵¹ In addition, Charbonnel advised the cardinal prefect of the Congregation of the Propaganda that the Catholic population was growing rapidly in all three major areas of his diocese and that two of these sections were far removed from his see and therefore difficult to administer. He complained about the lack of priests and stated his plan to go to Europe to obtain them.⁵²

At the Second Council of Quebec in October 1855, Charbonnel again made an appeal for recognition of the necessity for division of his diocese. He stated:

⁴⁹ M. W. NICOLSON, "The Irish Catholics and Social Work in Toronto 1850-1900", *Studies in History and Politics*, No. 1 (1980): 29-54.

⁵⁰ TEEFY, "The Life and Times of the Right Rev. Armand Francis Marie Comte De Charbonnel", pp. 143-60.

⁵¹ ATA, Charbonnel Papers, Charbonnel to Father Taschereau, 26 June 1854.

⁵² *Ibid.*, Charbonnel to The Prefect of the Congregation of Propaganda, 25 May 1855.

Also Protestantism reigns supreme in the Diocese of Toronto, powerful, rich and zealous, it has at its beck and call landed property, business and labour and numerous clergy, well endowed, teaching in schools of every branch and degree, churches and magnificent schools in abundance, elections and all the seats in Parliament, almost all public employment, houses of charity, the press and secret societies. The Bishop of Toronto is insulted in the streets of this city and in several counties there have been different attempts on the life of the missionaries. However, the presence of the Bishop, his visits and his incipient institutions have produced a certain betterment which will be much better with two new Sees and the action of their bishops.⁵³

Charbonnel was successful in his various pleas and the Diocese of Toronto was divided into the three areas he had suggested. He recognized that, with two additional bishops, the number of clergymen, schools, churches and religious institutions must increase.⁵⁴ With the reduction in size of the diocese, Charbonnel was able to expend maximum effort and tighten control in his own city and its vicinity. Furthermore, it was his foresight that predetermined the later creation of an Irish ecclesiastical province in Upper Canada. Although not a true metropolitan, throughout his whole career as Bishop of Toronto Charbonnel spoke for the Irish Catholics in all the dioceses of Upper Canada.⁵⁵

Disenchanted with the state of his clergy and the condition of his flock, Charbonnel made a visitation of the diocese to evaluate the situation before determining corrective measures. In the summer of 1852 he called an ecclesiastical retreat for seven days in September, to be concluded with a two-day synod. In preparation for the retreat a circular was issued in which certain points were emphasized regarding parish practices. Priests were advised that they were trustees and superintendents of all Catholic schools by divine law (*de jure divino*). This was necessary to protect, through education, the faith and morals of the children in the parishes. There was a clear warning against the proliferation of heretical books, the danger of mixed marriages, and the use of Protestant prayers in mixed schools as sources of seepage from the Church. Evidently the priests were to be prepared to discuss these issues in synod and to explain their lack of attention to them. Priests attending the retreat were to advise the laity of the reason for their absence from their parishes and to ask for their prayers. The deans were to submit reports on the state of their deaneries, including proposed reforms and improvements. In addition priests were to bring the vestments for divine office, the decrees of the Council of Quebec and the statutes of the diocese. Their records of marriages and baptisms were to be examined. Priests were to plan for and discuss with their parishioners the absorption of the ever-growing number of Irish orphans in the city. Any priest unable to attend was to notify the bishop in writing.⁵⁶ The agenda

⁵³ Ibid., Charbonnel to all the Bishops during the Second Council of Quebec, 20 October 1855.

⁵⁴ Ibid., Circular of His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto to his Clergy on the Sub-division of the Diocese, 1856.

⁵⁵ For Charbonnel's influence, direction and leadership of the Church see *The Mirror* and *The Canadian Freeman*, 1850-60.

⁵⁶ Charbonnel Papers, Circular to the Clergy, 18 July 1852.

shows that Charbonnel had formulated a plan to make priests accountable for their actions, which he intended to implement.

