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Bibliographical Note

The bibliography which follows is a complete listing of all works consulted during the preparation of the present study. The present note is not meant as an analysis of the works consulted and used, but is rather a brief comment on the nature of the materials.

There exists no single source, original manuscript, printed document, secondary or monographic work which is per se more important than any other. The economic and social history of New France requires not merely a knowledge of relatively unused sources, such as the C 11 A series, volumes 113 to 119, CANADA, DEPENSES GENERALES, or the metropolitan counterpart, the F 1, FONDS DES COLONIES, but also the correlation of such materials. The two collections noted give the names and amounts received by individuals for services to the State. This information, however, has a restricted use until it is correlated with other data, original or secondary. Examples of this may be seen in the chapter on the seigniorial régime. P.-G. Roy's calendar of documents in the Québec Archives permits the tracing of patterns of land ownership. The expenditures noted in the budgets of New France indicate that the seigniors were also administrators, merchants or members of the army. Every chapter of the present work may be used to illustrate this most important aspect of the use of the materials: correlation.

A last comment is necessary, on the paucity of secondary materials, or rather, on the paucity of secondary materials which could be relied
upon. It was necessary throughout the work to establish a point of departure for the testing of the original hypothesis. The result of this approach is an extremely critical evaluation of past works on the history of New France. It is hoped that the criticism of historians, past and present, is accepted as an honest judgment of their works alone, and not of themselves.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The following work, THE CANADIAN BOURGEOISIE, 1729-1748, began, as do some dissertations, on a more prosaic level. Nine years ago, the régime of the intendant Gilles Hocquart, 1729 to 1748, was the object chosen for research. A consideration of Hocquart's long term as chief civil officer of the colony had been suggested in a lecture of Dr. Guy Frégault's, the then Director of the Institut d'Histoire of the Université de Montréal, and presently sous-ministre du Ministère des Affaires Culturelles of Québec. Of the original topic all that remains is the time span, the years 1729 to 1748.

There was then, as there is now, an obvious gap in the history of New France. The historiography of the far northern colony of France, if the extant literature is any criterion, leads one to the inevitable conclusion that, apart from a few peccadillos, i.e., Dupuy's fight with the governor, the Marquis de Beaubois in the late 1720's, significant events ended in 1713 with the Treaty of Utrecht, and that the period to 1744, the beginning of a new series of wars in America, was uneventful. There has been a deplorable tendency in Canadian historiography on the French Régime in Canada to consider only what is called "drum and trumpet history". As research into the original topic progressed this historical void led to two significant modifications, ones that completely changed

---

1 Gustave Lanctot's synthesis, HISTOIRE DU CANADA, VOLUME 3: DU TRAITÉ D'UTRECHT AU TRAITÉ DE PARIS, 1713-1763, is a recent manifestation of the historiography which illustrates this phenomenon.
the original purposes of the present work.

The first was a modification of the study to that presently offered. That there has been little social and economic history of Canada written is a truism, and doubly so with reference to the French Régime. The years of Hocquart's administration, it was soon evident, were extremely rich in historical ores; not merely the common ores of wars, Indians, and the many battles for precedence, but more valuable nuggets, literally thousands upon thousands of pages of under-exploited economic documents. The lure of the unknown was overwhelming and the object of the research slowly began to shift from a study of a man, to the study of man and men in society. This, in itself, is by no means unusual in history: all historians study man and men in society. However, in terms of the French Régime it was, and is, unusual and particularly when the object of study is a social class which derives its position mainly from an economic base.

The study of the Canadian bourgeoisie, as a work hypothesis, was finalized in reaction to the work of another historian, Jean Hamelin, a member of the Institut d'Histoire of l'Université Laval. In 1960 he published his ECONOMIE ET SOCIETE EN NOUVELLE FRANCE. In it the author examined the commercial activities in New France from the origins of the colony until the conquest by the English. His researches, at that time, led him to the conclusion that there had been no bourgeoisie in New
France. The preliminary studies of the present writer on Gilles Hocquart, however, had indicated a somewhat different conclusion. The task of the present work became fixed: to examine, as Hamelin had, the existence of a class through economic interest, but unlike the work published in 1960, to consider a narrow period in depth rather than a broad period in more general terms.

The second modification, although directly related to the first, had more profound effects on the present work. The study of a class, and its activities, even when set in a period of time past, tends to depart from the sometimes narrow confines of history and encompass equal, allied and ancillary disciplines. Yet, if a class was to be studied, there appeared to be no other means of procedure. The decision was taken several years ago to do inter-disciplinary and comparative history as a technique leading to a better understanding of the French Régime in Canada, and it is presently supported by several recently published works by Americans, but in terms of Canadian history it is still somewhat the virgin

2 Professor Hamelin, in conversation with the present writer, has explained that he did not deny the existence of a bourgeoisie in New France, but rather of a grande bourgeoisie. Hamelin's last chapter, titled "Un être de raison", however, concludes that there was no bourgeoisie. See p. 137. Also, below, this chapter.

3 See the recent works by Thomas C. Cochran, THE INNER REVOLUTION: ESSAYS ON THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY; E.N. Saveth, ed., AMERICAN HISTORY AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES; W.J. Cahnman and A. Boskoff, eds., SOCIOLOGY AND HISTORY. Sir George Williams University, of Montreal, Québec, is presenting in the summer of 1966 a program titled SOCIOLOGY AND HISTORY. In November of 1965, the Institut d'Histoire of l'Université Laval held a public seminar under the general title of LA Bourgeoisie Canadienne Francaise: Ses Fondements Historiques. Participants presented papers from the points of view of two historians, one sociologist and one economist.
territory of Clio's domain. It is not, however, sufficient to declaim a difference; it is necessary to explain the difference.

The present study, at least in the first chapters, is historical entrepreneurship. Quite literally, in the same way that a business man may risk capital in the commercial world, the historian, through the use of a work hypothesis, uses a speculative idea. A probe is sent deep into the historical data; the test drill, the hypothesis, may or may not bring up ore samples of sufficient value to make them historically profitable. But, the possibility of historical profits makes the risk of historical capital worthwhile.

Perhaps one of the most extreme variants from the usual historical procedures is the lack of a consistent narrative form, the telling of a story. On the whole, the present work is analytical. The primary purpose of the study is not to tell a tale, but to analyse the writings and the concepts of the past histories of New France in the period under consideration; to establish criteria; support this criteria by reference to mass evidence; and to draw a conclusion based on the significance of this evidence. The result is a sometimes complex literary form, but it is the only possible way by which one can establish the validity, or lack of validity, of the thesis, using "thesis" in the radical sense of the word. Another departure from historical criteria is the loose chronological form. The rigid pattern of "in 1729", "in 1730", and so on, does not lend itself to social and economic analysis, and restricts the possibilities of the evidence in terms of interpretation. At times it
was found useful to draw support for a point from outside the time sequence of the present work.

The use of materials and methods from disciplines other than history has been mentioned. The use of tools drawn from other sciences of man is implicit in the title THE CANADIAN BOURGEOISIE, 1729-1748. A consideration of the structures, composition and functions of man, and men, belonging to a social class cannot, without distorting the study, bypass sociology, economics and political science. The first two, sociology and economics, loom almost as large as does history in the following pages. Nevertheless, the work is primarily historical in the sense that man in the past is the object of study. As well, unlike some branches of other social sciences concerned with the study of man, the present work is not concerned with the formulation of social laws; the purpose is more modest: to find out how men behaved.

The investment described as historical entrepreneurship is most evident in the second chapter: "A Colonial Bourgeoisie: A Work Hypothesis." The contents, the criteria of the study which follows, are explicitly stated. Basically, variations on one question are asked: what was the nature of the colonial society of New France? To ask a question is to presume a standard of judgment. The hypothesis, by the use of a comparative methodology, establishes a series of subsidiary criteria which are then used in the chapters that follow. What, for example, was the nature of the metropolitan society — France? Were the social and commercial structures of the mother country the same as those of the infant
colony? Can the metropolitan model be used as an analytic tool to reach an evaluation of the structures of the colonial society? If the answer to the preceding is no, then can a better methodological implement be found? Are the other colonial societies of the Americas better models for purposes of comparison? And, if yes, which of the colonies? The British-American colonies, as will be evident, and particularly the Northern ones, appear to afford the best basis for comparison. A tentative definition, a hypothesis, of a bourgeois class is reached in this second chapter. No one definition of a bourgeois class, as the term is used today, may be applied as an analytic tool to a consideration of a bourgeoisie in a colonial society. A further result of the hypothesis is to establish the social structures to be examined. Once established, these means and functions of testing the bourgeoisie hypothesis become the subject matter of the following chapters.

Commerce and money are generally accepted as at least one of the valid criterion of bourgeois classification. To state that there was commerce in New France is hardly sufficient to prove that there was a colonial bourgeoisie in the French colony. In the third chapter the levels of commerce are presented in absolute and relative terms. This, for purposes of comprehension, is preceded by a consideration of the units of currency, the necessary prelude to understanding the statistics cited. The comparison of currency units, and volumes of commerce of New France with those of British-America permits the use of terms such as high, average or low in a meaningful way. Income is another means
of determining social status. These are presented in this first of three sections devoted to "The Bourgeoisie and Commerce." This chapter, like that which preceded it, has a dual purpose: to add to historical knowledge by presenting historical data, facts; and, as important, to establish criteria based on statistical information which will serve the purposes of historical analysis within the chapter, and when applied to other sections which follow.

The two following parts, Chapters IV and V, consider problems related to entrepreneurship and credit facilities in New France. As well, the rôle of France, as a purchaser of goods and services, and as one of the mainstays of the economy of the colony, is presented. Some writers, Fernand Ouellet being an example, use the term entrepreneur to denote not merely an individual involved in commerce, but as a psychological type. This, according to Ouellet, is a necessary condition of bourgeois classification. Did, in fact, the commercial class of New France lack this mental attitude? Another matter considered is Hamelin's claim that the levels of profit in New France were insufficient to permit capital formation for investment purposes. These questions, these problems, are presented within the context of the colonial society. Also considered is this section, in the fifth chapter, are the sales to the state. The level of these, as suggested above, helps to determine the income level of the group classed as bourgeois.

In "The Bourgeoisie and the Hinterland", the subject matter of the
sixth chapter, the relations between commerce and the army are considered. Prior studies of the composition of the army of New France, and of the aristocracy from which were drawn the upper echelon of the Troupes de la Marine, have presented the post commandant, and army officer as part of a military class, and have spent less than just effort on the links between logistics, strategy, and the more mundane activities, such as making money. The relations of military position and economic power are investigated in this section of the work. Underlying the consideration of "The Bourgeoisie and the Hinterland" is a very fundamental question: was the military aristocracy also a commercial aristocracy?

One of the most often referred to, and least studied institutions of the French Régime in Canada is the seigniorial system, specially from the point of view of economic history. What was its nature? Who were the seigniors? To what class did they belong: the seigniorial class; the bourgeois class? Answers to these questions are proposed. The views of past historians, Munro, Adair, Trudel and Diamond are presented and analysed. The questions unasked by these past writers are investigated, and a radical revision of the seigniorial class results. The hypothesis is presented as a chapter title: "The Bourgeoisie and the Seigniorial System", and permits, as will be evident, a rapprochement, an analytic consideration of the institution in a new light, and with somewhat different results.

The three following chapters, "The Bourgeoisie and the Administ-
ration", consider the links between judicial, administrative, military and economic power. The Superior Council, the supreme judicial body in the colony, is considered first. Who were its members? What were their functions; their salaries; their relations with each other, and with members of other administrative groups? Most important, was there a relation between the members of the Council and the commercial activities of the colony? The civil administration, Chapter IX, considers the same questions. As well, the commercial and personal links between members of this group, and others such as the so-called military aristocracy are analysed. The three chapters on the administration, ending with the military État major, will also present the pecuniary benefits of employment by the state. In particular, the total remuneration of the individuals, when compared to that of the average wage, will provide a significant criterion of social classification.

The penultimate chapter, "The Bourgeoisie and Marriage", will consider class structures in New France through the medium of marital and personal relations. A close examination of who married whom will, perhaps, reveal unsuspected alliances quite apart from the more obvious purposes of marriage: procreation or romantic love. Marriage as a source of power during the French Régime in Canada has been, up to now, a too-neglected analytic tool of social analysis.

The conclusion will repeat the hypothesis as a thesis, and test its validity in the light of the evidence proffered.
A COLONIAL BOURGEOISIE: A WORK HYPOTHESIS

It has been, unfortunately, unusual in recent historiography on the French Régime in Canada to begin an interpretative piece of research by a definition. This is specially true of the works concerned with the existence, or non-existence, of a colonial bourgeoisie in New France, be it a petite, moyenne or grande bourgeoisie. The value and accuracy of the works of Michel Brunet, Guy Frégault, Fernand Ouellet, Jean Hamelin, Hubert Guindon, and Philippe Garigue cannot be given, therefore, until such time as at least a preliminary definition is established, and until a criterion is offered, which will permit a valid judgment.

There is an immediate objection that may be raised to this procedure: the facts, according to one historiographical concept, should speak for themselves. This rather naive positivistic concept merely results in the use of ill-defined work axioms. The preferable work

1 Michel Brunet, "La Conquête anglaise et la déchéance de la bourgeoisie canadienne, (1760-1793)." (Hereafter Brunet, Déchéance).
2 Guy Frégault, CANADIAN SOCIETY DURING THE FRENCH REGIME. (Hereafter Frégault, SOCIETY).
3 Fernand Ouellet, "M. Michel Brunet et le problème de la Conquête."
4 Jean Hamelin, ÉCONOMIE ET SOCIÉTÉ EN NOUVELLE FRANCE.
5 Hubert Guindon, "The Social Evolution of Quebec Reconsidered."
6 Philippe Garigue, "The Social Evolution of Quebec: A Reply."
base is the overt declaration of what Louis Gottschalk has called "...the interrogative hypothesis." Research in history presumes prior interest, prior knowledge, prior opinions and perhaps even prior, and distorting, prejudices. "History", it has been written, "is basically a series of questions asked by the historian and answered by him through the interpretation of evidence." The purposes of the historians, however, may differ.

There are presently three distinct groups or schools of interpretation involved in the controversy over the existence of a Canadien bourgeoisie. The first position is that put forward and sustained by Jean Hamelin and Fernand Ouellet, both, at the time that they expressed their views, of l'Université Laval. They claim that the decapitation of the Canadian bourgeoisie, claimed by Michel Brunet, is "...séduisante, mais correspond-elle à l'exacte réalité? Il est permis de poser la question, car l'hypothèse a été lancée sans qu'aucune recherche exhaustive ne vienne l'étayer."  

7 Louis Gottschalk, UNDERSTANDING HISTORY: A PRIMER ON HISTORICAL RESEARCH, p. 141.
8 Edward Eastman McCullough and Cameron Nish, A PRIMER ON HISTORICAL RESEARCH, p. 22.
9 Professor Hamelin is still a member of the Institut d'Histoire of l'Université Laval. He appears, if oral testimony is accepted, to have significantly modified his views since 1960. Prof. Ouellet, since the fall of 1965, has been a member of the History Department at Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
10 Hamelin, p. 127.
The main centre of the pro-bourgeoisie hypothesis is in Montréal where Dr. Michel Brunet, the present Director of the Department of History, and his immediate predecessor, Dr. Guy Frégault, both contend that "La Nouvelle-France eu sa bourgeoisie. Celle-ci occupait les postes de commande dans le commerce, dans l'industrie, dans l'armée, et dans l'administration. Elle se composait de nobles et de roturiers."

The third school of interpretation is that of two sociologists: Philippe Garigue, the Dean of the Social Sciences of l'Université de Montréal, and Hubert Guindon of the Department of Sociology of Sir George Williams University, in Montreal. These scholars do not debate the fact of a Canadian bourgeoisie during the French Régime, but rather the effects of the Conquest on French-Canadian society since 1760. Garigue supports the interpretations of Brunet and Frégault. He bases his whole argument on the validity of the positions of the two historians, a precarious position, to say the least. Guindon criticizes not Ouellet, Hamelin, Frégault or Brunet, but Garigue.

A striking characteristic of the writings of the six controversialists is their concern not with the past nature of Canadien society, but with its present status. Hamelin, for example, in his conclusion

---

11 Brunet, Déchéance, p. 50.
12 Garigue, p. 28.
13 Guindon, p. 534.
states that:

L'absence d'une vigoureuse bourgeoisie canadienne-française en 1800 apparaît ainsi comme l'aboutissement du régime français non pas comme une conséquence de la Conquête. Car le drame de la colonisation française au Canada c'est de n'avoir pu former une bourgeoisie canadienne-française assise sur l'exploitation rationelle des ressources naturelles du pays.

Guindon advances the thesis that the important groups involved in the settlement of Canada were "...the colonial administrators, soldiers, businessmen...clergy, and immigrant population." It is notable that from this declaration, he goes on to state a historical anachronism, claiming for the clergy of New France a position they held in Canadian society not before 1760, but after the Conquest. Evident in Guindon's writings, as in Garigue's, are their concern with the problems of contemporary French Canada, specially the anti-clericalism of the quiet-revolutionists rather than with the realities of Canadian society during the period prior to 1760.

Fernand Ouellet's position might be classified as neo-Tawneyism, or at least as a post-Marxian view. His estimate of Canadien society during the French Régime reflects the influences of the "Protestant Ethic", and a blending of 19th century liberal postulates. In many ways,

15 Guindon, p. 534.
16 Guindon, p. 534.
M. Ouellet reflects the social and economic characterisations found in
the works of two well-known English-language Canadian historians: Donald
Creighton and A.R.M. Lower. Ouellet emphasizes the antipathy between
a bourgeois-capitalist mentality and that of the mercantilists. His
rejection of the bourgeoisie hypothesis is also based on psychological
grounds. "Conscient des valeurs individuelles," he has written, "le
bourgeois capitaliste se caractérise par son dynamisme économique. En
conséquence, il rejette tout paternalisme tout en étant capable d'utiliser
le pouvoir politique à ses fins." His criteria are drawn from his
studies of Sombart, and the latter's collaborators. Ouellet's ultimate
base of judgment is that "Il faut alors chercher à découvrir les éléments
sur lequels se fonde leur conscience de groupe."

The basic positions of the upholders of the pro-bourgeoisie
hypothesis have been set forward by Guy Frégault. He wrote:

It is not easy to draw precisely the line which separates
the middle class from the upper middle class, or that
which divided the latter from the aristocracy. As a
matter of fact, the last two groups were really one. In
the seventeenth century, the King gave Charles Le Moyne

17 Donald Creighton, THE COMMERCIAL EMPIRE OF THE SAINT LAWRENCE,
specially the first chapters.
18 A.R.M. Lower, COLONY TO NATION: A HISTORY OF CANADA.
19 Ouellet, pp. 95-96.
20 Ouellet, p. 95. Ouellet's emphasis.
21 Ouellet, p. 94.
patents of nobility; but after becoming a noble Le Moyne continued to engage in trade...Titled or not, the lesser nobility or the upper middle class, the upper stratum of society, enriched by commerce, set the tone of the society.

This statement, somewhat lacking in clarity in its use of terms, is weakened further by a question which preceded it. "Why did Canada", Frégault asks, "succeed in postponing for half a century the effects of the defeat of 1713? Because it benefited from two conditions which were to disappear between 1760 and 1763: it remained within the orbit of French colonisation and it preserved its upper middle class." Brunet, in a note, puts forward a similar idea. Both, at least implicitly, advance the Conquest Hypothesis, and the effects of a conquest on a society.

The controversy can be narrowed to two groups: Hamelin-Ouellet versus Frégault-Brunet. The two sociologists are, due to their concerns and disciplines, ancillary to the controversy. Neither Garigue nor Guindon have undertaken the research necessary to support their positions vis-à-vis the French Régime. It is possible to place Ouellet and Brunet in the same camp. Neither of these historians are primarily interested in the history of New France. Brunet, although a frequent commentator on French Canada, does not teach the subject. Further, his researches

23 Frégault, SOCIETY, p. 9.
24 Brunet, Déchéance, n., p. 55.
25 Frégault and Brunet base many of their ideas on Professor Maurice Séguin's views. M. Séguin, a member of the Department of History of l'Université de Montréal, seldom, unfortunately, publishes his ideas.
have centred on the post-conquest period. Ouellet is a specialist in the history of 19th century French Canada. Both, however, are valuable to their respective sides as the promulgators of ideas concerned with the bourgeoisie of New France.

The opponents justifiably accuse Frégault and Brunet of affirming the existence of a social group without having established the validity of the social class by prior research in class structures. The protagonists assume, but do not define. This applies, it should be noted, more to Brunet than to Frégault. Ouellet has asked, correctly, "Cette affirmation nous amène a nous demander ce que M. Brunet entend par bourgeoisie." He cites Brunet's answer, but finding it unsatisfactory, again repeats his query: "Qu'est-ce qu'un bourgeois?" Ouellet's own answer is that the Canadien merchant was suppressed by the paternalism of the French state, besides which, when the Canadien of the French Régime did make money, he dissipated it in his attempts to live as a noble. To Ouellet, under the influence of the "Protestant Ethic", the

26 See his LA PRESENCE ANGLAISE ET LES CANADIENS.
27 Frégault's SOCIETY is a pamphlet of 15 pages.
28 Ouellet, p. 94.
29 Ouellet, p. 95. While Ouellet does ask the right question, let it be noted that he does not necessarily give the right answers. His opponents invert Ouellet's faults; they do not ask the questions, but give the answers.
30 Ouellet.
noble and the merchant were antonyms.

One of the primary weaknesses of past writings on the subject of the Canadian bourgeoisie is most evident in Hamelin's work. After writing a work devoted to a consideration of the possibility of a bourgeois class in New France, he concluded with the affirmation that there was no bourgeoisie in the colony, and wrote in an extensive footnote that:

Le mot bourgeois est un vocable imprécis qui peut recouvrir des réalités fort différentes. Une étude sur la bourgeoisie canadienne-française devrait d'abord définir le sens du mot bourgeoisie, quels sont les critères qui classent un homme dans la grande, moyenne ou petite bourgeoisie. Est-ce le revenu, le rôle social, ou quoi? Puis, ayant sur des données concrètes chiffré approximativement cette bourgeoisie à des époques différentes, il faudrait interpréter son rôle social, politique et économique par rapport à la réalité canadienne, non pas par rapport au statut de la bourgeoisie européenne.

---


32 Hamelin, n. 4, p. 132. Professor Hamelin, in a note to the present writer, denies that he meant that there was no bourgeoisie in New France. On pp. 127, and 137, of his work, he questions the existence of a "bourgeoisie canadienne-française". On pp. 129 and 130, he writes of a "grande bourgeoisie". His footnote, in the opinion of the present writer, supports the lack of clarity of his definition.
This footnote must be the point of departure for a valid study of the bourgeoisie of New France. Was there, or was there not, a class or group of men whose functions in the society of the French Régime may be defined as those of a bourgeois class? A definition, presented as a hypothesis, therefore, is the necessary prelude to the present study.

There has been a tendency to use what may be called a classic concept of social classification on the part of those attempting to characterize the social structures of European and of colonial societies,

Max Weber, a classic sociologist, has written that:

A class is any group of persons occupying the same class status. The following types of classes may be distinguished: (a) a "property class"...is primarily determined by the differentiation of property holdings; (b) a class is an "acquisitive" class when the class situation of its members is primarily determined by their opportunity for the exploitation of services on the market;...In principle control over the different combinations of consumer goods, means of production, investments, capital funds, or marketable abilities constitutes class statuses which are different with each variation and combination.

Another classic definition, one is tempted to say post-Marxian definition, is that found in the work of Henri Sée. The simple, and misleading, First, Second and Third Estate division. Sée himself points out that this global grouping does less than justice to the com-

---

34 See the Barbers book, referred to on p. 17, n. 31, for a more recent contribution to the study of European social classes.
plex economic differentiations within a society. His reservations, how­ever, are limited to the necessity of further sub-divisions within the Third Estate, and he does not reject the rather rigid pattern of the two upper classes. Weber and Sée offered definitions of social structures of European societies. One question that must be asked, one hypothesis that must be investigated, is the applicability of the European model as an analytic tool when studying a colonial society.

Dictionary definitions may assist in the clarification of the character of a bourgeois class. Sainte-Palaye, in his Dictionnaire Historique de l'Ancien Régime defines a bourgeois as "...mis en opposition avec villain, homme de village...Il est synonyme de civis citoyen..." The lack of precision of the term may be illustrated by his additional classifications of types of bourgeois: "...bourgeois fieffez du roi...Bourgeois de dedans, internes ou habitants..." and "...Bourgeois forain, externes..." Other descriptions add more definitions and types, rather than characterize clearly. The bourgeois is a freeman; the class between the worker and the landed nobility; or the term is used as a synonym for capitalist. Another characterization offered is that the

---

35 Henri Sée, LA FRANCE ECONOMIQUE ET SOCIALE AU 18iè. SIECLE, p. 7.  
37 Sainte-Palaye, p. 86. Sainte-Palaye's emphasis.  
bourgeois is not only a resident of a city, but he is as well opposed to
the military. The ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES' article on
the "bourgeoisie" advances this definition: "The term, originally de-
noting the members of a mediaeval borough, derived its specific social
connotation from the relation of the master and journeyman in the handy-
crafts and small manufactories of France during the seventeenth, eighteend-
and early nineteenth centuries. Bourgeois came to be synonymous with
patron or employer."