Charbonnel's visitation and the synod and retreat evidently provided him with information regarding the mismanagement of parishes. In December of 1852 he issued a circular letter to the clergy, admonishing them for their failure to conduct themselves as responsible spiritual leaders. He stated that he was appalled at the lack of decency in the celebration of the mass. He accused priests of neglecting the spiritual teaching of both children and adults and of exercising little control over the Irish laity by allowing children to attend mixed schools and adults to belong to secret societies. Contrary to Church Law, marriages of consanguinity and affinity had been permitted and they were to be stopped. Although statistics were not provided, Charbonnel was concerned with the number of mixed marriages that occurred and not being documented which enhanced the seepage of the Catholic partner into Protestantism. So grave was this problem that, by order of the pope, mixed marriages in the Diocese of Toronto were to be limited to fifty for the whole year. In addition, Charbonnel demanded collections for the support of the newly-established seminary, the remittance of monies for dispensations, as well as the *cathedraticum* or dime, one-tenth of parish income, to put the diocese on a sound financial footing. Charbonnel expected each priest to take a census to ascertain the concentration of Catholic population. Priests were to encourage vocations to religious orders to increase the numbers of personnel dedicated to work among the Irish. The clergy were urged to find accommodation with Irish families in the country for the numerous Irish orphans being lost through proselytism by placement in Protestant homes in the city. In order to create an educated lay leadership for the future, he proposed monetary assistance to the parents of a select group of children who would be placed under the guidance of the various teaching orders in Toronto. To assist him in accomplishing these tasks, Charbonnel was determined to appoint a coadjutor and to obtain qualified priests in Europe until his seminary began producing a native Irish clergy.⁵⁷

The problem of amortizing the debt of St Michael's Cathedral and the bishop's palace was a drain on diocesan revenue, but it was also an element in creating a modern institution. In 1842 the Catholic population of Toronto was 3,000 and the only church, St Paul's, had been enlarged and repaired at a cost of \$6,150. With scant resources the building of the Cathedral commenced in 1845 and accrued a debt of \$77,000. Power went to Europe in 1847 to obtain priests and financial assistance but returned empty-handed. The Cathedral was consecrated by Bishop Bourget in 1848 but only because two laymen, John Elmsley and S. G. Lynn, made themselves liable for the debt. Consequently the debt increased and some method had to be found to pay the principal and the growing interest.⁵⁸ Charbonnel was faced with this pressing problem. Although he paid off a

⁵⁷ Ibid., Circular to the Clergy, 26 December 1852.

⁵⁸ Kelly, *The Story of St. Paul's Parish*, pp. 88, 100.

portion of the debt from his personal estate he was not able to assume all of it. In a pastoral address of 1850 Charbonnel explained that it was his duty to speak about debt and money and told the laity: "We say we owe because this debt is ours and not the debt of your first Bishop; Martyrs are in Heaven, and in Heaven there is no debt."⁵⁹ He organized collections at both St Paul's Church and St Michael's Cathedral and established a cathedral loan fund.

The creation of the fund forced Charbonnel into operating a metropolitan financial institution of considerable consequence. At the cathedral and palace doors, through the mail and at every rectory and church in the diocese and sporadically throughout the New World Irish diaspora, loans were made to the Church at various interest rates, renewals were authorized and payments receipted, all of which had to be recorded. There was a more stringent need for financial control as the Irish laity sometimes demanded payment of loans before the due date and stipulated various modes of payment of principal or interest, place of payment and to whom it was to be made. Funds loaned to the Church were applied against the principal and money for early repayment was not always immediately available. When Charbonnel established the Toronto Savings Bank he had more than one goal in mind. He intended it as an Irish Catholic depository; he also planned it as an institution which extricated the bishop and the cathedral staff from the time-consuming burden of managing the increasingly complicated finances of the cathedral loan fund.⁶⁰

The fiscal control and bookkeeping methods which contributed to the success of the cathedral loan fund provided Charbonnel with the guidelines for a system which was introduced throughout the diocese. The growth of personnel and institutions after 1850 indicated the need for analysis of revenues and expenses so that the Church could utilize its assets most effectively. The simple bookkeeping practices applied in Bishop Power's tenure, in which the management of Church finances seemed to be recorded in a single notebook, were no longer adequate. It was not difficult for Charbonnel to initiate change in the seminal institutions in the city more directly under his control. For any real financial success to occur, however, the priests in the diocesan parishes had to participate in this accounting revolution.