Another means of social analysis is the legal status of the indiv-
idual or class. Leclercq, in his LECONS DE DROIT NATUREL insists, as do
most writers on the subject, that "La Bourgeoisie est une classe sociale
difficile à définir, parce que c'est une classe de fait et non de loi." He
further adds that property or money may be used as a base for classif-
ication. But, again, as do many others, his general characterizations
of the French Régime, and its classes, implies the use of the term Ancien
Régime in a pejorative sense. Privileges were the result only of birth
or administrative functions; and the bourgeoisie was classed lower on
the social scale than was the clergy and the nobility. Another defin-

39 DICTIONNAIRE ENCYCLOPEDIQUE QUILLET, p. 103.
40 Carl Brinkman, "Bourgeoisie", ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF THE SOCIAL
41 Jacques Leclercq, LECONS DE DROIT NATUREL, vol. 1: LES DROITS
ET DEVOIRS INDIVIDUELS, p. 224.
42 Leclercq, p. 224.
43 Leclercq, p. 225.
ition, that of an accepted authority on the subject, Gaetano Mosca, is that "The Bourgeoisie in the broad sense of the term, composes (sic) the numerous class of people who find employment in the liberal professions, in commerce and in industry, and who combine moderate means with a technical and often scientific education that is far superior to that of other social classes."

In all of the views and characterizations presented there is an evident tendency to divide society into estates, or classes, with mutually exclusive concerns and functions. There is agreement on the difficulties of classification; the urban nature of the bourgeois class; and on the group's concern with money, commerce, the professions and education. Brinkman has somewhat modified the tendency to a rigid class structure. He views the bourgeoisie as "...succeeding waves of middle class groups ascending from the ranks of the peasants, artisans and laborers through the position of bourgeois merchant and manufacturer to that of a landowning, political or administrative aristocracy." Here, however, the rise through to that of again results in only a modified estates concept.

More recent, but as yet seldom applied social classifications exist. Elinor Barber, for example, attributes to René Fage the view that

45 Brinkman, pp. 654-655.
"...the bourgeois were those owning real estate, engaged in commerce and the liberal professions, as well as those having careers in the official financial administration - treasurers of France, controllers of the King's domain, receveur de taille, etc." This differentiated, but more encompassing social classification is supported by Dollinger's definition of the bourgeoisie as an urban social group noted for its economic and political influence, specially when they presented a striking moral conformity or family cohesion.

In our rather extended consideration of the nature of a bourgeoisie, one factor has not been noted: a colonial bourgeoisie. Few definitions exist. One, however, does, albeit a summary one. Robert Mandrou, in a recent conference, differentiated a colonial bourgeoisie from a metropolitan bourgeoisie. The former, he said, was a multiple-function group, that is, concerned with many aspects of the society in which they lived, such as commerce, the administration, landowning and so on. They also had a greater opportunity for class mobility. The metropolitan group, specially after 1660, was less mobile, and more bound by the classic concepts of class structures characteristic of the Old Régime.

---

46 René Fage, "La Vie a Tulle aux 17è et 18è siècle, (Paris, 1902), cited by Elinor Barber, THE BOURGEOISIE IN 18th CENTURY FRANCE, p. 16. The extract cited on p. 17, n.31, by Barber is drawn from this work.


Any characterization of a bourgeois class is subject to close scrutiny, for neither historians, sociologists, economists, political scientists nor jurists agree as to the exact meaning of the term. The word bourgeois is often used synecdochically. The ideas presented of the classic, and the modified classic concepts have all too often served as a micro model for purposes of social analysis of societies and eras which are different, specifically colonial societies. It may well be asked if this is a valid historical procedure.

Jean Hamelin, in referring to New France, noted that the word bourgeois was seldom, in fact almost never, used to define a class, group or function. In the documents of the 17th and 18th centuries, in New France, the word is encountered, but it refers to individuals, and their privileges as individuals and not as a class. The word is never used in its modern sense. In its narrowest application, the word bourgeois, never bourgeoisie, retained its root meaning: resident of a city. A slight extension of the word may be inferred: bourgeois was often coupled with the word marchand and/or négociant, at times literally, but

---


50 See the impositions on the bourgeois of Montréal, "Bordereau...1732"; "Bordereau...1736"; "Bordereau...1739"; "Bordereau...1740"; "Bordereau...1741"; "Bordereau...1742"; "Bordereau...1743"; P.A.C. C 11 A, vols. 113-2, p. 468; 114-1, p. 11; p. 98; p. 261; 114-2, p. 336; 115-1, p. 34.
most often inferentially. This idea may be extended further. Commercial activities were permitted to the nobles and gentilhommes of New France by French law. The king's edict of 1685 permitted the nobility to trade on land or sea without fear of dérogéance, that is, loss of noble status. This was a colonial privilege for the nobility of France had to wait until 1701 for the same right, and, as Professor Mandrou has suggested, the society of France was not prepared to accept the fact. The participation of the class called seigniorial and noble in the commercial activities of New France was also evident after 1717, when the merchants of the colony were permitted to assemble daily to dis-

51 "Requête de Simon Mars,...marchand, 24 avril, 1681", Les Bourgeois sous le régime français, B.R.H., vol. 24, p. 348, and "Arrêt du Conseil Supérieur de Québec qui permet au Sieur François Vieney Pachot, Marchand forain, de jouir des privilèges dont jouissent les autres habitants de ce pays...", ARRTS ET REGLEMENTS DU CONSEIL SUPERIEUR DE QUEBEC, vol. 2, p. 87. (Hereafter AR.), and "Arrêt qui révoque le privilège accordé aux Srs. Cugnet, Gamelin, Taschereau, Olivier de Vezain et Simonet pour l'exploitation des mines de fer de St. Maurice...Versailles, 1 mai, 1743"; P.A.C., F 3, vol. 13, 1 partie, f 70, and "Memoire de Cugnet, Québec, le vingt quatre octobre, 1743"; P.A.C., E, François Etienne Cugnet, carton 101, p. 9-26; and "Deliberation des Créanciers du Sr. Cugnet, Québec, 18 août, 1742", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 114-1, f. 235-236. (The examples of the inter-changibility of the terms bourgeois, marchand and négociants are extensive in the P.A.C. series C 11 A; B; E; and the calendars prepared by the Archives of the Province of Québec, see specially GREFFES DES NOTAIRES, vols. 1-20.)


cuss their affairs. The merchants, nobles and seigniors were, apparently, the same people. A further insight into individual functions and class designation is afforded by the descriptions contained in the documents concerning the Compagnie de la Colonie, formed in 1700. A prime mover, and a very large shareholder, was described as "Charles Aubert Ecuyer, Seigneur de la Chefnay, Conseiller au Conseil Souverain de Quebec." Another member of the company mentioned in the same document was the "Sieur François Mathieu Maturin, Sieur Delino, Marchand Bourgeois du dit Quebec..." The latter was also a member of the company and of the Superior Council; Delino had the same functions and the same commercial interests as did the sieur Aubert.

The use of the term bourgeois, in New France, meant a city dweller. The term may be extended, and applied in conjunction with terms such as marchand and négociant. The two latter words were, as well, applied to residents of areas other than the city. Further, the term bourgeois, in some ways, may also be applied to the noble and the seignior. One of the hypotheses which may be formulated and investigated, must include the notation that the term of social characterization, and social status in New France, was not very precise. For example, one contemporary doc-

54 "Arrêt qui permet aux Négociants des Villes de Québec, et de Montréal de s'assembler tous les jours dans un endroit convenable, pour y traiter de leurs affaires de Commerce, 11 mai, 1717", EDITS, ORDONNANCES, DECLARATIONS DU CONSEIL DU ROI, vol. 1, p. 369. (Hereafter EOR.)

55 "Amendement fait par les procureurs généraux des Directeurs Généraux à l'article XXe du Règlement pour la compagnie du Canada...28 mai, 1701", EOR., p. 285. Also, Guy Frégault, "La Compagnie de la Colonie", pp. 127-149.
ument will refer to one man as a noble and gentilhomme, and another as a marchand-bourgeois in spite of similar activities and political functions. The hypothesis simply stated is: the social group cannot, in the French Régime, be determined merely by contemporary appellations. The base of social classification must include functions, actions, and this is the only valid analytic tool.

The functions and actions of individuals can be studied in a variety of ways. Hamelin has suggested, although he has not implemented, a study of the society of New France by means of comparison with those of European social structures. Pierre Harvey, in his review of Hamelin's work, has written that "...dans toute explication qu'on donnera de la stagnation de l'économie de la Nouvelle-France il faudra prendre soin de vérifier ce que deviendra l'hypothèse lorqu'on l'appliquera aux colonies britanniques..." New France, in other words, must be placed within a historical context relative to the period of its existence. Inquiries into the nature of Canadien society must use as criteria of classification, the standards common to the metropolis and, more important, those common to other colonial areas. The utility of comparative history is another hypothesis advanced, and the application of this hypothesis as a valid method must be tested. The criteria of classification, and of social analysis, may be a money-based criterion,

56
Hamelin, n. 4, p. 132.
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Harvey, p. 540.
a comparison of social structures as sources of power, and lastly, a comparison of accepted dominant ideologies.

The first, the money criterion, has associated with it the commercial activities of New France. The volume of these and income levels have been used by Hamelin as a proof against the existence of a vigourous bourgeoisie. In particular he noted the level of capitation. The tax of 1754, Hamelin wrote, classed an assessed "60 marchands des plus aïsés: 60 livres", and "100 marchands moins aïsés: 30 livres...comment concevoir que des commerçants extrêmement riches ne seraient taxés qu'a 60 livres, alors qu'un "habitant" dit aisé voit le fisc lui demander 40 58 livres..." Hamelin is thinking in absolute rather than comparative terms. He used a capitation tax as an income factor for the year 1754, and then questioned the meaning of the term wealth without giving his criterion.

There exists, in the work of Ligou and Garrison, a social classification of the metropolitan society based on the capitation. It provides a comparative criterion. "Si l'on tente une définition toute fiscale d'une classe sociale," they wrote of the tax of 1762, "on fixera à 10 livres de capitation la frontière très arbitraire, répétons-le, et nullement étranche, entre la bourgeoisie et le peuple; à partir de 30 ou 40 livres pourrait se situer la démarcation entre la petite et moyenne

---

Hamelin, p. 128.
bourgeoisie et la classe supérieure." From this, as a hypothesis, and perhaps as a conclusion, one can at least state that there were 160 bourgeois in the city of Montréal in 1754. For the moment let the hypothesis be restricted to the value of comparisons as a means of classification.

Another monetary criterion used by Hamelin was the value of the letters of credit and exchange, the billets and the card money belonging to Canadians. He determined their value, to whom they were due, and concluded that the citizens of New France did not own a sufficient amount to permit classification among the grande bourgeoisie. Again, no comparative criterion was established.

After the conquest of New France, a list of the outstanding debts was drawn up. In the list of the holders of French notes, we find, among others, that Pierre Papin owned 14,029 livres of currency; the sieur Hervieux, 15,606 livres, 10 sols; 60,796 livres, 15 sols were

59 D. Ligou and J.E. Garrison, "La Bourgeoisie Reformée Montalbanaise à la fin de l'Ancien Régime.", p. 381.
60 Hamelin, pp. 129-130.
held by Jacques Hervieux; Pierre Ranger listed 65,828 livres, 10 sols and Joseph Dugas 27,392 livres. These men's claims dated back, at the latest, to 1756; most of the claims were for the years 1758-1760. It should be noted that the sums listed as due to these men referred only to those owed by the French government and did not include any monies due, or gained from commercial activities with individuals or private companies. Hamelin makes two claims, both negating the existence of a grande bourgeoisie in New France. The sums were not high enough, and the monetary forms, the card money, letters of exchange, were deleterious to the economy. Ligou and Garrison again permit a more valid assessment.

En effet, la lettre de change est leur monnaie courante...
En 1762, Paul Sol, marchand, fait l'état des billets et obligations qui lui sont dus: sa fortune en argent liquide se monte à 407 livres, sa fortune en papier est de 28,864 livres.
On comprend donc que cette situation brillante soit assez peu solide et que des faillites nombreuses jalonnent l'histoire du commerce montalbanais dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle; ces fortunes ne résistent pas à la crise

---

66 "Suspension du paiement des Lettres de Change, 15 octobre, 1759."
DOCUMENTS RELATING TO CANADIAN CURRENCY, EXCHANGE AND FINANCE DURING THE FRENCH PERIOD, vol. 2, pp. 928-932, (Hereafter Shortt, CURRENCY.)
67 Ligou and Garrison, p. 390. Also, Hamelin, pp. 130, 46. For a more extended examination of the comparative value of money, and of commercial volume, see below, and specially Chapters III, IV and V. For the moment, the proof offered is meant as a hypothesis and not a detailed examination.
causée par la perte du Canada, de 1763-1766, aggravée par une terrible inondation.

What hypothesis is permitted? The levels of fortune were, in our terms, low, but figures in the twenty-thousands, in the 18th century, were high. Also, the merchants of France, the bourgeoisie of Montalban, at least, had some economic factors in common with those of New France. This use of comparison will permit us, in the pages to follow, to establish the significance of the volumes of commerce, internal and external, and determine the contemporary value of entrepreneurial capital. It appears to be a valid analytic tool.

The political system of New France's metropolis, and by implication, that of the colony, have been characterized as unprogressive and hostile to bourgeois interests. The bourgeoisie, even at the expense of economic loss, was prone to seek political office as a means to higher social status, it is said. It is also said that there was an inalienable dichotomy between money and political power; between social status and economic and political function. A correlative of this view is that the dominant political and business ethics of New France were paternalistic and mercantilistic, while those of the British-American colonies were nurtured in a democratic and salutary neglect milieu.

69 Régine Pernoud, LES ORIGINES DE LA BOURGEOISIE, p. 78.
70 Creighton, pp. 117-118; Lower, pp. 46-50; Ouellet, pp. 95-96.
This interpretation of the differences between the English and French colonies requires some comment, and will lead to a further work hypothesis.

What is mercantilism? Often used, but seldom understood, this economic theory which dominated the political and commercial life of the Americas in the colonial period, has been defined by Nettels as that system which:

...encouraged the merchants, shippers, and manufacturers by conferring benefits upon them, and by identifying their private interests with the highest needs of the state. So close was this identification that one may properly regard the theory of mercantilism as a rationalization of the special interests of the dominant groups of the time. The mercantilist policy was an expression of an accord between the landowners and merchant-capitalists in alliance with the Crown.

Nettels suggests that an alliance and not a dichotomy between political and economic power existed. The specifics support this generalization. The members of a political structure in Massachusetts, for example, in spite of annual elections for office in the Council, had an average tenure of 10.5 years." The members were of the better sort, what in New France were called gentilhommes. They were, Labaree has written, "...those who by inheritance or acquisition owned the larg-

---

71 Curtis P. Nettels, "British Mercantilism and the Economic Development of the Thirteen Colonies", p. 106. See also Stuart Bruchey's THE ROOTS OF AMERICAN ECONOMIC GROWTH, 1607-1861, pp. 16-73, for a general application, and the significance of, the mercantile system in the British-American colonies.

72 W.L. Labaree, CONSERVATISM IN EARLY AMERICA, pp. 24-25.
est estates, had the best family connections, and most firmly supported
the existing political system." In Virginia, another British-American
colony with an elective system, 60% of the places on the Council from
1680 until the Revolution were held by 23 families. All the provin-
cial councillors in the Colony of New York, from 1760 to 1775, were mer-
chants or members of families related to landowners. The evidence sug-
gests that domination by a clique was a usual pattern in the democratic
British-American colonies.

A further illustration of the lack of conflict between progress
and paternalism, at least in colonial societies, has been well expressed
by Arthur Lewis: "Collective actions and cohesive sentiment are not
merely necessary to growth, they may in certain circumstances achieve
results superior to those achieved by individualism. A cohesive group
organized on authoritarian lines is probably better able to attain given
objectives than a group individualistically inclined."

73  Labaree, p. 28.
74  Labaree, p. 7.
75  Labaree, pp. 42-43. For similar views see Virginia D. Harrington's
THE NEW YORK MERCHANT ON THE EVE OF THE REVOLUTION; A.M. Schles-
inger's THE COLONIAL MERCHANT AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, 1763-1776;
C.L. Becker's THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE PROVINCE OF NEW
YORK, 1760-1776.
Lewis' emphasis.
A hypothesis, to be a valid analytic tool, must also state criterion; it must establish the types of commercial endeavours, and delineate the types of individuals who participated in these economic activities in the society under consideration. Again, the British-American model furnishes insights. Robert East has listed six characteristics of the British-American merchants: 1) varied interests; 2) the need to export to sustain letters of credit and exchange; 3) a concern with local trade and a constant need to collect species; 4) the use of letters of credit as a business barometer; 6) the personal relations and partnerships as a means of furthering commercial endeavours. Support and elaboration of these characteristics have been provided by Virginia Harrington and others. The British-American colonies lacked two institutions generally associated with a bourgeois society: corporations and commercial banks. The northern British-American colonies had adverse trade balances with their metropolis. Hamelin noted, and used this factor as a negative one. In New York, in part due to restrictions imposed by England on the manufacture of goods, the merchants invested in land rather than in trade and industry. New France also lacked

78 Harrington, p. 48, and Bruchey, pp. 32-37.
79 Harrington, p. 353.
80 Hamelin, p. 33.
81 Schlesinger, pp. 20-21.
industry. Harrington, with reference to New York, characterizes a class and its functions, political figures, merchants, landowners and professionals as one class; East describes these many functions as those participated in by the merchants. "In view of the many difficulties he faced," Bruchey has written, "it is small wonder that the colonial merchant approached the business of earning his living with many fingers in many small pies."

Among the factors to look for in elaborating a class structure, and class functions in New France, then, are the similarities with other colonial societies. This is another classificatory term of the present study. There remains two aspects of colonial societies to be viewed: the means of power, economic, political and social, and a brief comment on the ideologies of 17th and 18th century America. The means to power are a monopoly of the economic activities; control of military office; land grants; dominance of the political structures; and marriage. An examination of the dominant class in the British-American colonies has led some scholars to the conclusion that there was one cohesive group, "...a class of great landowners were soon recognized", Labaree has written, "as the aristocrats of the province. They, and their allies, the

82 Hamelin, pp. 119-121.
83 Harrington, p. 2.
84 East, p. 16.
85 Bruchey, p. 54.
merchants, and later the lawyers, came to dominate the politics of the colony..." of New York. "...the heads of the great families occupied the seats on the governor's council." Harrington has questioned the validity of the social classification of a contemporary witness, Cadwaller Colden: "...landed proprietors," the Lieutenant-Governor of the Colony of New York had written, "the lawyers, the merchants, and a fourth estate compromising the small farmers and artisans.", was the characterization of Colden. An extended period of inter-marriage, according to Harrington, had fused the three first groups into one. Labaree, in slightly more colorful language, wrote that "...their genealogical trees..." became "...veritable jungles of interwoven branches." The relatively restricted group which dominated the society was not, however, a closed one. Marriage was a means of recruiting capital, new office holders and new privileges. In Virginia and New York the blending of power in all its aspects has been noted. The policy of the governors was to grant lands to prominent citizens as a means of bettering their relations with the elites of the colonial societies. "Within

86 Labaree, p. 10.
88 Harrington, p. 10.
89 Labaree, pp. 2-3.
90 Lewis, p. 84.
91 Labaree, pp. 29-30; 30-34; Becker, p. 8.
the gift of the governors were public offices 'dealing with matters that profoundly affected the basis of economic life-tax collection, customs regulations, and the bestowal of land grants.'", Bruchey has written. He continued: "An 'inner circle of privilege' arose and in time became a wedge dividing the merchants into those who benefited and those who did not."

The hypothesis which may be derived from this is simply stated: the better sort, the aristocracy of the British-American colonies was a cohesive and closely related group. Did the better sort of New France, the gentilhommes, the merchants, the administrators of the French colony belong to a similar group?

Much has been made by those opposing the bourgeoisie hypothesis of the lack of a business ethic in New France. Underlying such criticisms is the relation seen, and assumed, of a link between the ideologies of the British-American colonies and their commercial activities. Generalizations such as the "Protestant Ethic", the "spirit of capitalism", the egalitarian and democratic political institutions and their necessary relationship with commerce, are implicit mental categories in Ouellet.

92 Bruchey, p. 55.
93 Hamelin, p. 137; Ouellet, pp. 95-96.
94 Ouellet, p. 94.
In New France, on the other hand, we have terms such as aristocracy, paternalism and mercantilism used in very pejorative senses. On the factual level, our consideration of the social structures of the colonies to the South of New France tend to indicate a different society than that which might be expected from such "democratic" institutions. Bruchey, to cite but one writer on the subject, after examining both the ideas of the "spirit of capitalism", and after considering the nature of the requirements of colonial societies in America, reasonably concluded that the Weberian value was less than accurate.

The hypothesis used as an analytic method in the pages to follow may be stated categorically: the assumed link between individualism, radicalism, political liberty, free trade, laissez-faire, salutary neglect, and the host of other euphemisms, as a basic requirement for the existence of a bourgeois class in a colonial society, are rejected. The hypothesis asserts that functions, and not traditional concepts of class structures are the basis of any valid assessment. What people do is at least as important as what they say they are; in fact, it is more important. If in the following consideration of the actions of the citizens of New France in the period 1729 to 1749, are encountered activities attributed to the functions of a bourgeois class, then those

96 Professor Dubuc, of l'Université de Montréal, presented this factor as a necessary one in a presentation at l'Université Laval, "Conférence sur la bourgeoisie canadienne-française: ses fondements historiques", November 13, 1965.
individuals engaging in these activities may be called bourgeois. If there exists a monopoly of commerce in the colony of New France, and this commerce is of a sufficient volume, which we will determine comparatively, then this will be considered as evidence of bourgeois activity. If there is an evident monopoly of political power, and a high enough financial reward, this will be considered as a proof of bourgeois activity. If there is an evident, provable social cohesiveness, achieved by a variety of means, this will be a further proof.

Not as a hypothesis, but as a tentative conclusion, we can now also appreciate that a definite opinion on the views of the opponents and protagonists of the bourgeoisie hypothesis must await the evidence. This must await the conclusion of the present study.

The use of such an approach, while it may depart from strict, i.e. traditional historical norms, is justified. As Thomas Cochran has written:

Careful advance statement of categories to be examined, questions to be answered, and methods to be used will call attention not only to the anticipated aspects of the evidence but also to those that were not expected.

97 Cochran, p. 33.
THE BOURGEOISIE AND COMMERCE: I: 
COMPARATIVE LEVELS

The present chapter, the first of three on "The Bourgeoisie and Commerce", will investigate the levels of commerce in New France. The aim is to establish that there existed in the colony a commerce of sufficient value to permit the participants in the commercial life of the colony to be characterized as engaging in an activity usually considered as one of the criterion of a bourgeois class. For the present, the volume of this commerce will be given in total and comparative terms, rather than the volume of any one, or several individuals. The citation of statistics of the 18th century in a vacuum is, however, a meaningless pastime. A true appreciation of the numbers requires a prior inquiry into the approximate value of the currency of New France in terms of other colonial societies. This will precede trade statistics. A further gauge of value, and a further criterion, may be gained from a consideration of the wages current in the period under study. This will permit not merely a meaningful comparison of the prevalent wages in the Americas, but, as well, establish a monetary base of social analysis.

The most common units of currency in France in the period under consideration were the louis, écu, livre, sol and denier. John Lough,

---

1 Chapters IV and V will consider entrepreneurship, credit facilities, and the volumes of individuals' commerce in New France.
in his INTRODUCTION TO EIGHTEENTH CENTURY FRANCE, notes that the value of the **livre** established in 1726, varied little until the French Revolution. He gives the currency these values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of French Currency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 <strong>livres</strong> equal 1 <strong>écu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 <strong>livres</strong> equal 1 <strong>louis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 <strong>livre</strong> equals 20 <strong>sols</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 <strong>sol</strong> equals 12 <strong>deniers</strong> (or 4 <strong>liards</strong>.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In New France the **louis** and the **écu**, as units of currency, were seldom used, at least in the documentation of the period. The common units in use were the **livre**, **sol** and **denier**.

In a previous study, the present author established the following table of conversions in terms of currency equivalents most applicable to the period 1720-1750. It must be remembered that these are not terms of purchasing power, but merely terms of internal relevance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparative Value of French Currency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 <strong>louis d’or</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 <strong>English pound</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 John Lough, AN INTRODUCTION TO EIGHTEENTH CENTURY FRANCE, p. vi. See also Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 1, pp. 473n, 477n, 489, and general introduction.

3 "Table of Equivalent Values of Currency", Appendix F, Nish, REGIME, p. 160.

4 Range due to fluctuating value of currency, Nish, REGIME, p. 160n.
This bare recital of currency values raises a fundamental problem: is the table of equivalents valid for the period? In 1739 a memorialist claimed that 25 shillings was the equivalent of almost 6 livres. This would establish the livre at a much higher rating than the shilling, a doubtful equivalence, and unsupported by other documentation. Most of the evidence for a table of equivalences is to be found in documents of the British Régime in Canada rather than those of the French period. In 1768, for example, 1,345 livres was equated with 67 pounds sterling.

Lieutenant-Colonel Christie, a British military officer, land speculator and proprietor, in his commercial relations with his agent in England,
used 20 livres as the equivalent of the pound sterling. A little later, in 1785, "Mons le Général Christie...", in a land concession to Angus Kennedy, gave the value of "...L'Écus de France" as "Six livres, & la 8 piastre d'espagne a cent cinq sol..." This indicates, if nothing else, the difficulties of establishing a consistent rate of equivalence. It also raises the problem of conversion into dollars and cents, the terms used today.

A perusal of account books and engagement books in the post-conquest period provided this useful equivalence: "To cash 5 dollars..."
This was equated with 1 pound, 5 shillings, 3 pence. A dollar was also entered as 6 shillings while 110 livres was valued at 5 pounds, 10 shillings, 3 pence. This is the only entry encountered in which all three forms of currency, French, English and Spanish, or what became Canadian and American units, were encountered.

Another means of approaching the problem of equivalence lies in

7 "Acco't Between the Agents of M. Franc Rybot Merch't in Spittlefield Lond and Lieut. Col. Christie, 1771", P.A.C., SEIGNEURIES: MCGINNIS PAPERS: CHRISTIE PAPERS, document no. 065,694. (Christie was deeply involved in the land speculation that followed the conquest of New France. He bought up 5 seigniories on the South Shore of the Saint Lawrence, and some of them, at least, were sold in the 19th century at quite fantastic profits.)

8 "Concession par Mons le Général Christie de quatre arpens de terre de front sur cinquante six de profondeur a Angus Kennedy, 13 octobre 1785", P.A.C., SEIGNEURIES: MCGINNIS PAPERS: SEIGNIORIAL PAPERS: LA COLLE, document no. 015,350.

a consideration of the early history of Nova Scotia. Its conquest by the
English at a time when New France, as a French colony, still existed,
provides contemporary comparisons. In 1751 a Lieutenant John Hamilton
"...negociated for the ransom of himself and other English persons...
The sum required...was...17,651...livres...(which is about...882 pounds,
Halifax currency.)." In this document we see the ratio of 20 livres
to the pound used again, but in relation to Halifax currency, and not
that of the pound sterling. The Spanish silver dollar, or "piece of
eight", in Nova Scotia, was valued at 5 shillings, Halifax currency.
Lanctot gives this as the equivalent of 20 shillings, same currency, or
four (4) dollars. Isabel Craig, in her study on ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN
CANADA, 1763-1783, uses about the same series of values: the livre with
the shilling, and the dollar with 5 to 6 shillings.

The conclusions permitted from the evidence surveyed are: the
English pound sterling and the Halifax pound varied slightly; the Halifax
equivalence is the one used in Canada after the conquest. Both pounds
were between four and five dollars, Canadian decimal currency. The twenty
shillings to the pound places a value of approximately .20 to .25 dollars
on the shilling, and this shilling is the equivalent of the livre. It

10 Beamish Murdoch, "History of Nova Scotia, vol. 11, p. 204,"
cited by Gustave Lanctot, ed. DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE CURRENCY, EX-
CHANGE AND FINANCE OF NOVA SCOTIA, 1675-1758, p. 346. (Hereafter Lac-
tot, CURRENCY.)

11 Lanctot, CURRENCY, p. 405n.

12 Isabel Craig, ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN CANADA, 1763-1783, pp. 211-
212.
must, however, always be remembered that these are equivalences of currency and are not comparable as units of purchasing power with today's prices.

A few historians have attempted to equate the money of the colonial period to that of contemporary times. Marcel Trudel, without reference to any source, equates the *livre* with the Canadian dollar, and the *sol* with the Canadian five cent piece. Professor W.J. Eccles, in a recent work, values the *livre* at one dollar and fifty cents, (1.50) to two dollars, (2.00), Canadian funds. As interesting as this problem may be, it is quite outside the limits of the present study, and an invalid historical procedure, and this for two reasons. No study of the prices prevalent in the colonial period of Canada, has as yet been published. As well, costs of living, and the ratio of money to prices, depends not merely upon objective factors, but on subjective and cultural ones. The staples of a society would have to be known, as well as the luxury items. The relative value placed upon literally thousands of day to day items would have to be determined, and evaluated. Attempts to translate past units of currency into contemporary units tends to distort and not clarify the past. The only significant relation that may be

---

13 Marcel Trudel, THE SEIGNEURIAL REGIME, p. 13. (Hereafter Trudel, SEIGNEURIAL.)
14 W.J. Eccles, CANADA UNDER LOUIS XIV, p. 18n.
15 The present writer began, in the summer of 1965, a study of the prices of goods in New France. After a summer's work, there are at least 3,000 5x8 cards filled. It is estimated that a further five years work will be required before any truly valuable statistics are available.
established is an internal one, or, at best, a comparative contemporary one. With the ratios given on pages 40-41 above, we may now proceed to determine the volume of commerce of New France, and its significance.

New France, in the second quarter of the 18th century, significantly augmented her commerce. In part this was due to a normal population growth, in part to an above normal increase in agricultural production relative to population, and also to an ever increasing diversification of her commercial activities. This is borne out by the export statistics of furs, lumber, and food products. In 1729 the value of furs imported into La Rochelle from New France was 1,339,186 livres; in 1748, a war year, the value was 764,635 livres. For the period 1729 to 1748 the approximate annual value of fur exports was between 1,000,000 and 1,250,000 livres. The fur trade exports, while varying significantly, were in the period under consideration but one of the economic activities in the col-

16 "Censuses of Canada, 1720 and 1734", in Nish, REGIME, pp. 121-122; see also Michel Brunet, "La Présence Anglaise en Amérique", p. 104. (Hereafter Brunet, Présence.); also the CENSUS OF CANADA, 1871, volume 4. This presents, sometimes in a summary, and sometimes in detail, a survey of all the census statistics of New France, 1665-1754.)


ony, a decided change from the earlier colonial period.

The lumber industry, also provides some evidence of the volume of the commerce of the period. In 1728, 5,000 shingles were produced; in 1732 the figure was 197,748 and by 1739 this had risen to 291,240.

Shingle, bardeau, in 1741, were worth 8 livres per thousand. The production of barrels rose from 2,000 in 1728 to 53,000 in 1737. This is, in part at least, explained by the increase in agricultural exports.

Thirty sols was the price paid for a baril vide in 1737. The number of pine planks exported in 1728 was 11,500; this rose to 203,020 in 1733; fell to 148,200 in 1735; rose in 1737 to 256,940, and fell again in 1739.

The average cost per hundred pine planks in the 1730's was between 40 and 45 livres. The use of lumber for ship repairs and construction in New France, and the increased export of food products also provided an expanding internal market for the timber industry.

See also Chapters IV and V.

"Lumber Exported", Lunn, ECONOMIC, pp. 468-469.


"Lumber Exported", Lunn, ECONOMIC, pp. 468-469.

See below and Chapter VII.

"Bordereau...1737", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 114-1, f47.

"Lumber Exported", Lunn, ECONOMIC, pp. 468-469.

"Bordereau...1732"; "Bordereau...1737"; "Bordereau...1739"; P.A.C. C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 15; 114-1, f 16, 37, 39; 114-1, f 112, 129.

See Chapter V.
The export of food products was subject to wide fluctuations. The main reason for this was the crop failures in New France. For the years 1732 to 1741, the average export of quintals of wheat was 8,000; exports of quintals of biscuits averaged 7,800 over a period of nine years. In an eight year period approximately 2,300 quintals of peas were exported. The monetary value of food exports may be gathered from a summary statement of exports to Louisbourg, in 1740. Milled flour in the quantity of 6,956 quintals was shipped to the Fortress in that year. The value in livres was 83,483 or 12 livres per quintal. The value of 1,666.41 quintals of whole flour was 15,831 livres, 17 sols, 10 deniers, or about 9 livres per unit. This was classed as second class flour. Biscuits were worth 10 livres per quintal, and 75,000 livres were shipped in that year.

The use of trade statistics to illustrate the commerce of New France is fraught with some dangers, as are all colonial era numbers. They are, at times, incomplete, and must be used, as the compiler herself

29 Hamelin, p. 64, and I. Caron, LA COLONISATION DU CANADA SOUS LA DOMINATION FRANCAISE, p. 60.
30 Approximately 100 pounds, Nish, REGIME, p. 123n.
31 "Agricultural Exports", Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 449.
cautions, "...for what they are worth." For the years 1729 to 1743, Dr. Lunn has compiled the following table:

**Table 3**  
**Exports and Imports of New France, 1729-1743**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Export Livres</th>
<th>Import Livres</th>
<th>Balance Livres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>1,287,256</td>
<td>1,419,415</td>
<td>-21,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1,398,327</td>
<td>1,931,424</td>
<td>-448,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>1,483,192</td>
<td>1,631,060</td>
<td>-147,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1,527,244</td>
<td>2,100,271</td>
<td>-573,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1,705,698</td>
<td>2,309,662</td>
<td>-603,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1,677,696</td>
<td>1,913,542</td>
<td>-235,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1,656,002</td>
<td>1,722,269</td>
<td>-66,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>1,760,917</td>
<td>1,827,241</td>
<td>-66,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>2,103,868</td>
<td>1,919,572</td>
<td>+184,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>2,317,709</td>
<td>2,086,917</td>
<td>+230,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>2,091,907</td>
<td>2,157,552</td>
<td>-65,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>2,396,642</td>
<td>2,483,406</td>
<td>-86,764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence within the work of Dr. Lunn suggests that the export statistics are too low. In 1729, for example, the total value of the furs imported into La Rochelle from New France, according to her own figures, was greater than the value of the exports which she gives for the year. The total of furs, lumber and food products exported in

---

33 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 477n. The Centre de Recherche en Histoire Economique du Canada Français, of Montreal, is presently engaged in a thorough study of the historical statistics of New France under the direction of the present writer.

34 "Canadian Export and Import Trade in Livres Cash", Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 477.

35 "Value of Furs in Livres Cash Imported into La Rochelle, 1718-1761", Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 464.
1733 also give more than the figures cited in the above table.

Two manifest features of these import and export statistics are notable. The value of furs exported, while subject to fluctuations, and the value of food products and lumber exported, subject to the same tendency, did not, in the period under consideration, result in a radical lowering of the total value of exports. Even in 1733, a year renown for its disastrous crop, the figures are only slightly lower. During the latter part of the 1730's, and for the years in the 1740's which are given, there is a noticeable drop in the significance of the fur trade, as compared to other export products. The economy of New France, while still based on furs as the single greatest export commodity, was developing a more diversified and mature economic life.

The second notable factor is that the colony, in spite of an increasing trade volume, had a chronic trade deficit with its metropolis. Frégault, in his CANADIAN SOCIETY DURING THE FRENCH REGIME, adopts a very apologetic tone when considering the matter, and proudly points out

36 This conclusion is arrived at by correlating the statistics given by Dr. Lunn.
38 The Centre de Recherche en Histoire Economique du Canada Français has undertaken a detailed study of the exports and the imports of New France.
the few years when New France had a trade surplus with its metropolis. Jean Hamelin, throughout his work, repeatedly emphasizes the indebtedness of the colony to France. The usual, and expected trade relations between a colony and its metropolis must, therefore, be considered. Such a consideration will place colonial trade within a colonial context, and permit significant comparisons and evaluations of the statistics. We will begin with the trade of France, colonial and national.

The table which follows of the colonial-metropolitan trade of France does not distinguish the areas of provenance. The figures are for the colonies of France, American and African.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imports to France</th>
<th>Exports from France</th>
<th>Excess of Imports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livres</td>
<td>Livres</td>
<td>Livres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>18,963,321</td>
<td>15,952,321</td>
<td>2,888,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>19,828,618</td>
<td>16,610,453</td>
<td>3,218,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>20,799,269</td>
<td>18,963,645</td>
<td>1,835,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>22,736,517</td>
<td>16,253,496</td>
<td>6,483,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>30,846,490</td>
<td>20,392,803</td>
<td>10,453,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>35,978,924</td>
<td>20,487,947</td>
<td>15,490,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>41,994,694</td>
<td>27,332,840</td>
<td>14,661,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>47,867,870</td>
<td>29,336,853</td>
<td>18,531,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>50,986,507</td>
<td>31,765,537</td>
<td>19,220,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 Frégault, SOCIETY, p. 11.
40 Hamelin, pp. 51-53, 127-137.
The increase in the value of colonial trade, in absolute figures, is most noticeable, a pattern also discernible in New France. It is interesting that France's rise in exports and imports continued until 1755, dropped drastically in the years 1756 to 1764, and then more than quadrupled from 1765 to 1788. For the moment let the continuous surplus of imports from the colonies be noted, and its corollary, the favourable balance of trade of the colonies vis-à-vis France.

The apparent colonial-metropolis trade deficit indicated by the statistics was, as might be expected, more apparent than real. The total exports and imports of France, according to a table cited by John Lough 42 for the years 1721 to 1748, averaged as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exports (Livres)</th>
<th>Imports (Livres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1721-1732</td>
<td>116,675,000</td>
<td>80,198,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733-1735</td>
<td>124,465,000</td>
<td>76,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736-1739</td>
<td>143,441,000</td>
<td>102,035,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740-1748</td>
<td>192,334,000</td>
<td>112,805,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total exports of France to her colonies, and to other countries, exceeded her imports from her possessions, and foreign lands. The evident pattern is that trade with some of the colonies produced a commercial balance in favour of the colony. The explanation of this phenomenon may be derived from a consideration of the trade statistics of another im-

important colonial power, England.

The exports and imports of England to the British West Indies and the British-American continental colonies averaged, for the years 1726 to 1750:

Table 6
Exports and Imports of England to the West Indies and the British-American Colonies, 1726-1750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exports (in thousands of pounds)</th>
<th>Imports (in thousands of pounds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.W.I.</td>
<td>B-A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726-30</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731-35</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736-40</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-45</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746-50</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

England and France had in common a trade deficit with some of their colonies. The trade totals of England, however, resulted in a favourable balance, as may be seen in the table below.

Table 7
Total Export of British Manufactures, 1726-1748

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exports (thousands of pounds)</th>
<th>Imports (thousands of pounds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>5,001</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>1729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43 This is a composite table drawn from "Destination of Exports (including Re-exports) from England and Wales. Average Annual Values, Table V" and "Source of Imports into England and Wales. Average Annual Values, Table VI", Elizabeth Boody Schumpeter, ENGLISH OVERSEAS TRADE STATISTICS, 1697-1808, pp. 17-18.

44 "Exports of English Produce and Manufactures", Schumpeter, p. 15.
This normal pattern of colonial trade applies not merely to the English and French trade with the West Indies, but with some of the American colonies as well. This phenomenon is due not to different commercial systems, but rather on the needs of the metropolis, and the commercial potential of the colonies. In the British-American colonies, as the following statistics indicate, the Southern continental colonies had a favourable balance of trade with their metropolis, excluding species exports. Virginia and Maryland, both with export surpluses, stand in striking contrast to the more Northern colonies, New England, New York and Pennsylvania. In a table to follow, the normal pattern of commercial relations of the colonies with the metropolis will be shown by a composite graph, that is, the exports and imports of New France, New England and New York will be compared to those of the colonies of Virginia and Maryland.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>52,512</td>
<td>161,102</td>
<td>15,833</td>
<td>64,670</td>
<td>7,434</td>
<td>29,799</td>
<td>386,174</td>
<td>108,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>54,701</td>
<td>208,196</td>
<td>8,740</td>
<td>64,356</td>
<td>10,582</td>
<td>48,592</td>
<td>346,823</td>
<td>150,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>49,048</td>
<td>183,467</td>
<td>20,756</td>
<td>66,116</td>
<td>12,786</td>
<td>44,260</td>
<td>408,502</td>
<td>171,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>64,095</td>
<td>216,600</td>
<td>9,411</td>
<td>65,540</td>
<td>8,524</td>
<td>41,698</td>
<td>310,799</td>
<td>148,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>61,983</td>
<td>184,570</td>
<td>11,626</td>
<td>65,417</td>
<td>14,776</td>
<td>40,565</td>
<td>403,198</td>
<td>186,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>82,252</td>
<td>146,460</td>
<td>15,307</td>
<td>81,758</td>
<td>20,217</td>
<td>54,392</td>
<td>373,090</td>
<td>172,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>72,899</td>
<td>189,125</td>
<td>14,155</td>
<td>80,405</td>
<td>21,919</td>
<td>48,804</td>
<td>394,995</td>
<td>220,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>66,788</td>
<td>222,158</td>
<td>17,944</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>20,786</td>
<td>61,513</td>
<td>380,163</td>
<td>204,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>63,347</td>
<td>223,923</td>
<td>16,833</td>
<td>125,833</td>
<td>15,198</td>
<td>56,690</td>
<td>492,246</td>
<td>211,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>59,116</td>
<td>203,233</td>
<td>16,228</td>
<td>133,438</td>
<td>11,918</td>
<td>61,450</td>
<td>391,814</td>
<td>258,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>46,604</td>
<td>220,378</td>
<td>18,459</td>
<td>106,070</td>
<td>8,134</td>
<td>54,452</td>
<td>444,654</td>
<td>217,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>72,389</td>
<td>171,089</td>
<td>21,498</td>
<td>118,777</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td>56,751</td>
<td>341,997</td>
<td>281,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>60,052</td>
<td>198,147</td>
<td>21,142</td>
<td>140,430</td>
<td>17,158</td>
<td>91,010</td>
<td>577,109</td>
<td>248,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>53,166</td>
<td>148,899</td>
<td>13,536</td>
<td>167,591</td>
<td>8,527</td>
<td>75,295</td>
<td>427,769</td>
<td>264,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>63,185</td>
<td>172,461</td>
<td>15,067</td>
<td>135,487</td>
<td>9,596</td>
<td>79,340</td>
<td>557,821</td>
<td>328,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>50,248</td>
<td>143,982</td>
<td>14,527</td>
<td>119,920</td>
<td>7,446</td>
<td>62,214</td>
<td>402,709</td>
<td>234,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>38,948</td>
<td>140,463</td>
<td>14,083</td>
<td>54,957</td>
<td>10,130</td>
<td>54,280</td>
<td>399,423</td>
<td>197,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>38,162</td>
<td>209,177</td>
<td>8,841</td>
<td>86,712</td>
<td>15,779</td>
<td>73,699</td>
<td>419,371</td>
<td>282,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>41,771</td>
<td>210,640</td>
<td>14,992</td>
<td>137,984</td>
<td>3,832</td>
<td>82,404</td>
<td>492,619</td>
<td>200,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>29,748</td>
<td>197,682</td>
<td>12,358</td>
<td>143,311</td>
<td>12,363</td>
<td>75,330</td>
<td>494,852</td>
<td>252,624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45"Series Z 21-34. Value of Exports to and Imports from England, by American Colonies: 1697-1776, (In pounds sterling. For the years ending December 24, except as noted), U.S. Bureau of Census, HISTORICAL STATISTICS OF THE UNITED STATES COLONIAL TIMES TO 1957, p. 757. (Hereafter U.S. STATISTICS.)"
Several preliminary comments are required prior to an interpretation of the statistics. These figures do not include the internal trade of the colony, nor the important illegal trade of the North-Eastern colonies and New York. Nor, of course, did the figures given for the exports and imports of New France. The larger population of the British-American colonies, would, of course, provide a home market. However, the same type of statistics must be used, and the home market, while an important economic factor, has not been sufficiently studied in the Americas, English or French, to allow any definite conclusions. Another point that might be made, if we are to qualify the statistics presented by a population factor, is that on a ratio of just population, the trade of New France would be overestimated. This will be more fully developed in a following table. Another comment is that, all things being equal, the statistics are reliable, within limits. Verification of several sources indicates minor, and not substantial differences.

The external commerce of the British-American colonies, for the period cited, fluctuated widely. Part of this fluctuation may be statistical error, but the fact of ups and downs remains. Import figures,

subject to the same general tendency, were, however, less subject to wide swings. All due allowance for error still results in the inevitable conclusion that some colonies had a favourable trade balance with their metropolis, while others had a trade deficit. The Southern colonies had favourable export-import ratios; the Northern colonies unfavourable ones. These statistics, now that their pattern is discernible, may be used in a comparative manner. All the figures given are in French livres, the pound sterling being given a value of 25 livres.

Table 9
Exports and Imports of New France, New York and New England, 1730-1743

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1,398,327</td>
<td>1,419,415</td>
<td>218,500</td>
<td>1,609,900</td>
<td>1,367,525</td>
<td>5,204,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1,483,192</td>
<td>1,931,424</td>
<td>235,275</td>
<td>1,638,500</td>
<td>1,602,375</td>
<td>5,415,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1,389,047</td>
<td>1,631,603</td>
<td>290,650</td>
<td>1,635,420</td>
<td>1,549,575</td>
<td>4,515,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1,527,244</td>
<td>2,100,271</td>
<td>382,675</td>
<td>2,043,900</td>
<td>2,056,300</td>
<td>3,661,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1,705,698</td>
<td>2,309,662</td>
<td>353,875</td>
<td>2,010,125</td>
<td>1,822,475</td>
<td>4,728,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>1,677,696</td>
<td>1,913,542</td>
<td>448,300</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
<td>1,669,700</td>
<td>5,553,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1,656,002</td>
<td>1,722,284</td>
<td>420,825</td>
<td>3,145,825</td>
<td>1,583,675</td>
<td>5,598,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>1,760,241</td>
<td>1,827,241</td>
<td>405,700</td>
<td>3,335,950</td>
<td>1,477,900</td>
<td>5,080,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>2,103,868</td>
<td>1,919,572</td>
<td>461,475</td>
<td>2,651,750</td>
<td>1,165,100</td>
<td>5,094,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>2,111,107</td>
<td>2,264,077</td>
<td>537,450</td>
<td>2,769,425</td>
<td>1,809,725</td>
<td>4,277,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>2,317,709</td>
<td>2,086,917</td>
<td>528,550</td>
<td>3,510,750</td>
<td>1,501,300</td>
<td>4,953,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>2,091,907</td>
<td>2,157,552</td>
<td>338,400</td>
<td>4,189,775</td>
<td>1,329,150</td>
<td>3,722,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>2,396,642</td>
<td>2,483,406</td>
<td>377,175</td>
<td>3,387,165</td>
<td>1,579,625</td>
<td>3,311,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conclusions! The exports of New France, relatively speaking, were not low, but extremely high. They are many times those of the Colony of New York, and equal to those of the New England colonies. Pennsylvania, not

---

47 This is a composite table calculated from those on pages 48 and 52-3 of the present work. The statistics for the year 1731 are incomplete and are therefore not used.
included in this chart, had a lower volume of external commerce than did New York. Also evident was the trade deficit of all of the Northern colonies with their metropolis, English and French. If a population factor were introduced, the French to English, (white) colonial ratio was 20 to 1, in favour of the English colonies. Therefore the citizens of New France, in terms of exports and imports, would have, on a per capita basis, a commerce 20 times as great as New England. This, however, is to distort rather than illuminate. The absolute comparative levels of commerce are sufficiently indicated, and, as is evident, the external trade of New France was neither low, nor was her import surplus unusual. The closest comparison should be with the colony of New York. In population, natural resources, and commercial activities it most closely resembled New France. Also evident from the statistical information, and comparisons, is that the figures reveal in no way any significant differences between the English and French colonies of a cultural nature. Numerically at least, the "Protestant Ethic" and the "spirit of capitalism" did not have an effect.

A further criterion of use may be determined from wage levels.


The objective is twofold: to determine what the wages were, and in so doing, establish an internal criterion of comparison. This will provide evidence for the relations between income and social classification. A short section on comparative wages will follow. This will, again, indicate a normal status of wages in New France vis-à-vis the British-American colonies.

In the period surveyed by Professor W.J. Eccles, 1663 to 1701, he gives the wages of a mason as 3 livres, 10 sols per day, and those of a carpenter as 4 livres, 10 sols. These 17th century rates applied, as well, to the 18th century. Hocquart, the intendant of New France in the period under study, in a letter to Maurepas, the Minister of Marine, wrote that the best workmen were paid 3 livres per day by local merchants and decried this high wage. A guard, he wrote further on, was paid 30 livres per month, or 360 livres per year. The wage levels suggested by the intendant were 300 to 400 livres per annum, but the continuous labour shortage usually resulted in somewhat higher salaries. In 1743, in the state-established shipyards, a worker, his trade not specified,

50 Eccles, p. 218.
was paid 50 livres per month, or 600 livres per year. The following table of wages paid for services other than administrative will indicate the prevalent wage levels.

Table 10
Wages in New France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Wage per annum (livres)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alavoine</td>
<td>1737-41</td>
<td>75-200</td>
<td>surgeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambroise</td>
<td>1737-41</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>padre (hinterland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td>1739-41</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>vacher (hinterland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine</td>
<td>1737-39</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>padre (hinterland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubertin</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>mason (hinterland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balesta</td>
<td>1740-41</td>
<td>75-120</td>
<td>vacher (hinterland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baré</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>janitor (Chambly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barthe</td>
<td>1736-41</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>armurier (Montréal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baudria</td>
<td>1739-41</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>seamstress (Frontenac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>trade clerk (Niagara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauret</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>sciur de long (Frontenac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauvain</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>blanchisseuse (Niagara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauvignerie</td>
<td>1736-41</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>interpreter (Montreal and Niagara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauvin</td>
<td>1739-41</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>gardener (Québec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicot</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>carpenter (Frontenac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude</td>
<td>1737-41</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbin</td>
<td>1736-41</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>carpenter (Québec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dazée</td>
<td>1736-37</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>baker (hinterland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis</td>
<td>1740-41</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>baker (Québec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillion</td>
<td>1739-43</td>
<td>40 sols p.d. (600?)</td>
<td>tonnelier (Québec) 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Epée</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>forgeron (Niagara)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 This is drawn from the still incomplete study noted on page 44 above.
56 Sources will be given at the end of table.
57 A combination first-aid man, dentist, dispensary caretaker. The word may be roughly translated into the current term "hospital orderly".
58 This is a selection from about 700 entries garnered to date. They are classified, obviously, in an alphabetical order. They represent
In the above table, the average basic wage is 120 livres per annum. The skilled worker, the tradesmen, had a high average of 600 livres per year, just a little higher than the men of the cloth, who averaged 300 per year. The place of work had little effect on the salary. The wage chart agrees with the rates given as current by Hocquart, 40 to 50 sols per diem, or about 600 to 750 livres per year. The work day of these men, according to the intendant, was from sunrise to sunset.