The key to priestly financial accountability was the introduction of the dime or *cathedraticum*. In 1852 Charbonnel discussed his plan with the Bishop of Baltimore who concurred that he had the right to demand one-tenth of the revenue of each parish priest. Once it was initiated Charbonnel observed that the *cathedraticum* did "not please the clergy very much and most of them are seeking to elude this obligation".⁶¹ But Charbonnel was adamant that this system would be employed. He purchased register books

⁵⁹ Charbonnel Papers, Pastoral Address, Inviting the Catholics of Toronto to Contribute Towards the Loan Fund of the Cathedral Church of St. Michael's in the City, 1850.

⁶⁰ See in ATA, Cathedral Record Books and Correspondence, 1850-1860.

⁶¹ Charbonnel Papers, The Bishop of Baltimore to Charbonnel, 16 May 1852; Charbonnel to Monseigneur, 30 May 1853.

for each mission, urban and rural, in which economic, religious and vital statistics were to be recorded.⁶² Recording ecclesiastical data of marriages, baptisms and burials was demanded as early as 1822 by the government.⁶³ Priestly reports drawn from parish registers became composite records of parish function and performance. Based upon information received the bishop was able to analyse population concentration and the number of available clergy and existing churches. This analysis provided insight into population change, the mission stations without priests, total revenues and debts of parishes, the costs and mortgages of building structures, the societies that functioned within the parishes, the average number of families by parish, the numbers of the laity attending communion, those making promises of marriage, the number of marriages, baptisms and funerals, those who were converts, those who remained obdurate sinners and the number of children attending school. In addition the annual report submitted by each priest was expected to contain documentation of any pertinent parish information, including picnics or bazaars held, building repairs, the cost of light and heat and salaries. From the reports parish priests were billed for *cathedraticum*, ecclesiastical education, dispensation money and a percentage for mission support.⁶⁴

Bishop Power had established a fee structure for services supplied and this was expanded by Charbonnel. Defined within this fee structure were dispensations from consecutive banns being read before marriage, dispensation from marriage during prohibited times and dispensation from minor problems of consanguinity, as well as the usual charges for marriage, requiem mass, baptism and burial.⁶⁵ The fee structure was established to guarantee the bishop the dispensation monies, for they belonged to him and were not always collected. They also served as guidelines to protect the poor from being overcharged or charged, as the case may have been, for religious services pertinent to their spiritual development. Controls were introduced over the number of masses a priest could say for requests received from outside the diocese. The purpose was to prohibit multiple requests for specific intentions at a single mass wherein a priest, paid to say a single mass for a fixed stipend, said one mass to cover multiple payments. Larger urban centres received more mass requests than the priests could possibly say. These mass intentions were delegated to rural priests. The danger was that some parish priests established illicit sources of income without the knowledge of the bishop.⁶⁶ Not only was the parish priest required to provide the monies from dispensations and the *cathedraticum*, but he also had to collect and remit collections for the support of

⁶² ATA, Sundry Books and Records, Memorandum Book, 1856.

⁶³ Province of Ontario Archives, Macdonell Letters, Macdonell to Mr Horan, 22 November 1822.

⁶⁴ Charbonnel Papers, Thomas Fitzhenry Report, 26 December 1855; Priests' Reports, 1860-1863.

⁶⁵ Power Papers, Priests' Circular, 8 May 1843.

⁶⁶ Lynch Papers, Father L. Gibra to Lynch, 1861; T. Gibney to J. McBride, 21 March 1887.

nuns, the House of Providence and orphanages, and on occasion to make special collections for the bishop.⁶⁷

Charbonnel intended that parish priests become accountable agents to the metropolis in more than just economic matters. The establishment of the deaneries was intended to improve the communication system. More direct supervision could be applied to the people and the priests, but in the interregnum following Power's death the effectiveness of the system was lessened. The authority of the two appointed administrators, John Hay and John Carroll, was limited for most of their control measures were ignored by the scattered Irish clergy.⁶⁸ To regain control Charbonnel expanded the earlier system of deaneries into preliminary tribunals. Local cases which required more extensive corrective measures were referred to the bishop's tribunal composed of the bishop and the officers of the diocesan curia, the deans, the vicars-general, the archdeacons and the chancellor.