The administrators of New France were paid, in 1738, the following wages: St. Ours, a lieutenant de Roy: 1,800; Péan de Livaudière, major du Roy: 1,200; Vaudreuil, the governor of Three Rivers: 1,500; the Commissaire de la Marine at Montreal, Michel, received 2,400 livres while Varin, the Controller de la Marine was paid 1,800 livres per year.

---

58 a just sampling of the wages for the years cited. The source of this data is given in the same order as the names appear, and by year. See "Bordereau...1736", vol. 114-1, f 20; 19; 29; 21; 31; 21; 20; 20; 31; 28; 21; 31; "Bordereau...1737", vol. 114-1, f 51; 58; 51; 51; 52; 51; 52; 51; 55; 50; 52; "Bordereau...1739", vol. 114-1, f 122; 128; 125; 124; 108; 123; 122; 125; 122; 105; "Bordereau...1740", vol. 114-1, f 294; 296; 296; 294; 295; 296; 294; 293; 293; 293; 291; vol. 114-2, f 299; 299; 299; 296; "Bordereau...1741", 114-2, f 386; 393; 390; 387; 388; 386; 385-85; 389; 385; 385; 347; "Bordereau...1743", vol. 115-1, 37, P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 114-1 to 115-1.

59 "Wages at Quebec, Quebec, October 11, 1739", cited by Nish, REGIME, p. 121.

60 See also Chapters VIII, IX and X.

61 "Pour les Depenses de Canada...du fonds du Domaine d'occident...1738", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34, f 94-95.

62 "Depenses de Canada...1738", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34, f 89.
At lower administrative levels the wages were 600 livres for Bernard, an écrivain in the intendant's office, and Deschenaux, who occupied the same type of post received 480 livres. A commis in the King's stores was paid 600 livres a year, as was a carpenter in the same place. Michel Martel, who was to play a somewhat prominent role in the later history of New France, began his career as a lowly clerk at 210 livres per annum.

A significant difference between the salaries of the administrators, judicial, civil and military, is that they were also paid des gratifications by the State while the labourers and artisans were not. The upper levels of the administration were paid 1,200 livres, and above, on an average, while the middle level, on a mean, received 600 livres per year. The equivalent of a clerk, fourth class, received between 200 and 300 livres a year. Statistical evidence indicates that 600 livres per annum was a high average wage, and this figure will be used for purposes of comparison throughout the remainder of the present work.

In the British-American colonies, the wage levels were similar. A good wage was 20 pounds a year, or about 400 livres. Barck and Lafortier give the annual yearly incomes of the various sectors of the English colonies as follows: the New England sector: 18 pounds, (or 360 livres);

---

64 See all of following Chapters.
the Middle colonies: 12 pounds, (or 240 livres) and, in the South, where the wages were a little higher, 20 pounds per year, (or 400 livres).

In New York, according to Adam Smith, a labourer received 2 shillings sterling per day while a ship's carpenter was paid 6 shillings, 6 pence. This is the equivalent of about 50 sols and 150 sols, or 2½ and 7½ livres per day. Another contemporary source, Crèvecoeur, sets the average wage of an agricultural worker at 3 shillings per day; at harvest time, the wages were higher: 5 to 6 shillings. Carl Bridenbaugh, in his work on THE COLONIAL CRAFTSMAN, writes that a house carpenter, a foreman would be the contemporary appellation, was paid 35 pounds per year, plus room, board and tools. In livres this translates as 775 livres per year plus board and tools. On the following page, Bridenbaugh wrote of William Bucklan, "One of the outstanding colonial "architects..." who was paid but 20 pounds sterling per year, plus board. The equivalence in livres would be 500, plus board. Why the carpenter is paid a higher wage than the architect is not noted, and the two wage figures are for 1752 and 1755. According to the same source a master craftsman received 16 shillings per week. In colonial equivalents this represents 832

66 O.T. Barck and H.T. Lafler, COLONIAL AMERICA, pp. 294-296.
68 Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, LETTERS FROM AN AMERICAN FARMER AND SKETCHES OF EIGHTEENTH CENTURY AMERICA, p. 267.
69 Carl Bridenbaugh, THE COLONIAL CRAFTSMAN, p. 11.
70 Bridenbaugh, p. 12.
71 Bridenbaugh, p. 28.
livres per year.

The wages of administrators in New Jersey also indicate the prevalent colonial wage levels. A clerk of the Council received 7 pounds, 10 shillings per quarter, or 30 pounds per year. A door-keeper, Anthony Elton, was paid 2 pounds, 10 shillings a quarter or 200 livres per year. The governor of the colony was paid 1000 pounds or 20,000 livres a year, plus a few gratuities. A judge, more moderately paid, was paid about 22 pounds for five months work; of this sum 16 pounds was for holding two courts, and the balance was a fixed salary. A projection of his total earnings on this basis produces a yearly income of 1,600 livres.

In the British-American colonies, workmen and artisans were paid approximately the same wages as in the French colony of New France; the upper, middle and lower administrators also received comparable wages. We have also seen that the trade statistics of the French colony compared favourably with those of the British-American colonies. Those of New

---

72 About the same as the governor of New France. See "Bordereau ...1736"; "Bordereau...1737"; "Bordereau...1739"; "Bordereau...1741"; "Depenses...Domaine...1741", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 114-1, f 17; 114-1, f 55; 114-1, f 119; 114-2, f 381; 115-1, f 10.


74 See also, for further wage levels, albeit incomplete, "Serie Z 318-329. Daily Wages of Selected Types of Workmen, by Area: 1621 to 1781", U.S. STATISTICS, p. 771.
France, at least in terms of export trade, were higher than those of Pennsylvania, New York, and the equal of those of the New England colonies. All of the northern colonies had trade deficits with their metropolis. On the other hand, the British-American colonies of the southern region, as well as the West Indian colonies, had trade surpluses with England. The French colonies in the West Indies and Africa had the same commercial patterns. The norm, then, of a colonial trade relation with a metropolis is dependent upon geographical factors, and metropolitan needs, and not the type of colonial system, or, as far as is indicated by the statistics, by any cultural or religious differences. What conclusions are permitted?

The comparison of the currencies of the British-American, and French-American colonies permits a valid type of parallel. The contemporary, and not modern values, are the sole monetary criterion of comparative judgment. The currency equivalences permit two definite conclusions. Firstly, the volumes of trade of the northern sectors of the Americas, when compared to each other in the same unit of currency, demonstrate a very high level of commercial activity on the part of the citizens of New France. Secondly, the wages in New France are comparable to those in the colonies to the south. A further hypothesis, but not a thesis, is permitted. If the commercial levels of the British-American colonies, in absolute numerical terms, were capable of supporting a bourgeois class, then the superior numerical levels of the trade statistics of New France would indicate the possibility of a bourgeois
class in the French colony. The trade deficits noted by Frégault and Hamelin are not factors. The low volume of commerce, mentioned by the latter, did not, obviously, exist. A thesis is also possible from this past chapter: 600 livres per year was a high annual wage. This figure may now be used as a tool of social classification.
THE BOURGEOISIE AND COMMERCE: 2:

FORMS OF CREDIT AND MEANS OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP

New France, according to Hamelin, did not possess a commercial class capable of rationally organizing the enterprises necessary to exploit the resources of the country. The society of the colony, therefore, was incapable of producing, or sustaining a group deserving of the name bourgeoisie. This conclusion is linked by Hamelin to the profit level, and the related problem of capital resources for further economic activities. However, most of his evidence for this conclusion is based on factors treated in isolation: the profits accruing to the Canadien merchants from the fur trade; the price of wheat rather than the sale of wheat; the instability of the monetary system and the high interest rate.

These views of Hamelin might appear to have the support of the intendant, Gilles Hocquart, who, writing to Maurepas of the Marine Ministry, noted that the merchants of La Rochelle and Bordeaux controlled 50% of the trade of New France. In 1733, the same official, in a joint letter with Beaufharnois, the governor, wrote that the largest individual

---

1 Hamelin, pp. 135-136.
2 Hamelin, pp. 55-57.
3 Hamelin, pp. 36-46.
4 Hamelin, pp. 55, n. 37.
fortunes, with one exception, were about 50,000 to 60,000 livres. This paucity of the Canadiens is also illustrated by Hamelin on the penultimate page of his work by citations from letters of the governors and intendants for the years 1679, 1682, 1706, 1708, 1709, 1714, 1729, 1735 and 1741. It has already been suggested that a level of 50 to 60,000 livres was a long way from poverty.

A consideration of the forms of credit and the means of entrepreneurship does, it should be honestly avowed, present problems of reconstruction and interpretation. In New France, as in other colonial areas, in the periods preceding the preservation of business records with any degree of consistency, the documentation is scarce, or rather, scattered. It does, however, exist, but requires careful interpretation. One of the purposes of the present chapter will be to evaluate some of Hamelin's conclusions, and to question the testimony of the contemporary intendant, Hocquart. A second important factor in our consideration of forms of business organization and capital resources in New France must be a return to the colonial milieu, and an inquiry into the particular and peculiar entrepreneurial and credit conditions existing in a nascent commercial society. A non-colonial standard of comparison cannot be

7 Hamelin, p. 136.
8 See page 27 above.
9 Harrington, p. 47.
interjected without distorting the time and place.

To say that there were enterprises and entrepreneurs is a truism. It does not establish either a level of commerce of profits, nor does it resolve the question of sources of capital for further commercial activities. The profit levels are, decidedly, difficult to fix. Hamelin's levels, however, are self-contradictory. If we use the figures that he supplies, the returns from the fur trade were high, and not low, as he claims. The percentage he uses is 150% to 200%. As Pierre Harvey has pointed out, these would produce fortunes in short order with a very small capital investment.

Desauniers, the syndic of the Quebec merchants, provides an indirect proof of the sufficiency of profits. In a report to the administrators of New France he does not complain of a lack of trade or profits, but rather of the too-large number of merchants, a complaint, as we shall see, not supported by evidence. Other evidence is more direct. Merchandise bought in Quebec for trade in the hinterland returned

10 Hamelin, pp. 50-57.
11 Harvey, p. 545. See also below, Chapter VI, THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE HINTERLAND.
13 See the following chapter for the monopolistic nature of State purchases.
60%. A more moderate return is seen in the investment of Louise-Catherine Robinaud, the widow of François Dejordy, of a principal sum of 6,050 livres and a return of 151.5 livres per annum or a little more than 2% yearly. The secure investments were, however, rare in New France, and a return of 2% cannot be considered a norm.

Hocquart, as we have seen, referred to an exceptional fortune; he meant that of François-Etienne Cugnet. But, was Cugnet the only

---


16 See Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 2, p. 542 n., and "Ordre pour faire l'inventaire des effets du Sr. Cugnet, Québec, 17 août 1742"; "Délibérations des Créanciers du Sr. Cugnet, Québec, 17 août, 1742"; "Etat de mes effets actifs et Passifs, Québec, 21, 24, 26, 27 août 1742"; "Scellés et Inventaires des effets du Sr François Etienne Cugnet, Québec, 28, 29, 30, 31 août, et 1 et 3 septembre 1742"; P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 114-1, f 206; 235-236; 211-217; 144-204. (It falls outside the limits of the present work to give a detailed consideration to Cugnet, one of the most interesting entrepreneurs in New France in the period 1719 to 1751. For some of the documents, in their entirety, see Cameron Nish, "La banqueroute de François Etienne Cugnet, 1742: Les biens de Cugnet"; "La banqueroute de François Etienne Cugnet, 1742: Cugnet et l'Etat". Three more sections of documents are to be published on the formation of the Saint Maurice Forges, their bankruptcy, and their administration by the French state. The three last items have not, as yet, been published, but are in manuscript form. Dr. Rosario Bilodeau, Dean of the Humanities of the Collège Militaire Royal de Saint Jean, is engaged in a study of the Canadian career of Cugnet. The E series of the P.A.C., as well as the C 11 A, and the B series, contain many interesting documents on this greatest, in volume, of all the bourgeois of New France.)
exception? Maurepas offered to free Lanoullier from the close arrest under which he was held because of his defalcation of Marine Treasury funds, if the sieur Lestage, "...négociant connu pour homme riche..." would act as his bondsman. Maurepas estimated Lanoullier's debt at 182,273 livres. Although never able to clear himself of debt, he was given administrative posts, special commercial privileges, and was never again jailed for his misdemeanor. Debt, therefore, cannot be used as a merely negative commercial factor.

The elder Guillimin, writing to Maurepas, claimed a substantial commercial status including a loan of 40,000 livres to the Treasury in 1712 during the card money crisis of the period. Maurepas requested confirmation of Guillimin's claims. The "...Sr Guillemin (sic) conseiller au conseil sup'r...", the administrators of New France wrote, "...fait des entreprises considerable...par des establissement de pesches ...A fait bâtir plusieurs maisons et grand magasin...; construit 7 ou 8


18 "Maurepas à Beauharnois et Hocquart, Versailles, 10 avril 1731", P.A.C., B, vol. 52-2, f 476.


20 Shortt, CURRENCY, pp. 457-459n.

21 "Maurepas à Beauharnois et Hocquart, Versailles, 8 avril 1732", P.A.C., B, vol. 57-1, f 621.
bâtiments de mers..." Beauharnois and Hocquart then go on to request proof of the King's favours for Guillimin.

To say that Cugnet was an exception, then, is not wholly true. It certainly does not mean that there was only one fortune that was high, for high is a matter of relevance and not of absolutes. How can one explain the letters, which may be described as begging letters, of the intendant and the governor? The letters, if they are accepted as literal truth, mask a simple social and economic phenomenon: those with wealth and privilege use every means possible to gain more wealth and more privilege. Hocquart, to give another example, wrote that de Lino, a member of the Superior Council, prominent merchant, and a seignior, and if we are to believe the French court, a man of doubtful honesty, left a small estate. The intendant was requesting the reversion of his pension to another member of the family. A further illustration of this same pattern of ulterior motive is evident in the letter of Hocquart concerning the level of fortunes in New France. His rather long preamble on the poverty of the merchants is his rational for not imposing new taxes


23 Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 1, p. 120, and R.P. Lejeune, DICTIONNAIRE DE BIOGRAPHIE..., vol. 1, p. 482. (Shortt confuses de Lino, father and son, in his biographical note. The de Lino referred to by Hocquart's letter is the father who outlived his son, of the same Christian name, by 10 years.).

on the citizens of New France. And more, as he wrote, a much larger army would be needed to cow the people into paying them. Taxes limit profits, reduce income. Hocquart, probably pressured by the economic elite, did his best for those under his charge.

Two comments are required to clarify the significance of the percentage of the trade of New France controlled by the merchants of France: one refers to the use of credit, and the other to the significance of the figure 50%. The letter of October 27, 1732, concerning the percentages of trade, was followed by one dated October 30. In this letter Hocquart wrote of the budget deficits, and of the need of credit if sales from the King's stores were to be continued. In effect, the use of credit by the State was being manipulated in such a way that credit was in effect being created. From a percentage of control we pass to poverty, and from poverty to the creation of credit, in the form of merchandise, for entrepreneurial purposes. The extension of credit to the Canadiens from State funds was disapproved of by the metropolis, and understandably so after Lanoullier's defalcations.

The second comment that must be made is an interpretative one.

26 "Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 30 octobre 1732", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 58, pp. 75-77.
27 The ulterior motives will be further examined in Chapters V and VI, and in those concerning the administration.
If we accept that 50% of the trade was controlled by foreign merchants, does this negate the possibility of profits? If we accept that the foreign merchants made a profit, and this was sufficient to them to continue to trade in New France, then the corollary must be that the 50% controlled by the Canadiens was also sufficient, produced a profit, and, if the foreign 50% could be called bourgeoisie, then the domestic 50% could be designated by the same social appellation.

An extremely high interest rate has also been used as a factor in negating profits, and capital formation. Hamelin accepts the rate of 28 40%. But, if profits from the fur trade were 150 to 200%, would even the rate of 40% have a serious effect on profits? It is doubtful. Even if we add a further factor, that is, that the Canadiens only benefitted to the extent of 28% of the profits of the fur trade, and, the corollary, only 28% of the capital risks, there is still a high profit level possible. Also, and this is not noted by Hamelin, two further factors enter as viable commercial entities: the fur trade was but one commercial activity in a rapidly diversifying economy, and, on less speculative economic activities, the interest rate, "...from time immemorial..." was 8%.

28 Hamelin, p. 55, n.37. He accepts this figure from E. Garnault, "Le Commerce Rochelais, Les Rochelois et le Canada, La Rochelle, 1893."

29 See also below, Chapter VI, and Hamelin, p. 56.

The trade in wheat, or to use Hamelin's criterion, the price of wheat, has been used as another negative indicator in the social analysis of the class structures of New France. This index may be put "à la question", in the French sense of the word. The commerce in wheat, as indicated above, was but one activity of the merchants in the colony. A more serious criticism may be made, however. Crop failures, shortages, and a widely fluctuating price, and general market instability are not negative economic factors, but positive ones. The ideal money-making situation is in times of shortage, as long as one can control the market. This was the condition in New France. In times of want, speculation and untoward profits are the norms, not the exceptions.

Intimately linked with profits, and credit, is the monetary system of a country or a society. This is not merely a modern phenomenon, but one evident in the 18th century as well. The best documented previous work on the Canadian "bourgeoisie" devoted a chapter to "Le système monétaire" of New France. In it, Hamelin analysed the instruments of exchange in the colony. Most of his chapter considers the failure of the system, specially that following the Treaty of Utrecht. The second issue of card money, between 1729 and 1760, covers two pages. He

---

31 See next chapter.
32 Hamelin, pp. 37-46.
33 Hamelin, pp. 37-43.
34 Hamelin, pp. 44-46.
concluded that "En aucun moment, la Nouvelle-France n'a joui d'une monnaie saine, adaptée au volume de ses échanges..." The monetary system was, therefore, incapable of contributing in a positive manner to the economic development of the colony. He does, however, note that the citizens of the colony had confidence in their forms of currency.

Let us consider the matter further. It is essential to understand that card money, and other means of exchange, fulfil a necessary rôle in a colonial society, and that this currency, this soft as against metallic species, was a feature common to all of the American colonies. The equivalent of New France's card money, in New England, was "pine-tree" currency, which had, however, a rather short life. Paper currency was a means of providing for the lack of metallic coin, and the chronic trade deficit with the metropolis. The monetary system of New France was elaborated in response to its needs. These same conditions and needs were also prevalent in the British-American colonies.

35 Hamelin, p. 46.
36 Hamelin, p. 45.
That, in 1729, the French government approved of a new issue of card money to the extent of 400,000 livres is a sign of economic need, and growth. In the period of the second issue, in addition to the emission of 1729, 60,000 livres were issued in 1731; 200,000 in 1733 and 12,000 livres in 1742. Hamelin, quite correctly, emphasizes that the administrators of the colony used the system, but is this a criticism?

The system of conversion was as follows. Cards were issued by the intendant’s office. These would circulate during the year, and theoretically, were to be redeemed in the Autumn for bills of exchange drawn on the French Marine Treasury. However, due to public confidence, not all the cards were exchanged, but continued in circulation. Some were used as a means of savings. The continuous shortage of hard species, means of exchange, and the needs of central and local officials and businessmen led to a growth of variations on this basic system. In addition to cards and bills of exchange, the deputies of the intendant, either in Montreal, Three Rivers or in the hinterland posts, took to

40 "Memorandum of the King to...Beauharnois...and Hocquart, March 22, 1729"; "Ordinance of the King on the subject of card money, of March 2 one thousand seven hundred and twenty nine"; "Details in Connection with the preparation of new cards, October 25, 1729"; "Beauharnois and Hocquart to the Minister, October 25, 1729"; "Public satisfaction with the card money, January 14, 1730"; Shortt CURRENCY, vol. 2, pp. 583-587; 589-595; 593-601; 601-611; 611.
issuing receipts for goods supplied, that is, promises to pay or ordonnances. These media of exchange were in addition to the more formal types issued by the intendant. Public confidence in these notes was so great that they circulated among the people in the same way as did cards.

The results were that instead of 720,000 livres, of currency being created in the period, much vaster sums were in circulation. In the year 1747, a war year, and a time when expenses would be higher, no less than 2,669,358 livres in different forms of notes other than card money were issued. These local treasury notes, and their volume, indicate that a high volume of commerce was prevalent. It should be added that this commerce expressed in ordonnances would only represent economic activities between individuals and the State, and did not include private commerce. There was, at times, a prolonged delay in the redemption of these means of exchange, but as long as they were redeemable, the delay did not lead to a lack of public use, and the notes would

46 Of the issues between 1729 and 1742, 60,000 livres were redeemed immediately; thus the total for the years was 720,000 livres. See "Reasons for the Excess of Card Money. Cards Returned for Bills of Exchange, Canada, 25 October, 1731", Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 2, pp. 623-625.
47 "Hocquart to the Minister, Quebec, October 27, 1747", Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 2, pp. 751-755 and 749n.
48 Shortt, CURRENCY, p. 607n.
continue circulating. Hamelin infers that the whole of the period after 1713 suffered from a financial instability due to a poor currency system. This was not so, for it was not until 1759 that actual suspension of the payment of card money occurred.

Any evaluation of the means of exchange in New France, even making due allowance for inflationary tendencies in the war years, 1744 to 1748, must consider the needs of the economic system, and specially those of a colonial society, or to use a more contemporary cliché, an underdeveloped area. The system was beneficial as long as the people had confidence in it, and this, as we have seen, was the case in New France until the Seven Years War years. The monetary system was also beneficial as long as the volume of commerce and profits in the colony were increasing. Again, this was the case. If, however, the rise was merely an inflationary one, then it would be detrimental. The rise in government expenditures, other than inflationary, and the increased external volume of commerce, tends to indicate a volume rather than merely a price increase, at least to 1744.


50 See Guy Frégault, "Essai sur les finances canadiennes, (1700-1750)" for an indication of increased government expenditures. Also Chapters III and V. The lack of statistics for the period after 1744 limits the possibility of judgments.
A consideration of credit and entrepreneurship from a purely economic base tends to do less than justice to the conditions prevalent in a colonial society. In addition to a presentation of profits, interest rates, and the monetary system, an appreciation of the rôle of the State as a source of capital, and, as important, as a source of economic privilege is essential. Fauteux, in his essay on industry in New France, realized that the so-called nobility, the Ramezay's, the Longueuil's, the Bleury's, engaged in commerce without fear of dérogéance. But he did not reach the conclusion that it was because of their social status that they engaged in trade. The relations between belonging to a social, military, administrative or religious elite, and engaging in commercial activities has been neglected as an area of study. The usual pattern in New France was to gain privilege or monopoly, use this to acquire capital through partners, or use the monopoly as a means of receiving a subsidy from the state.

The sieur Poulin de Francheville, described as a "...négocian (sic) à Montreal" and "propriétaire de la Seigneurie de St. Maurice", was granted a monopoly for the exploitation of the mineral resources of the Three Rivers region in 1730. In 1733, to assist the enterprise,

---

51 J.N. Fauteux, ESSAI SUR L'INDUSTRIE AU CANADA SOUS LE REGIME FRANCAIS, vol. 1, p. xviii, and Chapter II of the present work.

the state granted the monopolist an "...avance de dix mil livres qu'ils ont demandée pour luy et dont il doit faire le remboursement dans trois ans..." In the same year, to further facilitate the exploitation of the resources, and to acquire more capital, a company was formed. Among the members were Louis Frédéric Bricault de Valmue, the secretary to the intendant, Hocquart; François-Etienne Cugnet, a member of the Superior Council and Director of the Domaine d'Occident; Ignace Gamelin, a Montreal merchant and a seignior, and Pierre Poulin, Francheville's brother. The possibility that there was a relation between the company being formed and a government subsidy and monopoly appears to be a valid assumption.

Francheville died, but his monopoly was eventually continued under the direction of the ubiquitous Cugnet. In 1737, the Compagnie des Forges du Saint-Maurice was formed. In addition to Cugnet, Gamelin and two forge masters from France, the company included Thomas-Jacques Taschereau. He was the representative of the treasury of the Ministère de la Marine in New France.

53 "Mémoire du Roy aux Srs...Beauharnois...et Hocquart, 12 may 1733", P.A.C., F 3, vol. 12, part 1, f 136.
56 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 191.
Cugnet and his company went bankrupt in 1742. But Cugnet's debts illustrate well the relation between privilege and capital formation. The total of his debts, his personal obligations, contracted for the exploitation of the Forges, was 141,142 livres, 10 sols, 6 deniers. Of this sum, half was owed to the Marine Treasury, the remainder to merchants of La Rochelle, Rouen, Bordeaux, and a few individuals in New France, including Taschereau, the Treasury representative, and Hocquart, the intendant. Cugnet was juggling the figures a little, for as Hocquart told Maurepas, the total indebtedness of the company to the State, apart from any particular obligations, was 192,642 livres. The intendant also pointed out that of this sum, 64,302 livres, 1 denier was due to the account of the Domaine, and 5,705 livres, 18 deniers to the magasin du Roy. Of the total due, 110,000 livres was an advance from the State. Hocquart expressed well the evident link:

"...Je n'ay même pas craint de vous avouer plus d'une fois que j'avois contribué en quelque sorte au derangement que cela luy (Cugnet) avoit occasionné dans les affaires par mes excitations a l'Engager a trouver des fonds, a Em-


60 "Hocquart au Ministre, Canada, 24 octobre 1743", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 80, pp. 27-34.