To curtail absence from either rural or urban parishes for other than Church-related functions, Charbonnel insisted that priests advise him of the reason. Charbonnel, a diligent worker, set a standard of austere living not much different from that of the poorest he served, and expected his priests and his parishioners to function at a similar level and with as much enthusiasm.⁶⁹ With this attitude it was difficult for any priest to complain about his situation for Charbonnel had said: "You, laity, give us liberally for our support and the good works we have to attend to, and we clergymen, let us continue to live economically, not to indulge our kindred, which is one of the greatest curses of a family."⁷⁰

Priests were to be identified as representatives of the Church at all times. Bishop Power sought to introduce the compulsory wearing of the normal Italian clerical garb, the soutane or cassock, by all priests. The soutane was a black, floor-length, skirted garment that identified the Roman Catholic clergy. Some confusion as to the use of the soutane arose. Bishop Macdonell had never stipulated the requirement, and many of the priests could not afford to purchase soutanes. Others, in areas of Orange concentration, were afraid of the insults and threats associated with the distinctive apparel. The wearing of this garb in the streets of Toronto was sufficient cause to bring threats to the person of the priest. Despite Charbonnel's observation that Toronto was a hot bed of Orangism and the purgatory of Catholic priests, he insisted priests wear the soutanelle, or abbreviated soutane, to remind them of their vocations and to gain the recognition and respect of the Irish laity.⁷¹

⁶⁷ Charbonnel Papers, "Autobiography" (1855); Lynch Papers, T. Gibney to Lynch, n.d., and (?) to Lynch, 28 November 1887; Offering of Priests to the House of St. John's Grove, n.d.; Circular to the Priests of the Archdiocese of Toronto signed by F. Rooney and W. R. Harris, August 1884.

⁶⁸ Power Papers, Pastoral Letter, 31 December 1846.

⁶⁹ Charbonnel Papers, J. Kennedy to Charbonnel, 25 June 1853. Lynch Papers, Note in Lynch's Handwriting, 29 April 1879; Lynch to J. McBride, 15 July 1881.

⁷⁰ Charbonnel Papers, Notes from a Circular, n.d.

⁷¹ Power Papers, Power to W. P. Macdonald, 4 May 1844; Charbonnel Papers, Fragment in Charbonnel's writing, n.d.; Father Bruyere, "Is It Advisable For the Clergy of Toronto to Adopt the Soutenella Instead of the Cassock?", n.d.; Charbonnel to Dear Sir, 5 June 1852.

Priests were essential for the survival of the Church as an hierarchical institution. Charbonnel canvassed Europe, especially Ireland, in search of dedicated men. In advance of his arrival at seminaries and colleges Charbonnel sent notices for students, "who, divinely called to the priesthood, by the advice of their Superiors and Confessors, would feel a supernatural attraction for the salvation of the hundreds of thousands of Irish Catholics who, in Upper Canada, stand in the greatest need of devoted Clergymen".⁷² He was successful in getting priests from France and Italy for the Hamilton and London dioceses as well as for Toronto. But all prospects from Ireland were denied.

Though Bishop Power had envisioned a seminary under the Jesuits, Charbonnel made it a reality under the Basilians. St Michael's College was established as a seminary and by 1855 Charbonnel could state that forty-two priests had been introduced into the diocese and forty more were being educated for the future three dioceses of Toronto, Hamilton and London.⁷³

Charbonnel, who perceived himself as a failure, succeeded in establishing a functional metropolitan system, a sturdy framework upon which his coadjutor and successor, John Joseph Lynch, could build. This French bishop saved the Irish Catholics from absorption into the Protestant population by championing a separate school system to satisfy their educational needs, by supplying social and welfare institutions to provide for their basic human needs and by giving them churches and well trained priests to encourage their spiritual growth. Lynch, whose tenure began in 1860, set about extending Toronto's pre-eminent position, broadening the communication framework and exercising more authority over his clergy so that the Church, as a growing and changing organism, could extend its span of control.

Initially the three new dioceses created from the original Diocese of Toronto benefited from association within the Ecclesiastical Province of Quebec. Bishop John Lynch believed that decisions made in Quebec did not favour his diocese and were detrimental to the progress of the Irish in the Toronto environs. Of particular dissatisfaction to Lynch was the dispersal of the estates and bequests of former bishops. This discontent in Ontario coupled with the rapid growth of Toronto as a commercial centre probably influenced Rome to make Toronto a metropolitan see in 1870. With the formation of the Ecclesiastical Province of Toronto, Lynch became archbishop and metropolitan of all Ontario except the Diocese of Ottawa which had been formed in 1847 from the Diocese of Kingston.⁷⁴

Having the metropolitan see in Toronto gave the episcopal city a certain pre-eminence in the eyes of the Irish laity. They took pride in the

⁷² Ibid., Notice, 1 September 1856.

⁷³ Ibid., Circular to the Clergy, 17 January 1855.

⁷⁴ Lynch Papers, Bishop E. J. Horan to Lynch, 18 September 1860, 22 July 1861, 27 November 1861, 24 September 1862, 27 October 1862; Horan to C. Robertson, 13 December 1862; Lynch to Horan, 28 February 1862; Lynch to Father Dollard, 28 October 1862; Lynch to My Beloved People, Rome, 1870; *Sadlier's Almanac and Ordo* (New York, 1864-1882), pages unnumbered; *The Ontario Catholic Directory* (Toronto: W. J. Flynn, 1976), pp. 13, 24, 58, 69, 83.

fact that other bishops had to defer to the superior authority of their own. As metropolitan Lynch had the right to suggest successors on the death of his suffragans, to announce their appointments, and to arbitrate disputes. He conferred with his suffragans through bishops' meetings and held the First Council of the Ecclesiastical Province of Toronto in his see in 1882. The meeting included all the officials of the four dioceses and discussed matters pertaining to social, political, economic and theological problems.⁷⁵ Toronto had reached its zenith. The Irish Catholics of Toronto addressed themselves to the apostolic delegate from Rome as "the Catholics of the Archiepiscopal City of Toronto", children of "the Island of the Saints".⁷⁶

Even before Lynch became the metropolitan he was concerned about the pastoral care and social progress of all the Irish Catholics in Ontario, but particularly those under French-Canadian jurisdiction in the Diocese of Ottawa.⁷⁷ The Diocese of Ottawa was composed of sections in Quebec and a large portion of eastern, central and northern Ontario. Through communication with priests and laity, Lynch had ascertained the viability of detaching a section of the Diocese of Ottawa to create a separate see. When Lynch became metropolitan he expected that the Diocese of Ottawa would become his subject. But the successive French bishops, J. B. Guigues and J. T. Duhamel, refused to enter his province as suffragans, accusing him of attempting to remove French bishops and replace them with Irishmen. In 1874, however, Lynch was successful in acquiring a large part of the Diocese of Ottawa in the central and northwestern portion of Ontario, to which he added sections of the Diocese of Kingston to balance the French-Irish population. From this area the Vicariate Apostolic of Northern Canada and Sault Ste Marie was formed, which later became the suffragan see of Peterborough under the supervision of an old friend, J. F. Jamot.⁷⁸

The Irish left under the direction of the French bishop of Ottawa faced exclusion and assimilation. As a group they informed Lynch, their ethnic leader and preferred metropolitan, of their inequitable treatment. They and their priests sent letters to Lynch which itemized their complaints. Statements were made that Irish parishes did not receive the same aid as French parishes, and new Irish parishes were denied. French priests, most of whom could not speak English, were placed in Irish parishes and the cathedral provided no English services. The bishop insulted Irish priests and people publicly by telling them they did not belong in his diocese. Irish priests were not promoted, and Irish immigration into the

⁷⁵ Lynch Papers, Pastoral Letter of Bishop Jamot, 25 March 1874; Circular, 16 March 1875; Memorial, 30 September 1873; The Under Secretary of State to Lynch, 18 April, 2, 10, 26 June 1884; Bishop P. F. Crinon to Lynch, 21 December 1881, 19 January 1887; *Acta Et Decreta Primi Concilii Provincialis Torontini In Ecclesia Metropolitana Sti. Michaelis* (Toronto, 1882).

⁷⁶ *The Irish Canadian* (Toronto), 27 June 1877.

⁷⁷ Lynch Papers, The Population of the Part of Ottawa Diocese in Ontario, 1865; A Statement of the Population of the Diocese of Ottawa, 1851-1861.

⁷⁸ *Sadlier's Almanac and Ordo* (New York, 1874-1882), pages unnumbered.

area was discouraged. French charities superseded Irish charities and attempts were made to crush existing Irish charitable institutions. Furthermore, an order of Irish nuns had been refused permission to establish a convent. The Irish demanded that the Ontario portion of the diocese be detached from the jurisdiction of the French bishop and be placed under the direction of the Irish metropolitan in Toronto.⁷⁹

Lynch was unable to obtain Ottawa as suffragan, but arbitration with the archbishop of Quebec accomplished the removal of Ottawa from direct Quebec influence by having it created into a separate ecclesiastical province in 1886. Archbishop J. Walsh succeeded Lynch in 1889 and during his tenure Kingston became an archdiocese which took over the jurisdiction of Peterborough in the newly-created province. This left Toronto responsible for the London and Hamilton dioceses. Nevertheless, the constant division of the old vast Diocese of Peterborough allowed Thunder Bay to become suffragan to Toronto as late as 1952.