61 "Arret qui révoque le privilège accordé aux Srs Cugnet, Gamelin, Taschereau, Olivier de Vezain et Simonet pour l'exploitation des mines de fer de St Maurice et reunit au domaine l'établissement fait dans cet endroit ainsi que les effets qui en dépendent, Versailles, 1 mai 1743", P.A.C., F 3, vol. 13, partie 1, 1741-49, f 70-73. See also the two Nish articles cited above on page 69, n. 16.
prunter...

The intendant did not neglect the debt due to the State, but he did not emphasize the fact that the French government was the greatest creditor.

Cugnet was also the lessee of the posts at Tadoussac. For the exploitation of the furs and fisheries of the posts, he managed to indebt himself to the extent of 19,498 livres, 15 sols, 7 deniers, and was very annoyed when, later, during Bigot's régime, the latter withdrew these money-losing posts from him. Another of Cugnet's schemes was the domestication of the boeufs d'Illinois. He was granted a state subsidy and monopoly, and formed a little company with a man called Gatineau, Beauharnois the governor, and Hocquart the intendant. Cugnet, in spite of an apparently formidable load of debts in 1742, died solvent in 1751. His wife was left enough to live at ease. Cugnet, while

---

exceptional in terms of volume, was not exceptional in terms of being granted privileges.

A slate industry was begun in the 1730's by Michel Sarrazin, a doctor employed by the State, member of the Superior Council, and a brother-in-law of Pierre Hazeur de l'Orme and Thierry Hazeur, two members of the clergy, and his partners in the enterprise. The purchase of the produce by the State, in effect a guaranteed market, will be considered in the following chapter. The slate industry was assisted, however, by judicial as well as financial means. In 1729 and 1730, the intendant issued ordonnances forbidding anyone from disturbing Sarrazin and company from developing their quarries. The Hazeurs, the partners, were the sons of a prominent merchant of the colony who was also a member of the Superior Council. De l'Orme was the representative of the Chapter of Quebec in France. His brother, Thierry Hazeur, who was not

69 Fauteux, vol. 1, p. 143.
considered to have the qualities necessary to make a good priest, became grand pénitencier and grand vicaire of the Quebec Chapter. These men, as was their brother-in-law, were men of affluence and influence.

Another of the partners in the tile industry was l'abbé Lepage "...un type fréquent dans l'histoire de la Nouvelle-France celui de prêtre, gérant d'entreprises industrielles...." He received consistent aid from the State in terms of assured markets, and the benefits of the law. In 1730, the purpose of an ordonnance was to permit an extension of the limits of his seigniory, and thus provide him with better access to lumber supplies. A second, that of 1731, permitted him to exploit the timber resources of lands other than his own. This lumber he then sold to the State. Lepage's brother, Germain, his partner, contracted to supply 10,000 pine planks to Lanoullier de Boisclerc.

---

74 Fauteux, vol. 21, p. 282.
75 "Ordonnance qui permet au sieur Lepage de Sainte-Claire, seigneur de Terrebonne, de continuer ses établissements dans la profondeur de deux lieux au déla de la profondeur dela dite seigneurie, et d'en tirer les bois...22 juillet 1730", Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 2, pp. 76-77. See with reference to l'abbé Lapage Chapter VII, THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE SEIGNIORIAL SYSTEM.
76 "Ordonnance qui permet au sieur l'abbé Lepage de faire exploiter dans les seigneuries de Berthier et Dautré...5 octobre 1731", Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 2, pp. 107-108.
Eustache Chartier de Lotbinière, the Dean of the Chapter of Quebec, and, at the same time a member of the Superior Council, was also involved in the lumber industry. These illustrations indicate not that the clergy engaged in commerce, but rather that men in a position of authority, or men of property, used their social and political status for economic purposes. Influence was based on status, and power, a privilege denied to the lowly.

Denis de la Ronde, an army officer whom we will again encounter in the following chapter, was also involved in commercial activities. The King approved of his attempts to discover and develop the mineral resources of the Lake Superior region. To assist him in the enterprise he was granted "...le poste de Chogouamigon (sic) pendant neuf années." It also happened to be a fur trading post. Nicolas-Marie d'Avène, sieur des Meloizes, another army officer and administrator, was granted a subsidy of 6,000 livres to assist him in the establishment of a tile factory. Jean-Baptiste Pommereau, Guillaume Estèbe and Daniel de Beaujeu formed a company to exploit the resources of Pommereau's grant.
in Labrador. Pommereau was an écrivain du Roy, Estèbe, a member of the Superior Council, and Beaujeu was an officer of the troupes de la marine. Estèbe also formed a partnership with the sieur de Saint-Vincent for the same purpose in the following year, 1740.

François Martel de Brouage, the recipient of another post in Labrador, best illustrates the pattern of the des Meloizes and Beaujeu associations. Brouage formed a partnership with Pierre Trotier Desauniers in 1735, and this was continued by a new agreement in 1741. Brouage put little money into the company, but the value of the enterprise on May 20, 1741, was 55,846 livres, 9 sols, 1 denier. The privilege in this and the other instances, was the concession of land in a desirable area, Labrador. Fishing and furs were the main commercial activities. Part of the capital of the officers, or the recipient of the

82 "Acte par lequel Jean-Baptiste Pommereau subroge Guillaume Estèbe et Daniel de Beaujeu dans la moitié de ses droits pour la concession de cinq lieues de front sur quatre lieues de profondeur...à la côte de Labrador, 30 avril 1739", P.A.C., DOCUMENTS RELATIFS À LA PROVINCE DE QUEBEC: B-DISTRICT DE QUEBEC: GREFFES DES NOTAIRES, Latour, pp. 6-7. (Hereafter P.A.C., GREFFES).


84 "Convention entre François Martel de Brouage, commandant au poste de Labrador, et Pierre Trotier Desauniers, négociant à Québec, Au sujet de la Société contractée entre eux le 28 décembre 1735 au sujet de la traite au Labrador, 20 mai 1741", P.A.C., GREFFES, Boucault; see also Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 2, p. 705n.
post, was founded on his privileged position; this was his capital. That of the merchant was money.

Position, as well as privilege, was measured in monetary terms. Rocbert père, a garde magasin at Montreal was permitted to establish his own shop beside that of the King. Bréard, in his defense at the trials following the conquest of New France, claimed that "L'assurance qui me fait (sic) donnée que le commerce étoit libre, qu'il étoit meme permis aux officiers du Roy, me détermina a accepter cette commission, quoique les appointemens ne fussent que de 1800 livres par an." Martel, another defendant, in his justification wrote that the position of garde magasin was "...une place qui avoit exité (sic) l'ambition de toute la Colonies, Sans avoir éveillé La Sienne", although, it might be added, he did manage to accept it. Guillaume Estèbe justified his activities in the latter part of the French Régime by appealing to usages prevalent in the colony. Rocbert, father and son, in Montreal, and de Tonnancourt the garde magasin at Three Rivers, he claimed, also engaged in commercial activities while holding positions of trust. Estèbe also pointed an accusing finger at Cugnet, the first councillor of the Superior Coun-

85 "Martel de Saint Antoine, Jean Baptiste Grégoire, 1762", P.A.C., PRE-CONQUEST PAPERS: H: NEW FRANCE. See also Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 1, p. 359n.
87 "Martel de Saint Antoine, Jean Baptiste Grégoire, 1762", P.A.C., PRE-CONQUEST PAPERS: H: NEW FRANCE.
cil, as being but one more illustration of the same pattern of mixed, and conflicting interests.

Privilege and position could also metamorphosize themselves into credit, the latter being the equivalent of capital. Madame de Ramézay, the widow of the late governor of Montreal, was requested to pay her debts to the King's stores. Hocquart, however, placed his finger on the policy: "...il est vrai", he wrote the Minister, "qu'on a eu jusques à présent la facilité d'en livrer à Credit a ceux qui font quelque entreprise avec le Roy." Foucault, who at different times was a garde magasin, councillor and chief scrivenor, owed the King's stores about 33,835 livres in 1732. He was a member of the administration, a garde magasin, who owed money to the State and was responsible, at the same time, for the credit extended to others. The current term used to express the possible dangers of such a situation is conflict of interests.

---


These interminglings of commercial activities and of government posts are very evident. Alexandre Dagneau, sieur Douville, for example, signed an obligation for 9,510 livres and change, for trade merchandise with François Foucher, an administrator of the colony. Ramirezay, the son of the previously-mentioned widow, was the commander at la Pointe de Chagouamignon. He received goods valued at about 18,178 livres from a Montreal merchant, Louis Charly. Other examples of the creation of credit, and the relations between position and access to credit, are seen in the links between Jacques Lemoine, seigneur de Martigny and J.B. Neveu; in 1731 Charles Gonneville, sieur de Rupallais signed an obligation with François de Montfort; Montfort extended credit in the same year, to François Guyon Després, René Godefroy, sieur de Lincot, and others. In 1734, François d'Ailleboust, sieur de la Made-


94 See Roy, GREFFES, vol. 16, Guillet de Chaumont, p. 118. (Some of the notorial records have been listed through the index, rather than all as individual obligations.).

95 Monfort extended credit to no less than 8 individuals or companies in a single year. Also Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 2, pp. 213-225 and "Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 17 octobre 1730", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 53, p. 95.
leine, advanced credit to Alexis Lemoine Monière for trading at Michilimackinac. In the following year Pierre Margane de Lavalterie and Paul d'Ailleboust were supplied with 12,000 livres of merchandise by François Monfort and Company. What is apparent is that no one individual or company was the single source of credit. But, there was a monopoly in the sense that the same names appear all the time, and that credit is continuously available to these men. Privilege, position and power and credit became almost synonyms.

As well as colonial partnerships, and the extension of credit in New France, there is a further factor to consider. Was the Canadien merchant merely a clerk of a metropolitan company? No! He was both a partner, and a branch. Goguet, for example, was an associate of Pascaud's. Fleury de la Gorgendiére had, as a partner, his brother

97 "Obligation par Pierre Margane de Lavalterie et Paul Dailleboust de Cuisy, associés; à François Monfort & Cie Marchand de Ville-Marie, pour 12666 livres 12 sols 7 deniers pour marchandises fournies et contennes sur facture, 10 juin 1735", Roy, GREFFES, vol. 12, Chevremont, p. 36.
98 See, for example, Roy, GREFFES, vols. 12 and 15, pp. 52 and 48-50, 92-104.
99 "Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 8 octobre 1743", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 80, p. 6. (This is a matter to be further investigated. As yet, there are but scattered references to the commercial links between France and New France. Recent acquisitions of the P.A.C. of notorial records from the ports of France partially permit an elaboration, but a separate study of the question should someday be undertaken.).
Charles Chambaud de Fleury of La Rochelle. Havy and Lefebvre are the agents of Dugard of Rouen as well as principals in their own rights. Dargenteuil de Cerry, and his wife and brother, had commercial and credit arrangements with the Pascauds. Cugnet, as we have seen, owed local and French merchants, as well as the French state. The question of metropolitan-colonial commercial and credit relations cannot be stated as an "either or" relationship, but rather as "either and or"! Colonial economic societies needed the metropolitan link to carry out their commercial endeavours. Profits accrued to both groups. The conditions in New France were similar to those of the British-American colonies.

In the past pages we have spoken of enterprise and entrepreneurs. Some of the evidence supporting the existence of an entrepreneurial group, a characteristic of a bourgeois class, has been presented. The evidence conforms to Hall's definition of enterprise: "...action of a relatively high order of vigor..." and to James' concept of the

100 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 360.
102 "Messeurs Pascaud Frères a Monsieur Dargenteuil de Cerry, La Rochelle, 15 mai 1746", P.A.C., BABY COLLECTION, pp. 824-825.
104 See Bruchey, pp. 31-37.
105 Douglas Hall, IDEAS AND ILLUSTRATIONS IN ECONOMIC HISTORY, p. 15.
106 Clifford L. James, PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMICS, p. 3.
entrepreneur: "He is a special type of laborer. His function or place in production is that of organizing...and assuming responsibility for its operations." Hall also remarks that any definition is relative. The criterion by which we judge an activity and its achievements must be relative to the object and conditions prevailing in the milieu in which the objective is undertaken.

The relations of credit, capital, privilege and power, as we have seen, were very complex in colonial New France. It is impossible to draw a clear-cut line between commercial activities of merchants, the rôle of the State, or the use of the powers of the State for private ends. It has been admitted that the determination of profits, and the existence of credit and of capital funds presents problems of interpretation. Hamelin's isolated presentation and interpretation, however, does not conform to a work procedure valid as an analytic tool for a colonial society.

The use of evidence, if we are to achieve a correct view of a colonial economy, depends not merely on testimony, but upon inference. It appears logical to assume that continuous extension of credit by individuals to individuals, or groups to groups, depends upon a satisfactory fulfillment of prior obligations. It appears logical that privilege

---

107 James, p. 4.
108 Hall, p. 16.
could be translated into economic activity. It appears logical, and contrary to Hamelin's view, that the continued use, and increased volume of card money and other means of exchange, indicate an increased level of commerce, and not instability. It also appears logical that if the same people engaged in the same commercial activities year after year, that they did so because they made a profit, and not a loss.

The consideration of forms of credit and means of entrepreneurship in New France in the period 1729 to 1748 shows a normal colonial pattern. The French colony had difficulties, as did the British colonies. There was a continuous shortage of hard currency. There was often a lack of funds for capital investment, if by this we mean savings as against a surplus from production. The colonial limitations, however, cannot *ipso facto* lead to the conclusion that these limitations must result in a society incapable of supporting a bourgeois class. Quite the contrary, the colonist adapted to his conditions, as did his neighbour to the South. The colonists used privilege and power where they could; created credit by a variety of means; engaged in a multitude of activities to create volume and increase profits. Furs, fish, lumbering, tile manufacturing and mining are some of the activities we have examined. In the following chapter we shall further consider entrepreneurship through the medium of sales to the State.
CHAPTER V

THE BOURGEOISIE AND COMMERCE: 3:

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE STATE

In the historiography of the French Régime in Canada, it is only recently that a due importance has been given to the rôle of the State as a factor in economic growth. Frégaault, in his analysis of the budgets of the colony, noted that "Pour plusieurs années, et particulièrement entre 1730 et 1750, les bordereaux annuels de recette et de dépense comportent le détail de tout ce que l'Etat colonial se procure sur place..." What is indicated is that

Surtout on découvre dans ces documents un grand fait économique: l'importance de l'Etat considéré comme client de l'industrie et de commerce locaux. Que l'Etat achète beaucoup et paye bien aussitôt la prospérité se répand dans la collectivité canadienne...

Another investigator of the period, Elizabeth Jean Lunn, believed that during Hocquart's régime the practice was to purchase supplies for the King's stores from many individuals. This, as we shall see, must be modified to most supplies being purchased from a few and some supplies being purchased from many.

There is a traditional criticism of paternalism, that is, the interference of the State in economic affairs. In New France, the State

2 Frégaault, Finances, p. 309.
3 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 92.
was a vital, and viable economic factor. Arthur W. Lewis has well assessed the rôle that the State can, and does, play. He wrote:

The behaviour of government plays as important a rôle in stimulating or discouraging economic activity as does the behaviour of entrepreneurs, or parents, or scientists, or priests. It is, however, harder to get into perspective because of political prejudice...Sensible people do not get involved in the arguments about whether economic progress is due to government activity; they know that it is due to both...

Frégault's statement, applicable to the 1730's and the 1750's, and Lewis' generalizations are supported, as well, by testimony of the post-conquest period. Three Canadiens merchants wrote:

La France versoit annuellement soit pour l'entretien des troupes, ou autres objets politique, près de Dix a Douze million de Livres Tournois; cet argent repandu parmi les particuliers, formoit une Richesse reelle, la circulation donnoit essor a l'industrie & le Pays encore pauvres avoit besoin de cette resource...

That the State was an important factor in the economic life of the colony has been suggested. In this chapter we shall examine the purchases and expenditures for services by the State such as freighting, merchandise, which runs the gamit from nails to iron and vivres, usually food products. As well, the purchases will reflect the subsidies accorded by the means of a guaranteed market for tiles and lumber.

Freighting, that is, the carriage trade of goods within and

---


without the colony, was one of the sources of revenue for the citizens of New France. In 1732, Menthet received 8,431 livres, 15 sols, 6 deniers, for services rendered. J.B. Laforest, in the same year, furnished services to the approximate value of 12,256 livres. Testu (de la Richardière), in 1733, charged the government 1,248 livres for shipments to Louisbourg. A few years later, in 1737, Menthet delivered goods to Fort Frontenac, and Jean-Baptiste Laforest to Fort Fréderic. They received, respectively, 8,449 and 4,865 livres. In the 1740's, freighting was almost the monopoly of Sabrevois de Bleury. In 1743 his services were worth 7,654 livres. During the war year of 1747 the sum was 48,263 livres.

The State, apart from general supplies and food products, also paid for other services, such as repairs. In 1743, de Tonnancour and Desauniers performed reparations for the State. The magnitude, and the monopoly, may be gathered from the following table:

---

6 "Bordereau par extrait...1732", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, pp. 352-357.
7 "Sur les fonds de l'Isle Royalle, 1733", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 32, f 141.
8 "Bordereau...1737", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 114-1, f 49. (Figures rounded off.).
9 "Bordereau...1743", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 115-1, f. 36.
11 "A compte de Réparations, 1743", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34, f 240.
### Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Amount (livres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Allard</td>
<td>Tailleur de pierre</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Bellisle</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>13,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>4,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>11,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>9,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>4,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Chabot</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Cugnet</td>
<td>Bourgeois</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Dailleboust</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Desroches</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Maillou</td>
<td>Architecte</td>
<td>9,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Maillou</td>
<td>Architecte</td>
<td>4,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>Roofer</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Mignot</td>
<td>Locksmith</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sums expended annually for repairs were significant. Belleville, Maillou, Cugnet and d'Ailleboust had much larger shares of the work than the less influential people. Expenditures for fortifications and reparations in 1739 were: 18,877, Montreal; 7,515, Quebec; 3,258, Three Rivers; 3,254 Montreal; 598, Niagara and Frontenac; 218, St. Frédéric, all in livres. In 1740, the total was 41,459 livres and in 1743, 22,263 livres.

---

12 "Bordereau...1732"; "Dépenses...1732"; "Bordereau...1737"; "Bordereau...1739"; "Bordereau...1740"; "Bordereau...1741" and "Bordereau...1743", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 113-2, f 475; 113-2, f 474-475; 114-1, f 37-39; 114-1, f 13; 129; 130; 114-2, f 299; 299; 299; 300; 114-2, f 393; 400; 398 and 115-1, f 47; 45.

13 *Sols and deniers* omitted.

14 *Sols and deniers* omitted.


livres.

As noted, the State, in addition to using its judicial powers, and providing money subsidies, encouraged industry and commerce by assuring a market. Sarrazin, doctor, administrator, seignior and merchant, sold, in 1731, 107,600 tiles to the State at 50 livres per thousand. The following year the purchase was valued at 2,377 livres. The "sieur Page de Sainte Claire", (l'abbé Lepage), sold lumber valued at 1,191 livres to the government in 1733, while the sieur Leger, dit Richelieu, furnished pitch worth 6,050 livres. The merchandise was destined for the port of Rochefort.

Before proceeding with further illustrations of the purchases by the State of New France, it is well to pause and consider for a moment three of the names mentioned to date. The first, Menthet, (also spelt Mantet), was from a branch of the d'Ailleboust family. Desauniers,
whose name will appear many times, was the syndic of the merchants of Quebec. De Tonnancour's full name was Louis-Joseph Godefroy, sieur de Tonnancour, an administrator, merchant and seignior.

The sale of pitch and lumber for export was but one aspect of the trade in these commodities. More important was the ship-building industry re-established during Hocquart's régime. Between 1729 and 1742, according to Lunn, there were 105 ships built in New France ranging in tonnage from 10 to 300, and from types as diverse as barges to war ships. From 1742 to 1748 six ships were built for the King's service. In addition to purchasing materials, and establishing State owned and operated ship yards, the government also directly subsidized the industry. In 1733, 3,643 livres were paid to individual builders. Among those who received monies were Antoine Lemaitre Lamorille; the sieurs Desauniers, Perthuis and Bleury. The results of these ship building

25 See also Chapters VII and IX.
27 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 253.
activities were to prime the economy of the colony, for apart from the impetus given to merchants, the wages gained by the workers of the country were a positive economic factor.

The tendency noted above for a monopolistic tendency in State purchases, was also evident in the acquisition of materials for ship building. Jehanne, in 1743, supplied 17,000 livres worth of goods. The costs debited for building, equipping and arming the Caribou in 1743, were 20,000 livres. Taché, Guillimin, Delore, Estèbe, Goguet and Jehanne supplied 14,000 livres of this sum. Another statement totalled 18,952 livres of which over 17,000 livres of goods were supplied by Jehanne, Lanoullier, Charest and Imbert. For the same ship, St. Ange Charly, Ignace Perthuis, Madame Berthier, Ignace Gamelin, the sieur de Beaujeu and Jean Baptiste Pommereau furnished approximately 22,000 livres of materials.

Jehanne, Goguet and Charest were merchants. Guillimin, Estèbe,

---

30 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 277.
31 "A Compte de la fourniture des bois pour la construction, Québec, 30 octobre 1743", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34, f 236.
32 "A Compte de la Construction, Armement et chargement du V'au le Caribou, Québec, 30 octobre 1742", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34, f 238.
33 "Construction du Vaisseau Le Caribou, Québec, 30 octobre 1743", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34, f 242.
34 "Construction du Vaisseau Le Caribou, Québec, 30 octobre 1743", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34, f 244-245.
Lanoullier and Imbert were government officials and merchants. Madame Berthier was the widow of an army officer and the owner of a seigniory. Beaujeu was an army officer, administrator and seignior.

The expenses for the construction of the frigate Le Castor reveal that l'abbé Tonnancour supplied lumber valued at 5,370 livres. M. de Tonnancour sold for 4,000 livres, and the names of Jehanne and Taché are again encountered. Antoine-Charles de Tonnancour was the brother of Louis-Joseph, and although a member of the clergy, specifically of the Chapter of Quebec, he engaged in commerce.

The construction costs of Le Caribou, in 1744, again reveal the tendency to large purchases from a few, but at the same time show that some smaller purchases were made from well-placed persons. Imbert, a man who will figure prominently as the Marine Treasury representative in Canada during Bigot's régime, sold over 13,000 livres' worth of goods to the State; Lanoullier, 2,400; Jehanne, 2,000; Charest, 1,300; Gamelin, 900; Miss Pommereau, 5,300; St. Ange Charly, the same; Beaujeu, 1,500; Madame Berthier, 2,200; Desauniers, 4,800; Ignace Perthuis, 8,100.

35 "Achat de bois pour la Fregate le Castor, Québec, 30 octobre 1743", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34, f 246.

36 Le Jeune, vol. 2, p. 721. See also Chapter II, THE BOURGEOISIE AND MARRIAGE for a consideration of the close family ties between the names encountered to date, and the many to follow.

Smaller sales were made by Madame des Meloizes, Boucault, Foucault, an-
other Gamelin and Hiché.

Some details of the purchases by the State are missing. It is
difficult to reconstruct the transactions merely from the reports of
cost. However, the records of the letters of exchange drawn on the
French Marine Treasury do provide a means of supplementing the state-
ments of cost. Estèbe, not mentioned in a previous statement on the
cost of the Caribou, drew 3,000 livres in letters of exchange. Guilli-
imín, also not noted, received 800 livres.

In 1745 the total sum expended for the construction of ships,
and the armaments for these vessels, was 210,466 livres, 10 sols, 5 den-
iers. While it is not possible to accurately determine what part of
this expenditure went to whom, the lists of letters of exchange drawn
in 1745 for the expenses of Canada and l'Isle Royale indicate that Es-
lève received letters valued at 7,500 livres; Mathurin, (de Lino), 1,000;
Desauniers, 99,000; Imbert, 2,700; la Gorgendièrè fils, 6,500; Havy and

38 "Construction du Vaisseau le Caribou", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34,
f 242-245. See also "Etat de...lettres de changes tirées...pour la con-
struction...Le Caribou...Québec, 30 octobre 1743", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34,
f 245.

39 "Etat de dix neuf lettres de change...a compte de la construc-
tion, armement et chargement du vaisseau le Cariboux (sic)...1744",
P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34, f 238.

40 "1745, Construction et armements des Vx du Roy, Québec, 28 oct-
Lefebvre, 2,500; Varin, the marine commissary at Montreal, 900; and the governor, Beauharnois, 2,000. The total expenditures covered by this one statement were approximately 306,544 livres, a considerable sum for but one part of State purchases for the year.

It has been noted that the sales to the State were in the hands of a few merchants of New France, at least in so far as freighting and lumber were concerned. This will be seen to be the case in the State's purchases of marchandises, munitions et vivres as well. Of a total sale of 24,820 livres of miscellaneous merchandise in the city of Quebec in 1732, Sarrazin, Lepage, Cugnet, Léonard Larche and la Gorgendiére furnished 17,385 livres worth. In Montreal, Monfort and Hervieux supplied 6,634 livres of a total purchase of 10,854. In the latter city, in the year 1730, Francheville, of the Saint-Maurice Forges, Guyon Després and la Gorgendiére supplied 16,945 livres of food products out of a total purchase of 26,478 livres. Before considering further purchases from individuals, a table of total purchases of merchandise, excluding vivres and munitions will be presented for the years 1731 to 1743.