Between 1870 and 1900 the expansion of population and the emergence or dissipation of various commercial centres created the need for both centralization and decentralization. Ethnic and regional peculiarities had caused disruption, but by 1900 the different ecclesiastical provinces were functioning in an extended metropolitan organization. Toronto grew in population and remained the pre-eminent Irish see in central and western Ontario.⁸⁰

Like Charbonnel, Lynch saw the secular priests as the basic building blocks of a strong organization. As a strict authoritarian he tried to control the lives of the clergy through disciplinary action. In his opinion rules were "necessary in every station and calling in life"; those who worked without them would fail.⁸¹ He organized yearly retreats for the clergy in which he set forth a rigid series of exercises to encourage spirituality and obedience. In the mode of the monastic life the priests arose at 5 a.m. and retired at 9:30 p.m. The programme included mass, meditation, spiritual reading, lectures, conferences, discussion of the diocesan constitution, visits to the Blessed Sacrament, benediction, recitation of the breviary in choir for matins, lauds, vespers and compline, and the recitation of the beads. There was little free time and silence was mandatory.⁸²

Lynch publicized these retreats to show the people that priests were called into conferences to perfect themselves in a reflective manner so that they might better serve the laity. The priests in vestments were paraded from the bishop's palace to the cathedral with the children of the schools, members of the church societies, the diocesan hierarchy, and an honour

⁷⁹ Lynch Papers, Lynch to Bishop J. J. Duhamel, 18 November 1877; B. Cagney to Lynch, 18 May 1877; List of Demands, 1877.

⁸⁰ The breakup and realignment of the various dioceses in Ontario can be seen in E. J. BOLAND, *From The Pioneers to the Seventies, A History of the Diocese of Peterborough, 1882-1975* (Peterborough: Maxwell Review, 1976); FLYNN, *Built on a Rock; The Ontario Catholic Directory*, pp. 9-69.

⁸¹ Lynch Papers, Sermon Literature, notes.

⁸² *Ibid.*, Announcement of Priests' Synod, 12 July 1875.

guard of eminent Catholics. Sermons included topics such as "The Rule of Faith" (in which private judgement is superseded by Church authority) and the "Infallibility of the Church".⁸³ These organized opening ceremonies of priestly retreats were used by Lynch to demonstrate that laity, priests and bishops were unified as subjects to the central authority of God's vicar, the pope.

It may be that Lynch and his deans noticed that the spiritual atmosphere created by group participation in religious functions and supplemented by compulsory confession was conducive to change and reformation. In 1875 he decided to have the priests' annual retreat coincide with the end of the fiscal year. In preparation he requested that priests submit their annual returns to St Michael's Palace before the commencement of retreat. Some failed to comply with the request, offering a variety of excuses in return; others submitted reports which showed a general decline in revenues without satisfactory explanations. Lynch refused to accept weak excuses because money was needed to expand the institutions of the diocese. He demanded that parish books and registers be made available for inspection by himself, the deans or the vicars-general.⁸⁴ If irregularities were found the tribunal ruled on the offence and a penalty, monetary or spiritual, was meted out. The lack of funds to meet all the demands from within and without the diocese caused the tightening of fiscal control to the extent that the bishop, alone, sanctioned all parish loans and apportioned even minor expenses to the parishes throughout the diocese.⁸⁵

Priests were apprehensive of the tribunal. As an ecclesiastical judiciary the tribunal could determine several courses of action in answer to any charge. For those priests accused but innocent of wrongdoing the charge was dismissed. If the accused was a young priest, or if the infraction was a first offence, upon apology his faculties, that is the right to say mass and dispense the sacraments, were continued. However, if a priest was found guilty of a major offence, or if he refused the summons, his faculties were removed until penance and restitution were made, or he could be expelled from the diocese without recommendations.⁸⁶

But the conscientious cleric was often faced with inaccuracies and problems carried through the developing communication system to the bishop and suffered for them. People appealed to the bishop for priests and churches, making economic promises they could not fulfill. The obligation of financing and maintaining the local church building, the presbytery and school, of travelling over vast rural areas to visit parishioners and being required to provide money for the metropolis and the universal Church was often too great a burden for an inexperienced cleric. Communication from

⁸³ *The Canadian Freeman*, 27 August 1863.

⁸⁴ Lynch Papers, Circular, 11 June 1875; T. Laboreau to Lynch, 25 July 1884; Lynch to Mr Endcott, 14 May 1887.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, T. Laboreau to Lynch, n.d., and 13 February 1883; Lynch to (?), n.d.; J. McBride to Lynch, 15 November 1886; Lynch to W. Flannery, 20 February 1866.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, Lynch to Dear Sir, 2 November 1887; Lynch to W. McGinley, 24 January 1887; Lynch to Dear Sir, 24 May 1874; ATA, Walsh Papers, J. Walsh to P. McCabe, 20 January 1891.

responsible priests in the hinterland provided the hierarchy with more understanding of the problems that had to be faced in administering rural areas. One poignant appeal to the bishop for help came from Father C. Wardy of Newmarket. He advised Bishop Lynch of the amount of the debt on his parish, of what he was doing to try to eliminate it, blaming his predicament on his inexperience and inability in money matters and his naive belief in the promises of the laity and “the monetary crisis of these last years felt by all, especially by our people most of whom can get no money unless they get work and many of whom can get no pay except by bills on stores”. Having been obliged to make collections personally Father Wardy feared there was “a suspicion in the minds of some Catholics and some Protestants coming to our Church that the priest loves money, that money is all he wants”, which caused rumours to spread and religion to suffer. Father Wardy related that an old priest “often told me that the principal source of our difficulties was that the Bishop sent us to missions in debt, to missions not sufficiently prepared to receive a resident pastor — without having ascertained the possibility of paying the debts...” Having expended his own patrimonial he suggested an answer to his dilemma — either that the metropolitan financial requirements be reduced or that two priests be placed in a single centre, sharing expenses of house, horse and stable, but covering two different stations. He emphasized that two priests living together would dispel the problem of isolation with its devastating results.⁸⁷

Illness, infirmity and incapacity of the secular clergy created a financial drain as well as a social problem for the Church. It was the responsibility of the Church to provide care for these men, and usually any assistance asked from relatives was denied. Many had to resign because of old age, some becoming so senile they could no longer perform any sacerdotal or administrative functions. Some working priests were so poor they could not afford to retire. There are recorded cases of priests falling off the altar, forgetting their sermons, and acting in an inappropriate manner during services.⁸⁸ The Church in all charity had to do something for these men who had served the people and the institution so diligently during their younger years. In 1863 the priests, with the bishop, made the following declaration:

In our first Synod held, in July 1863, it was enacted that an “Infirm Priest’s Fund” should be instituted so that priests in good standing might be always sure that in sickness or infirmity they would have the means of a decent support, and that they might be able also to combat the temptation to avarice in hoarding up money.⁸⁹

The priests decided how the fund was to be administered and, rather than approach the public for money, voted unanimously to support their colleagues in the sacred ministry. The fund was intended for the use of secular

⁸⁷ Lynch Papers, T. Wardy to Lynch, February 1860.

⁸⁸ There is a considerable collection of correspondence concerning the problems of ill or elderly clergy. See particularly the Lynch Papers.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, Circular, 20 January 1887.

priests only, and priests deprived or dismissed could not make claim or regain funds previously deposited. It was an early form of social security, or old age pension, to be used as a reward for faithful service. In a similar manner the orders of priests and congregations of nuns and brothers provided care and shelter for their members, because having taken the additional vow of poverty money was not available to them.⁹⁰

The growing secular clergy was continually assisted by the services of the religious orders in the metropolitan centre. Those within the religious orders of men, particularly the Basilians and the Redemptorist Fathers were well trained, bound more strictly by rules of poverty and obedience and therefore set an example to their more erratic colleagues. It was these orders along with those of the Christian Brothers, the Sisters of St Joseph, the Sisters of Loretto, and the Sisters of the Good Shepherd which provided the various social and educational institutions in the city. These included: convents, private schools, separate schools, colleges, seminaries, homes for the aged, hospitals, orphanages, a children's aid society, hostels and refuges. In addition the lay organizations of the Church, which included the St Vincent de Paul Society, sodalities, various women's groups, national groups, and benevolent societies, were linked with the institutions to form a massive and intricate communication system which involved the secular clergy. With the hinterland as well as the metropolis supporting and utilizing the services of the urban institutions, the parish priests, through interaction with the institutional personnel or acting as chaplains to the different organizations, became a functioning element within the total system.⁹¹