---

41 "Etat des lettres de change tirées...a compte des Dépenses Marine, 1746...de l'Isle Royale (et) Construction des Vaisseaux du Roy, Québec, 30 octobre 1745", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 84, f 196-198.

42 "Bordereau par extrait...1732", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 352-357.

43 "Sur les fonds de l'Isle Royale, février 1730", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 34.
Table 12
Purchase of Merchandise by the State in New France, 1731-1743

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Purchase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>35,674.16.46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>70,941.5.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>55,245.6.8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After 1736, it is possible to break the figures down to the place of provenance of the merchandise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Quebec</th>
<th>Three Rivers</th>
<th>Montreal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>46,809.7.2.</td>
<td>16,513.12.5.</td>
<td>1,003.14.</td>
<td>12,016.9.9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>59,211.10.6.</td>
<td>17,526.1.</td>
<td>445.</td>
<td>18,157.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>58,846.14.4.</td>
<td>7,149.10.5.</td>
<td>625.15.</td>
<td>16,843.15.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>80,288.12.8.</td>
<td>15,111.8.10.</td>
<td>298.10.</td>
<td>21,721.12.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>64,085.10.3.</td>
<td>77,780.19.9.</td>
<td>170.10.</td>
<td>12,114.8.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart, incomplete, is drawn from the study of the present author, noted on page 44, n. 15. It is given as relevant, but not definitive.

44 Bordereau...1732", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 473.
45 Bordereau...1732", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 481.
47 In another section of this document, under guerre, there are further purchases by the State of merchandise.
52 Bordereau...1743", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 115-1, f 38-40. (As noted, these statistics are incomplete and not merely because the study is not finished, but also because the particular series does not contain
The purchase of *vivres*, usually food products, unlike that of merchandise, was all from New France. The total, and local purchases follow:

**Table 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total only</th>
<th>Quebec</th>
<th>Three Rivers</th>
<th>Montreal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>45,213.13.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>4,882.4.6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>117,545.9.8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>31,723.17.8.</td>
<td>5,501.15.</td>
<td>33,512.10.</td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>27,221.5.4.</td>
<td>(for Isle Royale)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>13,178.12.</td>
<td>5,229.10.</td>
<td>32,948.10.3.</td>
<td>(59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>27,911.8.10.</td>
<td>5,575.10.</td>
<td>49,008.3.7.</td>
<td>(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>66,011.3.11.</td>
<td>7,762.</td>
<td>80,295.5.1.</td>
<td>(61)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To these purchases of food products should be added the firewood bought by the State. The purchases averaged slightly over 10,000 *livres* per

---

52 all of the information. The study of economic history is made difficult by these gaps and lacuna in the documentation.

53 Drawn from the same study noted on the previous page, and again the word of caution; they are incomplete.

54 "Dépenses...1732", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 481.

55 "Bordereau...1736", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 114-1, f 24. These are purchases made in 1735 charged to 1736. They are obviously incomplete.


58 "Bordereau...1739", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 114-1, f 133.


year for the years 1732, 1736, 1737, 1739, 1740, 1741 and 1743.

The sales by individuals indicate the monopolistic tendency mentioned, by now, so often. The wheat trade played a large role in the commercial activities of Joseph Poulin Courval. In 1730 he furnished "...une partie de farine qui a esté envoyés a l'Isle Royele pour la subsistance des troupes...payement...de ces farine...4079..." livres. His sales in 1732 were 10,875 livres, and in the next year, 10,432 livres. Two years later, in 1735, 11,221 livres worth of wheat were sold by this man to the State. Desauniers, the syndic, boat builder and owner, seignior, and lumber merchant, also sold wheat and flour. In 1733 and 1737, to the value 3,360 and 1,758 livres were purchased from him by the government. Montfort of Montreal, merchant and fur trader, furnish-

See "Bordereau...1732"; "Bordereau...1736"; "Bordereau...1737"; "Bordereau...1739"; "Bordereau...1740", "Bordereau...1741" and "Bordereau...1743", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 113-2, f 470-478; 114-1, f 15, 115-117; 47;116-118; 287-289; 374 and 115-1, f 42-43.

"Sur les fonds de l'Isle Royalle, février 1730", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 34.

"Sur les fonds de l'Isle Royalle, Québec, 8 octobre 1732", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 31, f 43-44.


"Extrait de la dépense faite a Quebec...pour l'Isle Royalle, Québec, 26 octobre 1735", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 33, f 38.

"Extrait de la dépense...faite a Quebec pour...l'Isle Royalle ...1734", and "Bordereau...1737", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 31, f 219, and C 11 A, vol. 114-1, f 43.

See next chapter, THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE HINTERLAND.
ed wheat valued at 3,209 and 3,150 *livres* in 1737 and 1739. The Baron and Baroness de Longueuil, the first a noble, member of the administration, and a seignior, supplied 1,050 and 1,400 *livres* worth of wheat. The significance of the level of these sales may better be appreciated when they are compared to the sales of less important persons. A man called Gourdeaux sold for 505 *livres* of wheat in 1737 and Jacques Letourneau's sale totalled 284 *livres*. In 1739, Cloutier sold the State 546 *livres* worth of the same product and Mazurier's sale was for 400 *livres*, and these are, among small ones, relatively large.

Other large sales are those of Francheville in 1732, 2,000 *livres* and that of Jean-Baptiste Barsalou, 3,825. François Foucault, the *garde magasin* at Quebec, and later a member of the Superior Council, supplied the State with 12,792 *livres* worth of wheat for l'Isle Royale in 1735. Payments for the same commodity were made to Vallier, the

---

69 "Bordereau...1737", and "Bordereau...1739", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 114-1, f 43 and 113-2, f 113-115.
70 "Bordereau...1739", and "Bordereau...1740", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 113-2, f 112-115, and 114-1, f 285.
71 "Bordereau...1737", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 114-1, f 43.
73 "Bordereau par extrait...1732", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 476-477.
75 "Fourniture a l'Isle Royale, Quebec, 29 octobre 1735", P.A.C, F 1, vol. 33, f 37.
superior of the Seminary of Quebec in 1737, and valued at 5,752 livres; Philibert received an order for 2,197; la Gorgendièrè, 1,931; Gaillard, another member of the Superior Council, sold wheat to the government as did Gugnière. The latter's sales were worth 16,917 livres. Louval, a monopolist of the Three Rivers district, sold 2,730 livres of wheat and Guy, a Montreal merchant, 1,525. The year 1739 favoured five persons: they sold approximately 18,100 livres' worth of wheat. In Montreal in the same year, the same number of persons supplied 11,000 livres' worth.

Joseph Fleury, sieur de la Gorgendièrè, the representative of the Company of the Indies in New France, merchant, King's councillor, and father-in-law of the younger Vaudreuil and Thomas-Jacques Taschereau, the Marine Treasury representative in the colony, was the main source of cloth fabric purchased by the State. His sales of fabric follow in a table, in rounded-off numbers.

76 Le Jeune, vol. 1, p. 682.
80 See Chapter II, THE BOURGEOISIE AND MARRIAGE.
Table 14

Sale of fabrics to the State by de la Gorgendièrè, 1732-1741

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales in livres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>12,328 (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>7,212 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>8,096 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>3,435 (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>3,933 (85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, he sold wheat, as previously noted, and he was a seigneur.

The dealers in firewood were few in number, but their sales were large. François Léger was the main supplier in Quebec City. In 1732, he furnished wood to the value of 4,650 livres. The three other suppliers received, between them, but 900 livres. In 1739 Léger sold firewood valued at 5,445 livres; in 1740, 4,401, and in 1747, a time of increasing State purchases, 28,920 livres. Louval, of Three Rivers,

---

81 "Bordereau...1732", and "Dépense...1732", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 470 and 477.
84 "Bordereau...1740", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 114-1, f 280.
86 "Bordereau.par extrait...1732", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, pp. 476-477.
who also sold meat to the State, as well as candles, was the principal supplier at Trois-Rivières, although the State purchased much less there than in the other two metropolitan areas of the colony. Sales of 1,000 and 1,200 livres were the usual purchases. In Montreal the main furnishers of firewood were Ignace Gamelin, of the Saint-Maurice Forges, Beaujeu, already encountered in several other commercial activities, Ignace Bourassa, a fur trader, Madame Portneuf, François Monfort and Madame d'Youville.

The sales of meat and candles reveals the monopolistic character of purchases by the State. Charles Larche, Guyon Després, Joseph Guyon, Louval and Dolbec were the men who held the monopoly. Later, in the 1740's, the famous name of Cadet would be added to the list. In the years 1732, 1736, 1737, 1739 and 1740, Larche sold approximately 28,906 livres' worth of meat to the government. Guyon Després, in 1732, sold meat valued at 10,000 livres; 5,500 in 1739; 5,300 in 1740, and in 1747, 42,219 livres' worth of vivres. Louval and Dolbec, be-

90 "Bordereau...1739", and "Bordereau...1740", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 113-2, f 116, and 114-1, f 287.
91 "Bordereau...1740", and "Bordereau...1741", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 113-2, f 116, and 114-1, f 287.
92 "Bordereau...1732"; "Dépense...1732"; "Bordereau...1736"; "Bordereau...1739" and "Bordereau...1740", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 113-2, f 470, 477; 114-1, f 12; 44; 109-113 and 286.
93 "Bordereau par extrait...1732"; "Bordereau...1739"; "Bordereau...1740" and "Bordereau...1747", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 113-2, pp. 476-477; 113-115; 114-1, f 285 and 116-1, f 16-20.
tween them, supplied over 33,000 livres' worth of meat in three years.

There are two further means of illustrating sales to the government: miscellaneous merchandise, and again, more illustrations of total volume. In the later years of the period under consideration this is a necessity as the reports of the intendant do not always give the details of the purchases. This is specially true in the period of war, 1744 to 1748. The pressure of work tended to make the intendant's task very difficult. A factor to note, as well, in this later period, is that some of the suppliers of the earlier years have disappeared, at least as sellers to the State. Some of these changes are due to death, some to competition from rising merchants and officials. However, and this must be noted, even before Bigot's period, the tendency to purchase from a favourite few was the norm. The tendency to place all the blame on the shoulders of Bigot, erroneously, may be illustrated by an article by Allana Reid. She wrote that only one person listed in an anonymous "Mémoire du Canada" was in the country prior to 1749. In fact, seven were, and if we include the Canadian born Marquis de Vaudreuil, eight. This is neither to accuse Hocquart, not to excuse Bigot; it is merely to state that monopolistic features existed in the period under study.

94 "Bordereau...1737"; "Bordereau...1739" and "Bordereau...1740", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 114-1, f 43, 45-46; 114-1, f 113-115 and 285.

95 Allana Reid, "The Nature of Quebec Society During the French Régime", p. 27.
In the sales of miscellaneous merchandise to the government some
now familiar names appear. François Léger furnished pitch in 1739 and
1740 worth 800 livres. Cugnet sold lamp oil and iron valued at 1,100
livres. The councillor Guillimin sold cables, tobacco and sugar for
2,100 livres. Pommereau of the Marine Department, furnished sail-cloth
worth 386 livres. Gugnière, la Gorgendière, Lemoine-Monière, Neveu,
Jehanne, Estèbe, Havy and Jean Taché supplied such items as hemp, toba-
c, cloth, nails, stockings, spoons, stoves, axes, shoes and clothes.

One of the accounts of 1745, that of war preparations, indicates
State purchases of 233,449 livres, and this was a volume and not merely
a price increase. Most of the items were supplied by Canadian merchants,
another very notable feature of this later period. Goguet furnished
cloth and guns worth 8,700 livres. Lamorille supplied 996 pots of mol-
asses, and wines, for which he received 4,400 livres. Taché supplied
tobacco, Jehanne, shoes and Havy miscellaneous items. The total for
these three was 8,600 livres. Joseph Cadet sold food products worth
38,279 livres in 1747; Philibert, Marie Guerin, veuve Philibert, sold
47,190 livres' worth of victuals; La Corne, a man more noted for fur
trading, now also sold food products to the extent of the large sum of

96 "Bordereau...1739", and "Bordereau...1740", P.A.C., C 11 A,

97 "Preparatif de guerre, 1745, Québec, 21 octobre 1745", P.A.C.,
C 11 A, vol. 84, f 120-121, 123, 130.
20,742 livres. Others selling to the government were Jean Taché, 2,052; Lamorille, 25,927; Joseph LeProust, of Three Rivers, 20,721 livres of the total purchase in that area of 22,401 livres. In Montreal, the year was also a prosperous one. Bleury made sales worth 14,487 and 68,617 livres; Lemoine-Monière received 2,595, 2,454, and 9,011 livres. The Gamelins, Jacques, Ignace and Joseph's sales totalled 19,800 livres. Dufy-Desauniers, a member of the influential Desauniers family, supplied food worth 85, 1,814, and 7,416 livres. De Cuisy, a member of the d'Ailleboust clan, furnished the government with goods worth 5,200 livres. Other suppliers were Marsolet, de Lery, the chief engineer of the colony, Pommereau, Hervieux, a fur trader, Guyon and St. Ange Charly. The total purchase price of food, in this one year, was 459,926 livres, 4 sols, 6 deniers. War time was a good time to make money, then and now.

The Montreal merchants also figure prominently in the sale of general merchandise. The total of the purchases by the government in 1747 for commodities was 124,435 livres. Of this sum, half was sold by thirteen men, two of whom were brothers, the Hervieux's. Among the other names were Poulin Cressé, a member of the Courval family, Gamelin, Lemoine-Monière, Dufy-Desauniers, la Gorgendiè re, Bleury, St. Ange Charly,

---

98 See the following chapter. La Corne had purchased the seigniory of Terrebonne from l'abbé Lepage. See Chapter VII, THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE SEIGNIORIAL SYSTEM.

The Quebec merchants sold munitions and marchandises as well. Poulin-Cressé, again, Joseph Cadet, Jean Taché, Perthuis and la Gorgendiére received 61,740 livres.

The survey of the bourgeoisie and the State has been directed to establishing the names of the principal suppliers of goods, and to provide an indication of the volume of this commercial activity. This part of the trade of the citizens of New France was with the State. There also existed a trade, a private trade, but this cannot be determined. It is apparent, and natural, that the merchants of a colonial society engaged in a wide variety of commercial endeavours. They were what we would today call general merchants, but with a high volume. It is also apparent that the merchants were to be found not merely in a group designated as bourgeois, marchand or négociant, but would as well be found among classes usually, and erroneously, it is believed, called seigniorial, administrative or aristocratic. In the previous chapter the element of personal contact, and access to power, was noted. This factor also appears to have had an influence on the sales made to the State, for, the same names appear. A further factor is that men in power, whatever its form, in New France, also had the benefits of access to relations with merchants in France. An additional matter, but not to examined till later, relates to the personal relations of this economic

100 "Bordereau...1747", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 116-1, f 13-16.
They were closely intermarried. The in-group was even smaller than the listing of names would indicate.

---

See Chapter II.
CHAPTER VI

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE HINTERLAND

The fur trade of the hinterland in the period 1729 to 1748 was a relatively stable economic enterprise. The export monopoly was in the hands of the Company of the Indies. This provided a guaranteed market. From 1728 to 1742, the usual means of exploitation was through a system of licensing by the government. After 1742, the State tried to inaugurate a system of auctioning the rights to trade, but the outbreak of the War of the Austrian Succession, related military needs, and the pressures exerted by the governors and the intendants, left the trade much as it had been.

The period was also notable for two factors: a continuously expanding fur frontier, and a steady rise in prices. Commercial and military requirements necessitated further challenges to the Hudson's Bay Company through western and northern expansion, and this was related to the needs of furthering the system of Indian alliances. The fur trade should not be considered solely in economic terms, nor solely on military grounds. Rather, as in the case of many other activities in the

---

1 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 148.
3 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 122.
colonial society of New France, an appreciation of the trade involves a complex of relations.

The command of a post, military or commercial, was a highly sought after position. The official charged with the appointments was the governor. He could not make appointments to the civil administration nor could he unilaterally promote an officer, but "...c'était lui qui choisissait parmi les officiers les commandants des forts et des postes de la colonie." This privilege appears to have been shared, or at least influenced, by the intendant. Hocquart, in 1732, highly recommended Rigauville to Maurepas, "...que...Beauharnois a mis pour Commandant a Niagara a ma prière..."

The group from which the post commanders were chosen was the officers of the troupes de la Marine. These were the professional soldiers of New France. From the time of Denonville, the officers of this corps were drawn from the colony. Of them, G.F.G. Stanley, of the Royal Mil-

7 "Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 18 octobre 1732", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 58, p. 50. See also below for the influence of the intendant on the fur trade.
8 Donald Fraser McOut, MILITARY POLICY AND ORGANIZATION IN NEW FRANCE, p. 166.
9 G.F.G. Stanley, CANADA'S SOLDIERS, p. 27.
itary College, Kingston, has written:

The "Canadianization" of the Marine Troops, and in particular of the officers, is a most significant development. The Marine Troops became a highly nationalistic force. Proud of themselves and both jealous and not a little scornful of the regulars.

Another student of the Canadien army of New France viewed them as more than a military organization; they were in some ways a hinterland civil service commanding a chain of forts in the interior and distributing the King's bounty and stores to the Indians. Jean Lunn has noted a further feature of this group: the officers belonged to what has been called the seignorial class.

Before considering the role of the commandants in the hinterland, and their characterization as part of a bourgeois class, it is well to establish their salaries as officers. The salary of a captain, the usual rank of a commandant, was 90 livres per month, or 1,080 livres per year. A lieutenant received 60 livres per month. The lowest rank, the private, received 9 livres per month from which was retained

10 Stanley, p. 28.
11 McOut, p. 172.
12 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 15.
13 "Projet de la dépense...1731", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 417.
14 "Bordereau...1739", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 121-123.
15 "Projet de la dépense...1731", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 417.
18 deniers per diem for supplies given to him. The net pay of the common soldier was thus a little less than 7 livres per month. The officer, according to La Galissionière, was poorly paid.

The basic salary of the officer, however, was not the only source of revenue. Pierre-Jacques Chavoy de Noyan, writing to the Minister of Marine, Maurepas, claimed that the returns of a commandant, without trading in furs, were 8,500 livres per year. This sum was the result of selling permits at 500 livres each; the profits made on the sale of powder from the King's stores to the Indians and others, which he set at 1,500 livres, and 2,000 livres from the sale of spirits. Noyan goes on to assert that the second in command, the lieutenant, had the right to sell two permits, the interpreter sold one permit, and the missionaries were allowed to sell three. To the 8,500 we should add the salary of 1,080 livres. Perhaps this is an exaggerated figure, although other testimony

16 "Projet de la dépense...1731", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 418.

17 "Bigot au Ministre, Québec, 4 novembre 1748", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 118, f 258-259. See also, for an acceptance of this view of La Galissionière, Roland Lamontagne, LA GALISSIONIÈRE ET LE CANADA, pp. 50-78. Dr. Lamontagne, let it be noted, does not question the testimony of the governor, nor does he cite any statistics to sustain the high, or low levels of the salaries of the officers.

does support it. Let us examine further evidence. Maurepas wrote the administrators of New France that the commandants were well recom-
pensed. He sharply criticized the use of funds appropriated for pres-
ents to the Indians for, apparently, the commandants were using the mon-
ey to compensate themselves for claimed losses. Later, in 1744, Beau-
harnois and Hocquart wrote the Minister that they doubted that the chev-
alier de Longueuil would long be satisfied with his bonus of 3,000 liv-
res per annum, and the governor asked that the chevalier be promoted.
A few years before, writing with regard to the posts at Detroit and the
Rivière Saint-Joseph, the governor noted that the commandants received
but 3,000 livres per year from the lessors.

After 1742, when some of the posts were auctioned to the highest
bidder, we have some indications of the sums granted to the commandants.
Longueuil, at Detroit, for the years 1746 to 1748, was given 5,000 liv-
res; Duplessis de Morant, 2,500; at the Baye des Puants, de Verchères
received 1,500. La Corne, at Michilimackinac, for the balance due to
him for 1746, and 1747, was granted 3,000 livres. Others, in addition

19 Chevalier de Raymond, "Mémoire sur les Postes du Canada Adres-
sé à M. De Surlaville, en 1754, par le Chevalier de Raymond", R.A.P.Q.,
20 "Ministre à Beauharnois et Hocquart, Compiègne, 2 mai 1729",
P.A.C., B, vol. 53-2, f 536.
21 "Beauharnois et Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 12 octobre 1744"
22 "Beauharnois au Ministre, Québec, 5 septembre 1742", P.A.C.,
C 11 A, vol. 77, p. 76.
to their basic salary, received grants of 1,000, 1,500, 1,000 and 3,000 livres. These men were Dubuisson, de Verchères, La Corne, and Le Gardeur de Saint-Pierre.

When the court introduced the new policy of leasing in 1742, it became quite insistent that the commanders restrict themselves to their military duties and leave the fermiers their trading rights. Beauharnois, "...dans les termes les plus fortes..." told his officers to desist from trading. However, evidence suggests that some breaches of the regulations took place. Pierre-Joseph de Céleron, sieur de Blainville, the commandant at Michilimackinac in 1737; at Detroit in 1741 and at Niagara in 1744, was removed from the latter post because of complaints on the part of the fermier. He was again appointed to Detroit in 1750, but again removed for the same cause.

Bigot, in the early years of his administration, appeared to be using the proverbial new broom. He claimed that there had been, and for a long time, abuses in the posts. There was collusion between the merchants and commanders. In this letter Bigot claimed that he had told

La Galissionière of the abuses, but the latter wanted to retain the system as the officers were so poorly paid. In the following year, Bigot requested that the commandants be refused permission to trade. He also wrote that there had been abuses in the use of the King’s canoes in that the merchants and commandants were having their own supplies freighted at the expense of the State. He believed, however, that his policy of requiring the officers to keep journals would overcome some of the abuses and restrict collusion. Actually, the keeping of journals had been inaugurated two years previously, by Hocquart.

The hinterland presented problems, of this there is no doubt; it was both a commercial and a military area. However, the primarily military viewpoint of the governors does not necessarily lead to some of the positions sustained by the governors Beauharnois and La Galissionière. There is no doubt that evidence exists indicating that the governors claimed that the officers were poor. But, a basic revenue of 3,000 to 4,000 livres, compared to the base established in the third chapter, that is, 600 livres, was by no means a low income, relatively speaking. Further, the revenue of 3,000 to 4,000 livres presumes that the officers

28 See Cameron Nish, INVENTAIRE DES DEPENSES GENERALES DE LA NOUVELLE -FRANCE, SERIE C 11 A, VOLUMES 113 à 119, (ms., to be printed shortly by the Centre de Recherche en Histoire Economique du Canada-français), pp. 116 ff.
did not engage in the fur trade, a doubtful conclusion. And, as we shall see, the officers also owned seigniories. From these a revenue might be expected.

The complex of relations, political and economic and social, so insisted upon in this work, was also evident in matters concerning the fur trade in the years 1729 to 1748. In 1729, at the beginning of the period, the governor, Beauharnois, was accused of collusion, graft and favoritism, by the ex-intendant, Thomas-Claude Dupuy. While the latter's testimony is suspect, it is still worthy of consideration. Dupuy had accused the governor of being bribed, or demanding bribes of 1,000 livres in return for a post as commandant. The governor also was accused of having removed Tonty from the command of Detroit, and the chevalier de Longueuil from that of Fort Frontenac. He had also, for nefarious reasons, appointed Beauvais and de La Ronde to command posts. In his defense, Beauharnois claimed that Tonty had been removed at the request of the Hurons; and that Longueuil's removal had been at the request of his family. And, as to the appointment of La Ronde, who had been accused by the ex-intendant of having commercial relations with the English of Boston, Beauharnois replied that it was true, but that La Ronde had never fulfilled the contract.

---

29 See next chapter, THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE SEIGNIORIAL SYSTEM.

30 "Beauharnois au Ministre, 8 février 1729", P.A.C., D 2, TROUPES COLONIAL, vol. 49, to e3, f 293-295.
Maurepas supported the governor in his controversy with Dupuy, but qualified the support by writing that while he was sure that there had been no corruption or favoritism, that "...jay bien plustot pensé que l'envie de faire plaisir et quelque prédiction dans leur choix des sujets auroit put estre la cause des plaintes qu'on a fait..." It has already been suggested that one of the efficacious means of making money was favoritism.

Even if we put aside the possibility of favoritism, there still remains the military functions of the governor, and of the post commandants, to consider. Perforce, the military administrator must favour the military group. Beauharnois, for example, had been requested to suggest means of restricting the commercial activities of the British-Americans. He replied, jointly with Hocquart, that Forts Frontenac and Niagara must be well provisionned; that Detroit must be better garisonned; and that if the French did not do so, the British-Americans would, and they were bound to benefit. The constancy of this problem may be appreciated by noting that a later governor, La Galissionière, had many of the same ideas, as had had Beauharnois' predecessor, the first Vaudreuil.

---

33 Lamontagne, pp. 50-78.
Later, in 1742, when the metropolitan government inaugurated its policy of leasing the posts, Beauharnois demurred slightly, and wished that officials in France had sought his advice before declaring the policy. The posts, in conformity to the expressed desire of Maurepas, were farmed out, but not all of them; some would be administered by the State as part of the Domaine du Roy. The exceptions, however, were not restricted to those administered by the government for, Ramezay, one of the commandants, had signed an obligation before 1742, and it had a few years to go before it expired.