Charbonnel's goal in establishing St Michael's College had been to reduce dependence upon foreign clerics. Under Lynch continued pursuit of that goal resulted in an Irish-Canadian clergy. Young Catholics in the Diocese of Toronto benefited from the improved primary educational programmes and the opportunity to attend secondary institutions directed by the Sisters and the Christian Brothers. This provided an increased number of well-prepared students for the seminary. With more candidates for the priesthood Lynch expanded the facilities to train them. In addition to St Michael's College in Toronto and Assumption in Windsor, both under the direction of the Basilians, Lynch opened his own seminary at St John's Grove on the periphery of the city. As well he utilized St Jerome's College in Berlin, administered by the Congregation of the Resurrection and availed himself of the superior facilities of the seminaries in Quebec, Montreal, Dublin and Italy for the most promising candidates to the priesthood.⁹²

⁹⁰ Ibid., *St. Michael's Association, Composed of Priests of the Diocese of Toronto for Mutual Support in Sickness and Old Age*, 1863.

⁹¹ NICOLSON, "The Irish Catholics and Social Action in Toronto 1850-1900".

⁹² The development and utilization of institutions to educate priests is thoroughly documented in the bishops' papers. See particularly Charbonnel Papers and Lynch Papers. In addition see J. H. HANRAHAN, *The Basilian Fathers (1822-1972) A Documentary Study of One Hundred and Fifty Years of the History of the Congregation of Priests of St. Basil* (Toronto: The Basilian Press, 1973).

The changing calibre of the priesthood contributed to a more positive image of it. This new group of Irish-Canadian clerics, better educated and assured of security in infirmity and old age, functioned as part of the whole organization, not as individuals. Transfer from parish to parish ended the development of a personal power base and instead produced an awareness of social conditions and needs both urban and rural. As priests performed their tasks diligently and provided the leadership needed, there developed a new power base, that of respect for the priesthood by the Irish laity in the diocese.⁹³

The co-operation of bishop, priests and laity in the Diocese of Toronto was responsible for the creation of a modern institution. By 1883 the Church had become a corporate body, holding a considerable amount of property through investment or from the residue of estates. In its corporate name it was able to borrow money on real estate and to pay debts that had been incurred. Because of the ever-pressing demands of the predominantly working-class population it served, funds were never left idle. When property served no functional use, it was sold and the capital re-invested in other properties to be utilized for social services or education. The accounting problems associated with the episcopal corporation, necessitated by the servicing of capital debts and interest-bearing deposits, instituted an accounting system equal to that of any business firm in this period.⁹⁴

The institutional Church that developed in the future Archdiocese of Toronto after 1850 depended upon the growth of a vast metropolitan linkage that bound the metropolis to the hinterland. The basic structure of this hierarchically governed institution had not changed since the Roman Empire. Although Bishop Macdonell served as a good mission prelate, his inflexibility negated the growth of institutions. Power had initiated the framework for the traditional model of Church government but his efforts were swept away by the impact of the Irish Famine migration. It was Charbonnel who linked Church institutionalization and aid to the Irish as the means of saving both. He saw that the priests had to be controlled in order to make them the building blocks of a sound hierarchical organization. By introducing social, educational and religious institutions to serve the Catholic laity, Charbonnel created a modern, functional organism which bound metropolis and hinterland into an interacting unit. The metropolitan communication system required to govern and operate these institutions changed the structure from a mission Church to a modern organization.

⁹³ See Charbonnel Papers and Lynch Papers: Priests' Files and Parish Records, general correspondence with the clergy between 1850 and 1890; and the biographical sections in KELLY, *The Story of St. Paul's Parish*.

⁹⁴ See the various Church registers in Power Papers, Charbonnel Papers, Lynch Papers and Sundry Books and Records: Index to Property Held; Insurance on Buildings; Receipt Files and Correspondence concerning Church Institutions.