The complexity of the military and commercial relations of the hinterland did not effect only the governor. Hocquart, more concerned with the commercial aspects, also found himself between two posts. He realized, for example, that the trade of a post was a profitable business. He even suggested that Lanoullier, the ex-treasury representative, be given, free, the returns from the post of Témiscamingue and thus be in a position to re-establish his financial status. In a let-

36 "Beauharnois au Ministre, Québec, 6 juin 1742", and "Poste des pays d'en haut affermés suivant les adjudications qui en ont été faites le 26 mars 1743 au Chateau St Louis", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 79, pp. 87-88, and f 276.
37 "Beauharnois et Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 10 octobre 1744", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 81, pp. 5-6.
ter to the Company of the Indies, he again revealed how complex the problems of the hinterland were. He had been requested to suggest someone for the post of *receveur* at the Company's counter in Montreal. He hesitates, he wrote, to suggest Gamelin, for the latter had been involved in the fur trade. Gamelin, however, had promised to desist from trading, but, as in Ramezay's case, there was a slight problem. The nominee had a contract that had not expired. Hocquart mentioned, in the same letter, another interesting matter: la Gorgendièrè had suggested his son as Gamelin's assistant, at a salary of 800 *livres* a year. The letter also acknowledged that Longueuil and Michel, two administrators of the colony, had received 300 and 500 *livres* respectively from the Company's coffers.

To date we have examined the policy of the French state, the implementation of this policy in the colony, and the factors involved in the attitudes of those responsible for the military and commercial administration of New France. We shall now proceed to an examination of the men appointed to the posts of command, and the relations between the officers and the traders.

The posts of the hinterland may be divided into three large areas: those west from Frontenac on the North-eastern shore of Lake Ontario to the southern tip of Lake Michigan, the site of Fort Saint-Joseph.

---

in this area were to be found some of the important trade and military installations: Niagara, South-west of Lake Ontario; Detroit, between Lakes Huron and Erie; Ouiatanon or Ouyatanon on the Wabash River, and to the South-west of Lake Erie, the fort of the Miamis.

To the North-west, roughly the area of Lakes Michigan and Superior, the post of la Baye des Puants, or Green Bay was located on North-western Lake Michigan. Michilimackinac, or Missilimakinac was on the North-western tip of Lake Huron. Kaministigon or Kamanistiquia was set on the West end of Lake Superior. On the Southern shore of the same lake, Chagonamigon or Chequamegon was established, and North of this, Nepigon.

The third region, la Mer de l'Ouest, was the extremity of the hinterland. In it were found a chain of posts, established mainly by LaVérendrye, his family and their associates. Among the forts were Grand Portage, Saint-Pierre, Saint-Charles, Rouge, Maurepas, de la Reine and Dauphin.

A fourth area could be included: that South of Montreal. There, Forts Saint-Frédéric and Chambly, for example, were primarily military establishments rather than the usual mixture of military and commercial posts so characteristic of the Western forts. These have not been considered in the following analysis.

40 This geographic outline was prepared from the works of D.G.G. Kerr, A HISTORICAL ATLAS OF CANADA, and Lionel Groulx's NOTRE GRANDE
THE POSTS OF THE HINTERLAND

[Map of the hinterland showing various posts and landmarks such as Fort St. Jean, Fort St. Frédéric, Fort Chateauguay, and various lakes and rivers.]
The only means of establishing the pattern of command is to present a rather dull chronicle. In 1725, just prior to the period under study, a list of commanding officers was given:

**Table 15**

**Post commandants in New France, 1725**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Tonty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michilimackinac</td>
<td>Lignery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>Amariton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph</td>
<td>Villedonné</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miamis</td>
<td>Dubuisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouiatanon</td>
<td>Noyelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe du lac Supérieur</td>
<td>Linctot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamanistiquia</td>
<td>Verchères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort des Scieux</td>
<td>Marin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Témiscamingue</td>
<td>la Gorgendièrè</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A *Liste* of 1743 gives not merely the names of the commanding officers, but the subaltern ranks as well. These too will be presented in a tabular form.

---

**40** AVENTURE. See also "Western Forts and Posts, 1713-1760", in Lunn, ECONOMIC, pp. 450-454.


Table 16
Post commandants in New France, 1743

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>Beaujeu</td>
<td>Subaltern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>Dubuisson</td>
<td>Subaltern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>De Gannes</td>
<td>Subaltern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontenac</td>
<td>St. Ours</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>Captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontenac</td>
<td>Douville</td>
<td>Subaltern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontenac</td>
<td>Portneuf</td>
<td>Subaltern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontenac</td>
<td>Mazières</td>
<td>Subaltern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontenac</td>
<td>Maisoncelles</td>
<td>Subaltern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michilimackinac</td>
<td>Verchère</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>Captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michilimackinac</td>
<td>de Gaspé</td>
<td>Subaltern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Longueuil</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>Captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Croizille</td>
<td>Subaltern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Courtemanche</td>
<td>Subaltern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Népigon</td>
<td>Ramezay</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>Captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph</td>
<td>Villier</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>enseigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouiatanon</td>
<td>Laperrière</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>enseigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miamis</td>
<td>Repentigny</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Superior</td>
<td>La Ronde</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>Captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamanistiquia</td>
<td>Dubreuil</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>enseigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>Lusignan</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>enseigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mer de l'Ouest</td>
<td>LaVérendrye</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a statement of expenses of the hinterland prepared in 1750, the names of the commanders of the important posts, and those receiving special grants were noted. At Detroit, it was Céleron; at Green Bay, Marin; de Raymond was at Fort Miamis and Duplessis-Fabert at Michilimackinac. At Lake Superior the commandant was Marin fils, and Picoté de Belestre was at St. Joseph.

---

^43"Etat des depense...dans les Pays d'Enhaut...1750, Québec, 28 octobre 1750", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 119, f 278-287.
It is obvious that a glance at these listings indicates that a very small number of men were charged with the direction of the posts, a not unexpected result when we consider that the hinterland posts were relatively few in number. If we consider the posts from two other perspectives, a biographical one, and a further listing of forts, and their commanders, we will see that the chain of command was even narrower than might at first be indicated. At Green Bay, for example, the commandant in 1731 was Nicolas-Antoine Coulon de Villiers. His daughters married Alexandre Dagneau Douville and François Duplessis-Fabert. At the same fort in 1733, we find Villiers' son, Nicolas-Antoine Coulon de Villiers in command. His two brothers, Louis Coulon and François Coulon served at the same post. The Villiers' were also related to the Verchères family. In 1736, Jean-Baptiste Jaret de Verchères was in command of Green Bay. He was married to a member of the d'Ailleboust family, Madeleine d'Ailleboust de Manthet. Marin, the commandant at la Baye des Puants in 1750, was related to the Guyon family.

---

44 See below for more on the Douville's.
the last chapter as a monopolist of the meat trade in Montreal.

The fort at Detroit is another example. The removal of Tonty has been mentioned, as well as the accusations brought against the governor by Dupuy. Among the commandants we find, in 1729, Jean-Baptiste Deschaillons de St. Ours, who was to become an administrator at a later date, and was related to the Repentigny family. Henri Louis Deschamps de Boishebert, commandant from 1728 to 1734, was related to the Ramezay family. Pierre Jacques Noyan, the commandant in 1738, was married to Louise-Catherine d'Ailleboust de Manthet, the widow of Jean-Baptiste Charly. Pierre-Joseph Céleron, the sieur de Blainville, commanded at Detroit in 1742. He was married to Marie-Madeleine Blondeau, daughter of a prominent Montreal merchant.

South-west of Lake Erie, another post, and an important trading one, was established: that of the Miamis. Some of the commanders between 1725 and 1750 were Dubuisson, St. Pierre de Repentigny, Douville and Raymond. The first, Jacques-Charles Renaud Dubuisson also commanded at

51. Le Jeune, vol. 1, p. 197. See also below.
52. Le Jeune, vol. 2, pp. 363-364. See also previous chapter, and below and Chapter II.
Michilimackinac. His son was at Niagara in 1743. Jacques le Gardeur de St. Pierre, a member of the Repentigny family, was to be a commandant, later, at Michilimackinac; he was married to a Guillimin, a merchant and member of the Superior Council. Philippe Dagneau Douville married a member, Marie-Anne, of the Verchères family, and was the brother of Alexandre Dagneau Douville, who was married to a Villiers, and of César Dagneau, sieur de Quindre who, in turn, was married to a member of the Picoté de Belestre family.

Fort Michilimackinac, between Lakes Huron and Michigan, was another establishment which reflects the in-group features. Dubuisson and Céleron, two of the commanding officers mentioned, as well as Le Gardeur de St. Pierre served there. In 1748, Noyelles fils, the son of Nicolas-Joseph Noyelles, was the commandant. The father was the individual who

54 Le Jeune, vol. 1, p. 536.
55 See page 129.
58 Dagneau, Douville and de Quindre were brothers. See below and Chapter II, THE BOURGEOISIE AND MARRIAGE.
61 No biographical material has been found on Raymond. He was the author of the "Mémoire" noted on page 120, n. 19, See also Shortt, CURRENcy, vol. 2, p. 809n, confuses this Raymond with another officer of the same name.
took over the task begun by LaVérendrye. François Lefebvre Duplessis-Fabert, previously a commander at St. Fréderic and Niagara, was to become, later, a member of the Etat major.

On the South-West shore of Lake Superior, the fort of Chagonamigon, in English, Cheguamegon, was commanded by Linctot, Ramezay and La Ronde. René Godefroy Linctot's activities were centred about the extremities of the hinterland. His son, Louis-René Godefroy Linctot was also a participant. The first was related to the Le Moyne family, and then, by a second marriage, to a member of the d'Ailleboust des Musseaux'.

Another commandant was Jean-Baptiste Nicolas Roch de Ramezay. The son of the deceased governor of Montreal, he would also command at Népigon in 1742. Louis Denys de La Ronde, already noted as a merchant, was also a fort commander. In 1750, the commander was Joseph Marin, the son of the previously mentioned Paul Marin.

The subaltern officers noted in the 1743 listing also reveal close family links. Beaujeu's full name was Louis Liénard Vilemonble (or Vilemonde), de Beaujeu. He was married to Charlotte Cugnet, the

66 Le Jeune, vol. 2, p. 81. See also previous chapter.
daughter of François-Etienne. Louis Liénard's father had been a com-
mmandant at Michilimackinac in 1712, and later a member of the adminis-
69 tration. The chevalier de Gannes, Charles-Thomas de Gannes, sieur de Falaise, posted at St. Fréderic, was related to the Coulon de Vil-
70 liers'. The enseigne François-Josué La Corne Dubreuil was married to Marie-Michelle Hervieux. We shall encounter Hervieux' name many times shortly. Charles Croisille, or Croizille, was a member of the Repentigny family.

It is not the purpose of the present chapter to go into all of the details on marital relations; this will be done in a later chapter. However, it has been necessary to indicate the very narrow group from which the post commanders were chosen. Nor, to date, have the commercial benefits of this intermarriage been, as yet, determined. This we should now consider.

We have examined the nature of the fur trade, the mixture of military command and commercial activities, and considered some of the commandants of the posts. There remains to be examined the means of financing the activities, and to consider the possible profits. The finan-

68 Le Jeune, vol. 1, p. 453, and Chapter II.
69 Le Jeune, vol. 1, p. 337, and Chapter II.
70 Le Jeune, vol. 1, p. 611.
cial organization may be examined by a survey of four items: individual contracts; the recipients of the congés or trade permits issued by the governor; the hiring of men for the hinterland; and lastly, the obligations contracted for commercial exploitation of the pays d'en haut.

The link between the post commandants and the merchants is obvious. On August 9, 1730, Louis Deschamps, the sieur de Boishebert, commandant at Detroit, gave his power-of-attorney to "...Sr Charly bourgeois de Ville-Marie..." René Godefroy, sieur de Linctot, gave the same power to François Montfort in 1731. Contracts between merchants and post commandants also indicate the close relationship between officers and merchants. In the records of G.-J. Porlier, for the year 1734, we find the following contract:

Dépôt d'un acte de Société fait entre Messieurs Lajam-merais & Cie, Louis Hamelin & Cie, Marin Hurtubize & Cie, Eustache Gamelin & Cie, Louis Laplante et Cie, De Cheveau & Cie, pour la traite du poste de Manistigoia; le dit acte passé a Michilimackinac le 9 août 1733 et déposé le 22 mai 1734.

Another means of determining the same link between commercial and military activity is a consideration of ordonnances of the intendant. On June 18, 1740, Hocquart ordered that:

...les billets que le sieur Margane de Lavalterie peut

avoir en mains seront remis a Paul d'Ailleboust de Cui-
ay pour être envoyés au sieur Monfort par inventaire,
au désir de l'acte de société qu'ils ont passé ensem-
ble...

Mention has already been made of Denys de La Ronde, specifically
of the subsidy he received from the government for the development of
the mineral resources of the Lake Superior region. In addition, the
privilege included the right to trade in furs. Beauharnois, the govern-
or, issued the privilege in 1727. In 1734 the mining concession was
granted for nine years. Four years later, in 1738, La Ronde was assoc-
iated with Guillory, a Montreal merchant. Earlier, in 1733, we find
La Ronde associated with other officers in a contract drawn up by Henri
Hiché, and recorded on September 23, 1733.

Traité entre Louis Denis de la Ronde, chevalier de Saint-Louis,
capitaine d'une compagnie des troupes du détachement de la ma-
rine, Louis Damours de Clignancourt, officier dans les troupes
du détachement de la marine, et Jacques Le Gardeur de Saint-
Pierre, aussi officier...pour l'exploitation du poste de la

77 "Commission de Beauharnois au sieur de la Ronde de se rendre
au poste de Chagoumigon pour y commander avec le privilège de la traite,
Montréal, 6 juin 1727", P.A.C., PRE-CONQUEST PAPERS: H: NEW FRANCE: DENYS
FAMILY, pp. 64-65. (Hereafter P.A.C., DENYS).

78 "Autorisation pour le sieur Denys de La Ronde de la part de
Beauharnois et Hocquart de faire l'exploitation des mines de cuivre pour
neuf années au Lac Supérieur selon les conditions exigées par l'entente
de 1734, Montréal, 19 may 1734", P.A.C., DENYS.

79 "Mémoire de la part de Beauharnois et Hocquart pour servir d'in-
struction à M. de la Ronde et à son associé le sieur Guilley (sic),
au sujet de l'exploitation des mines de cuivre du Lac Supérieur, Québec,
18 mars 1738", P.A.C., DENYS.

80 P.A.C., GREFFES, vol. 4, Hiché, pp. 31-32.
pointe de Chagoumigon que le sieur Denis de la Ronde a obtenu pour l'espace de neuf années.

The partnership provided that La Ronde was to own one half and supply a like amount of the capital required. Clignancourt and Le Gardeur de Saint-Pierre would receive the other half, and assume an equal financial burden. The government accorded a few other privileges. Hocquart and Beaufort permitted the partners to use the King's supply barge to transport their goods. They also suggested to the Minister that after the conditions of the lease had been fulfilled, that the monopolists be re-imbursed for their capital expenditures.

Another example of the link between merchants and post command- ers is evident in the exploits of LaVérendrye and his family. Some controversy has arisen over the primary purpose of the Western explorations cum exploitations of LaVérendrye. Evidence suggests that no dichotomy existed; it was both exploration and exploitation. In 1731, a company was formed between LaVérendrye, Nicolas Sarazin, (not to be confused with Michel Sarrazin), and Bustache Gamelin de Chateaubriant. The agreement was for three years. The former, LaVérendrye, was to retain half share, and the balance was to go to the two latter. Sarazin and Gamelin

---

81 "Beaufortois et Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 7 octobre 1734", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 61, pp. 51-53.
were to supply all the capital. LaVérendrye rented property he owned in Montreal to Alexis Lemoine-Monière, a local merchant. The annual rental was 1,200 livres. Marianne Dandonneau, the explorer's wife, acting on his behalf, signed an obligation to Louis and Ignace Gamelin in 1732. In 1735 another link in this most complex chain was forged. LaVérendrye wrote Gamelin that he would no longer act with him in commercial matters. In the same letter, Marin Hurtubize, a name often encountered in fur trade documents, was described as LaVérendrye's nephew. Others involved with the explorer cum exploiter are indicated by a court order of 1742. In it the names of Charles and Joseph-Marie Nolan, Lamarque, Ignace Gamelin, (of the Saint-Maurice Forges), and Jean-Baptiste Legras appear as LaVérendrye's creditors.

The commercial affairs of Céleron de Blainville also illustrate the commercial and military links. Blainville, it will be remembered,

---


84 "Bail a loyer entre LaVérendrye et Alexis Lemoine Monière et Dominique Godé, Québec, 22 octobre 1748", P.A.C., LAVERENDRYE.


86 See below.

87 "LaVérendrye à Gamelin, 23 fevrier 1735", P.A.C., LAVERENDRYE.

was the commander who was recalled from his post because of his involvement, again orders, in the fur trade. In a letter to Guy, a Montreal merchant, Céleron mentions that he and his brother are grateful for the credit advanced. His brother will make the payments when he receives his returns from the post at Michilimackinac. Céleron also mentions that Guy had commercial relations with Havy and Lefebvre, two protestant merchants established at Quebec since the 1730's. The two protestants referred to were François Havy, "...négociant..." and Jean Lefebvre, "...associé de Havy".

One of the means of entrepreneurship in New France was the formation of partnerships. This permitted those with privileges, in terms of trade permits, to acquire capital. The form of the privilege of trade in the hinterland was the congé, a license to trade from the governor. Innis has suggested that this could lead to corruption, or at least to favoritism. In the first part of the period under consideration, 1729 to 1742, the post commanders were permitted to trade in their own names. However, as will be evident from the obligations to be considered shortly, these officers, even after 1742, when theoretically

89 "Céleron a M Guy Negociant a Montreal, Niagara, 20 septembre 1744", P.A.C., BABY COLLECTION, p. 522.

90 "Liste des protestant qui sont en Canada", P.A.C., D 2 D, carton 1. The probable date of this list, from internal evidence, is about 1753.

91 Innis, FUR, p. 67.
they were not allowed to trade, were still associated with the merchants commercially, and often maritally.

The dame de Varennes, a member of a family related to the Boucher's, Lavérendrye's and the Le Moyne's, was granted a congé in 1728, as were Lignery, father and son; Jean Bondy, associated with Jean-Baptiste Deschaillons de St. Ours, La Ronde and Villiers also received trade permits. Villiers was represented by Marin Hurtubize; St. Ours was associated, for trade purposes with a merchant, Louis Volant. In 1729 St. Ours, represented by his wife, formed a partnership with Francheville, a name noted in previous chapters as being concerned with the St. Maurice Forges and sales to the State.

The list of congés is not complete, but a consideration of those on deposit in Quebec, at the Judicial Archives, rather than in Montreal, reveal the same tendencies, that is, the mixture of the military and the commercial. St. Ange Charly obtained a trade permit for Témiscamingue and Chagouamigon; Ignace Gamelin and Gamelin-Maugras trade at Lake Michigan and in the Mer de l'Ouest area. Others receiving permits were Her-vieux, Monfort, Lemoine-Monière, d'Ailleboust, and two other members of the same family, Manthet and de la Madeleine, as well as another merchant,

---

Blondeau. The officers who received permits included Le Gardeur de Courtemanche, La Corne Dubreuil, Céleron de Blainville, Marin Hurtubize, Laperrière Marin, César Dagneau de Quindre and his brother Dagneau de la Saussaye. These congés were all issued by the governor, Beauharnois.

In Montreal, the local governor, Josué de Boishebert de Beaucours issued a permit to Noyelles.

Marin, de Quindre and Dagneau de la Saussaye, all related; Neveu, Ignace Gamelin, a partner in the Saint-Maurice Forges, La Corne Saint-Luc, La Ronde, Jean-Baptiste Blondeau and the dame de Manthet were among those receiving permits in 1740. In 1743, the year after the trade permits were to be granted only to the fermiers, the same names appear, indicating that very little had changed. De la Saussaye had a permit; Gamelin, a partner of LaVérendrye, St. Ange Charly, Lestage, d'Ailliboust, Blondeau, Lemoine-Monière and Neveu were among the now familiar names. Another name met is that of Gaucher, a member of the Gaucher-Gamelin family.

De Quindre and Marin Laperrière were the fermiers of the post of
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96 Congés, 1922-23, pp. 209-211.
97 Marcel Trudel, L'ESCLAVAGE AU CANADA FRANCAIS, p. 236, and Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 6, p. 179.
St. Joseph in 1745. These men were related to the Dagneau's and the Douville's. D'Ailleboust was associated with Texier and Auger in the trade at Green Baye. Lemoine-Monière was engaged in the trade of the far-western hinterland. This was the man to whom LaVérendrye had rented a house. Others granted permits in this year were Clignancourt and Ignace Gamelin, both at Michilimackinac; Hervieux, at the same post; St. Ange Charly traded in the Lake Superior region and Maugras, whose full name was Pierre-René Boucher de Maugras, traded in the region of the Mer de l'Ouest.

Congés were issued to Clignancourt of the Damours family in 1747, as well as to d'Ailleboust, Hervieux, Maugras, LaVérendrye, St. Ange Charly, Ignace Gamelin, de Quindre and Laperrière. The latter two were represented by their wives. Clignancourt, in 1747, was in partnership with Lemoine-Monière.

The lists of engagements provide a further indicator of the persons or groups engaging in the trade of the hinterland. These lists indicate those hired for the commerce of the hinterland, and by whom. One of the problems encountered was that the same man might well be listed under two or more names. Consistency was not a virtue in the 18th cen-
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100 Congés, 1922-23, pp. 225-231.
tury. However, a reconstruction of the full name is often possible.


Among those hiring for the hinterland in 1731 were Joseph Blondeau, Nicolas-Antoine Coulon, sieur de Villiers and Marin Hurtubize.

Thirty men were hired in 1733 by such men as Jean-Baptiste Blondeau, Ignace Gamelin, Foucher, a King's Councillor, Charles Rapullais and Company, Alexandre Dagneau, Joseph Blondeau, and François d'Aillebouste, sieur de la Madeleine. In the following year we find the names of Eustache Gamelin, Ignace Gamelin, Louis Damour, sieur de Clignancourt, Charles Desjardins, sieur de Gonneville, also known as Gonneville de Rapullais, and Neveu.

---

Simon Guillory, the associate of Denys de La Ronde, as well as Charles Ruette Dauteuil, the sieur de Monceaux, Pierre Gaultier de La Vérendrye, Marin Hurtubize in association with César Dagneau de Quindre, Marie-Françoise de Pécaudy, the wife of Hughes Jacques Péan, and others hired for the West in 1735.

In the period after 1742 when the officers were forbidden to trade, we might expect some changes. In 1744 those hiring for the hinterland were Charles Nolan Lamarque, associated, as we have seen, with LaVérendrye; Charles Rapullais de Gonneville; Ignace and Pierre Gamelin; Marin Laperrière and de Quindre; Nicolas-Marie d'Ailleboust des Musseaux; Noyelles and Company; Jean-Noël Desruisseaux Desrivières, a member of the Trotier family, Charles François Lapérade, Jacques St. Ange Charly and Louis Damours de Clignancourt. In 1748, six years after the introduction of the new policy, the names were much the same. A difference was that Louis St. Ange Charly hired rather than Jacques St. Ange Charly.

There remains to be considered the means of financing the trade of the hinterland, and a consideration of the possible profits to be
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derived from this commercial activity. As has been suggested previously, financing the fur trade was accomplished through credit and cooperation; credit from the merchants acting in accord, by contract or contact, with the officers commanding the posts. It is to be noted that the names of the debitors and creditors were often the same as those encountered in the survey of those who received post commands, and of those who received congés or hired for the hinterland.

Charles Desjardins, the sieur de Gonneville, also known as Rapul-lais, signed an obligation for roughly 4,600 livres in 1729. His source of credit: Louis and Jacques Charly, also known as St. Ange Charly. In the same year Thomas Blondeau signed obligations to Ignace Gamelin and Company as well as to Joseph Gamelin. Michel and Eustache Chateaumieux de Gamelin indebted themselves to their namesake, Ignace, for 3,753 livres. Pierre Lestage furnished 7,528 livres of merchandise for the trade of the hinterland and in the same year. Among the post commandants who borrowed money, we find, dated June 11, 1729, the following obligation:

Jean Baptiste Jarret, sr. de Verchères, Dame Madeleine D'Ailleboust, son épouse, et Pierre Hubert dit La Croix, son associé, lesquels reconnaissent devoir aux Sieurs Jacques et Louis Charly, frères, marchands, la somme de 5,069 livres pour le voyage qu'ils vont faire au poste de Népigon.

110 Massicotte, 1929-30, p. 271.
Later, in 1736, Denis Drouet, the sieur de Richardville, contracted an obligation for 7,726 livres. The lender was François Malhot. François Monfort lent Louis Linctot and his associate, the sum of 6,431 livres. Alexis Lemoine-Monière furnished merchandise, on credit, valued at 14,-000 livres.

From the indices of the GREFFES DES NOTAIRES we can determine the volume of commercial activities of individuals. Louis d'Ailleboust, between 1737 and 1744, hired 32 men for the hinterland, and signed obligations, or was the recipient of obligations, totalling 16 in number. Paul d'Ailleboust de Cuisy engaged 22 men, but neither owed nor was owed in the years 1734-1737. François d'Ailleboust de la Madeleine, from 1733 to 1744, engaged but 4 men and signed three obligations. D'Ailleboust de Manthet, a man engaged in the transportation monopoly, hired 4 men in 1739, and signed no obligations that year. All of these acts pertain to but one family, albeit an active one. One of the d'Ailleboust, Madeleine, was married to a Verchères, as is evident from the notorial act cited on the previous page.

Credit was furnished by individuals, by partnerships, and by the Company of the Indies. The latter was administered by the de la Gorgen-

113 Roy, GREFFES, vol. 15, Index, p. 236.
dière family. Often one individual was both a creditor and a debtor in the same year. Illustrations of this complex of relations is evident in the year 1743. The Company of the Indies extended credit to Ignace Gamelin, 5,526 livres; to St. Ange Charly, 7,317; to Texier-Augier and Company, 5,483; to Douville Lamotte, 1,035; to Gamelin-Maugras, 4,585; to Lemoine-Monière, 2,212; to Luc La Corne, 3,831; and in the same year, Charles, Michel, Marie and Augustin Hamelin borrowed, from Louis d'Ailleboust, the sieur de Coulonge.

At the same time, the companies formed by officers with merchants such as those of the Ramezay's, La Corne's and LaVérendrye's mentioned earlier, also must be borne in mind. Of the credit advanced between members of the same families, without notorial records, we can but surmise. It would be unusual for these personal relationship not to have had some effect.

The possible profit from the fur trade of the hinterland is a difficult matter to determine with any accuracy. Innis, in his FUR TRADE OF CANADA, claims a profit ratio of 700% in the late 17th century. However, he wrote that:

Local merchants supplied the commodities for the trade and received a proportion of the profits. In the earlier period, the proportion was as much as one-half, but later this share diminished.
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115 Innis, FUR, p. 62.
The approportionment of expenses and profits, according to the
document used by Innis, was as follows: the ratio of merchandise to furs
was 8 to 1. Of a total return of 8,000 livres, the fee for the license
and the cost of the merchandise would be 1,600 livres. Labour costs,
the engagés such as the voyageurs and the coureurs-de-bois were 2,400
livres. The balance was profit. This approportionment would tend to
support Harvey's contention, expressed in his review of Hamelin's book,
of the possibility of a very high profit.

Another possible profit indicator may be seen in the affairs of
François-Etienne Cugnet. After his bankruptcy of 1742, he was granted
the privilege of the trade of several posts. One of these, Témiscamingue,
he rented to Héry, a Montreal merchant, on a nine year lease, for
7,000 livres per annum. This, for Cugnet, as he furnished none of
the capital expenditures, was profit. One can presume that Héry also
made a profit, after paying the sum required by the lease, and supplying
the merchandise and wages.

However, many factors must be taken into account. These modify
the possible profits, although they still remain high. The estimate used
by Innis was based on a relatively low fixed costs factor. The distances
to be travelled were, in the 17th century, less than those of the 18th

116 Innis, FUR, p. 62.
117 "Cugnet au Ministre, 20 octobre 1747", P.A.C., E, François-
Etienne Cugnet, carton 101, p. 34.
century, and therefore, the maintenance cost of employees was lower. Also, the prices paid for furs, and for merchandise, would be different. Of the latter, as has been previously noted, one can say that the differences would not be substantial. Prices between 1729 and 1744 were fairly constant. Only after the start of the War of the Austrian Succession would inflation be a serious problem. The prices paid for furs are a different matter.

An examination and comparison of the prices paid to Canadians for the years 1695, 1730, 1738, 1746, and 1749 indicate, fluctuations discounted, that an average of one-half must be allowed, that is, 5 livres of furs in the 17th century would be worth about 2 livres 10 sols in the 18th century. It should be emphasized, however, that there was a constant rise in prices from 1729 to 1748, and a fairly constant catch. The purpose in using the lowest basic figure is to indicate that even at a low price level the profits could still be substantial.

On the basis of some of the known investment figures for the year 1737, and using a much reduced ratio of merchandise to fur re-
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turns, 4 to 1, we find that 30,000 livres would return a gross of 120,000 livres. If, instead of the 50% cost factor used earlier, we use a 75% cost factor, there still remains a profit of 100% per annum. In 1743, the investment of 45,000 livres by a few merchants would produce a like sum. The investments of individuals better reflects the significance of this profit level. The loan by the Charly brothers to Gonneville in 1729 of roughly 4,500 livres would be expended in merchandise and labour costs, as well as the license fee. The profit of 4,500 livres, would be shared by the creditor and debitor. Jarret de Verchères, his associate, and the Charly's, in the same year, would realize a profit of 5,000 livres and create wages and trade worth 15,000 livres. It has already been established that a high annual wage was 600 livres.

We see that using a low price level, and a greatly increased fixed cost factor, we still arrive at a profit of 100%. If, further, we use Hamelin's percentage of the profits which accrued to the Canadiens merchants, we arrive at, in the last instance, a profit of 1,500 livres, or 2½ times the annual wage for this one transaction. Further factors tend to increase profits: some posts were directly subsidized by the State; others, knowingly or not, used government services for private ends. There are other factors which tend to support a sufficient profit level. It is logical to infer, as has been previously noted, that if the same
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people, over an extended period of time, were granted trade permits, and proceeded to engage men for the trade, and were extended credit, that the enterprise must have resulted in a profit. Either this is true or the citizens of New France inverted the economic axiom of maximizing profits to that of maximizing losses. The desirability of a command post is another positive factor. Also, as Innis has pointed out, the leasing of the posts by the State produced a rising income for the government. In addition to these factors there should be added that there existed another form of trade, contraband, whose profits we can only guess at. Jean Lunn has suggested that this trade was substantial; further, that it was notorious; and that the authorities of the State appeared slow, at times, in suppressing it.

The evidence presented in the consideration of the hinterland indicates that a small group of officers and merchants dominated the fur trade of New France in the years 1729 to 1748. The two groups intermarried. The two groups formed many business associations. Most of the permits to trade were granted to members of the officer and merchant groups. Most of the hiring for the hinterland was done by these few men, and at times, women. One of the groups had a military function, but the best means of accomplishing this function was often through trade in pelts. The commerce in peltries was a means of attracting the Indians

126 Jean Lunn, "The Illegal Fur Trade out of New France", pp. 61-76.
to the French. This commerce, as well, produced a profit. The interests of both groups, and of the society of New France, were served. What is obvious, and insisted upon, is that it is impossible to consider the so-called officer class in isolation from the so-called merchant class. They were, by function and interest, one and the same class.
CHAPTER VII

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE SEIGNIORIAL SYSTEM

The seigniorial system of New France has attracted the attention of many historians. It has been presented, and revised. Yet, after numerous books, articles, collections of documents, and theses, it is still poorly understood. It will be the purpose of this study to present the past writings on the subject; consider the rôle of the State in its relations to the system; examine the group who owned the lands; and inquire into the possible profits that may have been derived from the lands by the seigniorial-bourgeois class.

The classic works on the seigniorial system are those of Munro. His generalized view was that the seigniorial system was a return to a primitive feudalism with the seignior dwelling on his land. The seignior considered himself a gentilhomme. "In a word, those who were the natural leaders of the colonial population were deficient in the prime qualities of economic leadership." Munro has written. After 1711, and the promulgation of the Edicts of Marly, the seignior was but a land granting agent of the Crown. Munro views the criticism levelled at the seigniors,
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1 W.B. Munro, ed., DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE SEIGNIORIAL TENURE IN CANADA, 1598-1854, and THE SEIGNIORIAL SYSTEM IN CANADA: A STUDY IN FRENCH COLONIAL POLICY. (Only the first of these works was used in this study.).
2 Munro, ed., p. xxi.
3 Munro, p. xi.
4 Munro, lxi.
and the system, by the intendant Raudot, "...a man of the people...", as merely a generalization from a single instance by one hyper-critical official. In other words, the seignior, and the seigniorial system, were not means of exploitation on the part of a group, as Raudot claimed, but a simple colonisation agency.

E.R. Adair, at one time a member of the Department of History of McGill University, and a specialist of the French Régime in Canada, claimed that "In a sense the French-Canadian seigneur was a parvenu, but without ample fortune which could give the parvenu power, or at least the satisfaction of getting his own way. The seignior had little prestige, power, capital, income, or share in the government." Adair also claimed that the shortage of tenant-farmers reduced the power of the seignior, and that the latter was often no better off than his tenants.

But the relative unimportance of the seigneur was not due solely to the fact that he was often of little better birth than his tenant farmers, or that he lacked the feudal prestige of leading his tenants to war, or of administering justice in his own courts, or that the "capitaine" was more in the government's confidence than he was, his economic position was just as important a factor.

At least four of these factors noted by Adair are false, as we shall see. Also, if we accept Adair, there are then serious contradictions with
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Munro to be resolved.

A more recent but equally contradictory position on the seigniorial régime of New France is that of Sigmund Diamond, a sociologist-historian of Columbia University. In an article titled "An Experiment in "Feudalism": French Canada in the Seventeenth Century", Diamond writes that "The most characteristic institution of the old regime in Canada—the one that gave tone to the entire society—was the seigniorial system." The distinction between feudal and seigniorial, ably established by Marcel Trudel, is not well made by Diamond, albeit, his own evidence indicates that it was an "experiment" rather than an applied system. Diamond, in common with some other commentators on the French Régime in Canada, seems to share a psychological approach:

The protection of the ego offered by keeping up appearances at all costs rather quickly reached its limits. Louis Hamelin, seignior of Grondines, was himself reduced to working his own mill when his miller was called to military service. The unimpeachable source for this is no less an authority than Dorothy Heneker's, itself of doubtful value. Diamond goes on to say that: "Even such notable families as Saint-Ours, Verchères, Repentigny and Aubert de la Chesnaye were impoverished and forced to besiege the King

10 Diamond, p. 23.
11 Dorothy Heneker, THE SEIGNEURIAL REGIME IN CANADA.
with petitions for military commands, judicial posts, licenses to trade in furs, pensions - anything that might produce income." One can only presume that these "notables" farmed and milled on their lands while living in the cities; served in the army; occupied judicial posts and traded in furs as part time occupations. Their main concern was, of course, faire du jardinage. The pleas and petitions, on the part of the notables, and their successes in monopolizing the privileges at the disposal of the State, indicate not poverty, but rather increased wealth and power, a result which did not occur to Diamond.

What is odd is that Diamond realizes that the "feudal system" was not applied in New France. He appreciates that there was speculation in land; that the seigniors encouraged sales of land for the sake of the mutation fee, and that the seigniors often made attractive verbal offers to attract settlers, only to set more demanding terms in writing. Diamond also notes that of seventy-six seigniories traced to original and current ownership in 1712, 50% only were in the hands of the original recipients. He is not quite so clear in his division of ownership claiming that twenty-two of seventy-two seigniories were owned by bourgeois families, of those of lower origin. It will be soon evident that the

12 Diamond, p. 23.
13 See below for residences of seigniors.
15 Diamond, p. 28.
assumption of aristocratic ownership as apart from bourgeois ownership is not a valid position.

Marcel Trudel, in a brief but succinct pamphlet, revises some of the fallacious assumptions of previous writers. He carefully notes the tendency, after the end of the 17th century, to grant smaller seigniories, and to avoid too-large estates. He also refutes the interpretation which attributed more land and power to the clergy than they really had. Trudel's weakness is to defend the régime too strongly, and make of the tenure system an earthly valhalla. He also appears to lack an appreciation of where some of his revisions lead.

The question, then, is: what was the nature of the seigniorial system? In his study on THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM, Maurice Dobb makes the point that: "The bourgeoisie may acquire a particular sort of property when this happens to be exceptionally cheap (in extreme cases acquiring it by duress for nothing) and realize this property at some later period, when the market value of this property stands relatively high..." A seigniorial grant in New France was free, and almost without pecuniary obligations on the part of the recipient. Also, unlike France, land in the colony was not a means to nobility, but a means to possible, and real wealth. Rosario Bilodeau, in studying this subject, has written that "Les seigneurs ne forment pas à proprement parler une
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16 Trudel, REGIME, pp. 5-6.
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noblesse, mais une bourgeoisie; il n'est pas nécessaire d'être noble pour être seigneur...La propriété seigneuriale au Canada présente donc plutôt un caractère bourgeois."

Similarities with the British-American colonies, in terms of land and politics, are a useful means of comparison, and assist in establishing the nature of the system in New France. In New York, according to Carl Becker, the English governors were told to attach themselves, by liberal land grants, men of ability. These men would then assist the governor in controlling the colony. "And it was in no small degree the liberal land grants by the early governors that served in fact to establish the peculiar social conditions that characterized New York in the eighteenth century", adds Becker, and, "Closely associated with the land-owning families were the wealthy families of New York." Labaree supports, and extends the land-owning cum political cum wealth synthesis in his study of the society of Virginia.

In New France, as in the British-American colonies, many have insisted on the factor of government control, albeit with different results. "Theoretically", Labaree wrote, "the home authorities imposed
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careful restrictions upon the granting of land, but the system as administered left plenty of room for abuse by those on the "inside".
The councils of the colonies, and the chief administrative posts and the lucrative offices were controlled by privileged groups, "...and, from that coign of vantage, manipulated the affairs of the state in the interests of their own aristocratic class."

The results of the views of Labaree and Becker, with reference to class lines, differ dramatically from those encountered to date. The historians of the colonial Americas shade the lines of class demarcation. The unity of commerce, the professions, political power, and land holding are emphasized. We shall see that in New France, far from being feudal, or having a separate landing owning aristocracy, the social, political and economic structure were the same.

The State was directly concerned with the seigniorial system. It was the agency through which the grants might be acquired, and it established the rules and regulations which must be followed, in theory, at least. Between 1717 and 1727 no seigniories were granted. Munro points this out, saying that it acted as a goad, and that cleared lands doubled in the period 1720 to 1730. "Under the spur of rigorous minis-
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23 See below for Edicts of Marly, and a similar type of theoretical control.

24 Labaree, pp. 29-30.

25 Munro, p. lxxix.
terial instructions, lands were promptly taken away by official decree when sufficient energy was not shown by their holders." The improve­ments led the administrators of France to again permit the granting of seigniories after 1731.

The goad, the ministerial instructions referred to, are in partic­ular, the two edicts of July 6, 1711, providing for the reunion of un­cleared lands to the domain of the seignior, in the case of the censit­aire, or to the Crown domain, in the case of the seignior. There ap­pears to be some slight difference of opinion on the implementation of these edicts. Jean Lunn has suggested that the officials of the colony were a little slow in applying them; "...it is not impossible that they were favoring the seigneurial class", she wrote. Diamond mentions the edicts, but fails to comment on their application. Trudel claims "This was not an empty threat. Eighteen seigneuries were suppressed for cause in 1741 alone." However, he fails to note that the total number re­united was twenty, and that some of them were given back to their or­

26 See below for the meaning of "promptly".
27 Munro, p. lxxix.
28 Munro, p. lxxix.
29 "The Edicts of Marly, July 6, 1711", Munro, pp. 91-94.
30 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 33.
31 Diamond, p. 16.
32 Trudel, REGIME, p. 11. Emphasis added.
33 See below.
Munro furnishes the evidence necessary to the proper evaluation of the significance of the Edicts of Marly, and of the importance of the seigniors in the society of New France, but fails to realize it. He wrote that:

On one occasion the officials announced to the home authorities that, under the terms of the royal decrees, they had permitted seigniors to re-enter and take possession of more than four hundred farms but in the ten years following the issue of the Arret de Versailles (sic) not a single seigniory seems to have been declared forfeited to the Crown.

This fact he attributed to the dominant influence of the seigniors in the Sovereign Council. He also noted that it was not until 1741 that a seigniory was reunited to the domain of the Crown. It was thirty years before the Edict was applied to the seigniors, therefore, and not ten. Munro also comments that: "This stroke would doubtless have been more effective than it was, had not the governor and the intendant restored several of these forfeited seigniories to their former owners by new grants." As indicated before, there appears to be some slight contradictions as to the meaning of the words promptly, and ministerial goad.

On the reunion of grants to the domain of the seigniors, Munro wrote that the cause was proffered proof of uncleared lands. In fact,

34 See below.
35 Munro, p. lxxxii.
36 Munro, p. lvi.
the reason was usually the tenants' inability to produce a clear title to the land. It is noteworthy that the censitaires were most often displaced from cleared lands, and not uncleared ones. Munro also fails to pay sufficient attention to the fact that the Superior Council refused to register the Edict of 1711 which affected them, but showed commendable promptness in registering and using, that Edict which struck at the tenant farmer.

In 1731, twenty years after the original edict, Maurepas, the Minister of Marine, wrote the governor and intendant that the King had heard with regret the lack of implementation of the edict, and that he was prepared to issue another, more stringent one. In the following year, 1732, the administrators of New France replied that the edict affecting the seigniors should not be implemented as the lands were not really very suitable for agriculture and settlement. Munro offers ten documents on the matter, without ever drawing the one valid conclusion.

37 See below reordonnances providing for reunion to seigniorial domains.


40 See "Extracts from the Minutes of the Council of Marine Regarding Seigniorial Abuses in Canada, May 5, 1717."; "Royal Instructions to Messieurs Vaudreuil and Bégon concerning the Decision of the French Authorities to Grant no more seigniories in Canada, May, 23, 1719."; "Despatch of Messieurs Vaudreuil and Bégon to the Minister concerning the re-
May 10, 1741 was the date on which, at last, the administrators of New France moved against the seigniors. Trudel, as noted, mentions that eighteen seigniories were reunited to the domain of the Crown. This apparently, is based on a scrutiny of the work of P.G. Roy on the documents concerning the seigniories of Canada on deposit at the Archives de la Province de Québec. In another calendar prepared by Roy, there is a document which indicates that there were fifteen seigniories reunited.
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40 union of Uncleared Seigniories to the Royal Domain, October 26, 1719.”; ”Instructions from the Duc d’Orléans, Regent of France, to Messieurs Vaudreuil and Bégon concerning the Granting of Seigniories in Canada, December 19, 1721.”; ”Royal Instructions concerning the Enforcement of the Arrêts of Marly, December 19, 1721.”; ”Despatch of Messieurs de Beauharnois and Hocquart to the Minister with reference to the reappearance of Seignorial Abuses, October 10, 1730.”; ”Despatch of Messieurs de Beauharnois and Hocquart to the Minister complaining of the Conduct of various Seigniories, and asking for a Reiteration of the Provisions of the Arrêts of Marly, October 3, 1731.”; ”Royal Arrêt ordering Seigniors to Cultivate their Lands and forbidding the Sale of Uncleared Lands, March 15, 1732.”; ”Despatch of Messieurs de Beauharnois and Hocquart concerning the Enforcement of the Royal Decree Relative to the Clearing of Seigniories, October 1, 1732.”; ”Despatch of Messieurs de Beauharnois and Hocquart to the Minister concerning various Seignorial Grants, October 15, 1736.”, Munro, pp. 153-157; 160-163; 163-165; 165-167; 169-172; 172-174; 174-176; 176-177; 178-181.

41 Work cited as Roy, SEIGNEURIE, in present study.

42 “10 mai 1741 - Ordonnance qui réunit au Domaine de Sa Majesté les seigneuries de François Daine, concédée le 5 avril 1733; de Lusignan, lieutenant dans les troupes, concédée le 6 avril 1733; de la Ronde Denis, capitaine dans les troupes, 8 avril 1733; de Beaujeu, major des troupes...9 avril 1733; Péan, major de Québec...10 avril 1733; Mgr. Dosquet...15 octobre 1731; de Saint-Vincent, enseigne en pied...12 avril 1733; Le Gardeur de Beauvais...20 juillet 1734; de Contracoeur fils...7 juillet 1734; de Contracoeur...1er juillet 1734; Boucher de la Perrière...6 juillet 1734; de Sabrevois...4 avril 1733; Sabrevois de Bleury...1 avril 1733; d’Ailleboust d’Argenteuil...6 octobre 1736; de Lafontaine de Belcourt...5 avril 1733; Rocbert...13 juin 1733; Foucault...3 avril 1733...”, Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 3, pp. 8-9.
Yet another document lists twenty concessions reunited. The latter is correct. However, be the number fifteen, eighteen or twenty, the significance of the delay must be attributed to the fact that the recipients had the power to restrain the application of the edict, and that some useful commercial purpose was to be served. The State, no doubt, did exercise a control, but who represented the State, and to what purpose was this power exercised?

Let us examine some aspects of State control. In 1731, ordonnances were passed reuniting to the domain of seigneurs lands held by censitaires. Among the seigniors were Nicolas-Blaise des Bergières de Rigaudville, a "...lieutenant dans les troupes, aide-major de Québec, à présent commandant pour le roi à Niagara." Etienne Charest, a merchant, seignior of Lauzon, married to Catherine Trotier Desauniers, was also accorded a reunion ordonnance. In 1732, the Jesuits proceeded to


44. See below.

45. "25 février 1731 - Ordonnance qui réunit au domaine de Nicolas-Blaise des Bergières de Rigaudville, lieutenant dans les troupes, aide-major de Québec, à présent commandant pour le roi à Niagara les terres de...etc.", Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 2, p. 93.

46. "30 mars 1731 - Ordonnance qui porte réunion au domaine de la seigneurie de Lauzon des terres...etc.", Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 2, p. 95. See also Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 1, p. 114.
the same end, as did Jean-Baptiste Boucher de Niverville of Chambly. The sieur d'Auteuil, previously noted as a member of the fur trade bourgeoisie, reunited lands in 1734. In the same year, another member of the fur trade group, Jean-Baptiste Neveu, holder of the fiefs of Dautré and Lanoraie, displaced some tenants. René Godefroy de Tonnancour, encountered previously as a supplier of goods to the State, owned several seigniories as well. He reunited to his domain in 1735. The seignior of Contracoeur, François-Antoine de Pécaudy, did the same. The

47 "10 janvier 1732 - Ordonnance qui réunit au domaine de la seigneurie de Laprairie de la Madeleine appartenant aux Pères Jésuites les terres des...etc.", Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 2, p. 109.

48 "27 juillet 1732 - Ordonnance qui réunit au domaine de Jean-Baptiste Boucher de Niverville, seigneur de Chambly, les terres de...etc.", Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 2, p. 128.

49 "23 mars 1734 - Ordonnance qui porte que...il sera procédé à la réunion...au domaine du sieur d'Auteuil, les terres...etc.", Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 2, p. 157.

50 "15 juin 1734 - Ordonnance qui réunit au domaine de Jean-Baptiste Neveu, seigneur des fiefs de Dautré et Lanoraie, les terres...etc.", Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 2, p. 168.

51 See Chapter IX, THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE ADMINISTRATION: 3: THE CIVIL ADMINISTRATION for other functions by Tonnancour, and see below.

52 "18 juin 1735 - Ordonnance qui réunit au domaine du fief de Tonnancour appartenant à René Godefroy de Tonnancour les terres des noms...etc.", Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 2, p. 186.

Gentlemen of the Seminary of Beaupré also displaced a few tenants, as did Hughes-Jacques Péan, "...chevalier de Saint-Louis, major des ville et chateau de Québec, seigneur de Saint-Michel." In 1741, the chevalier de Longueuil, "...capitaine...seigneur de Soulages..." proceeded to a reunion.

The government, without doubt, intervened. The inhabitants were compelled to give their days of corvées provided for in their contracts, or pay 40 sols per diem instead. The censitaires had to pay their rents either in cash or goods, as per contract, at the choice of the seigniors. The government protected Sarrazin, and his partners, in


56 "lr avril 1741 - Ordonnance qui réunit au domaine du chevalier de Longueuil, capitaine...seigneur de Soulages, les terres des nommés... etc.", Roy, ORDONNANCES, vol. 3, p. 7.

57 "Ordonnance qui condamne les Habitans à donner à leur Seigneur les journées de corvée portées par leurs contrat de concessions; 3 juin 1741.", AR, vol. 2, p. 438.

58 "Ordinance permitting the Seigneurs of Isle Jésus, to have their rents paid to them either in money or in capons, according to the contracts for the concessions, June 27, 1730.", Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 2, p. 613.
their exploitation of their tile quarry; the State assured the sieur de Croisille of his fishing rights and permitted Lepage and Bleury de Sabrevois to cut timbers in seigniories other than their own. The State also enforced the payment of seigniorial dues.

The other side of the coin, that of the censitaires, indicates that the more humble members of the society had slightly less influence. There is no doubt, as Trudel has stated, that the possible intervention of the intendants as a protector of the people checked a too-great exploitation on the part of the seigniors. At times the State intervened

---

59 "Ordonnance qui fait défense à toutes personnes de troubler le Sr. Sarrazin, et ses associées dans sa seigneurie tant dans l'exploitation d'une carrière d'ardoise que dans ses pêcheries de morues, Québec, 14 octobre 1729", Gouvernement de Québec, EDITS, ORDONNANCES, DECLARATIONS ET ARRETS RELATIFS À LA TENURE SEIGNEURIALE DEMANDEES PAR UNE ADDRESSE DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LEGISLATIVE, 1851, pp. 129-130. (Hereafter TENURE).

60 "Ordonnance qui conforme une autre ordonnance de M. Bégon, du 25 juillet 1723, et qui défend aux sieurs Marcot et Chastenay, habitants de la baronie de Portneuf, de troubler le Sr. Croisille, seigneur et propriétaire d'icielle, dans la jouissance du droit de pêche qu'il a au-devant de leur concession, sous peine de 10 lbs. (sic) d'amende et des dépens, dommages et intérêts, Québec, 2 juin 1730", TENURE, pp. 133-134.


62 "Ordonnance qui condamne les nommés...à payer à leur seigneur les Cens et Rentes, conformément à leurs contrats de Concessions, du vingtième janvier, mil sept cent trante", AR, vol. 2, pp. 337-338.

to reduce the *cens et rentes* if these were set above the rates established in 1669. The State also provided for a reasonable location so that the *censitaire* might give his *feu et lieu*, that is, produce his contract, and pay his dues and respects to the seigneors. A rather negative feature was the tenant's right to a seigniorial mill and oven. If the seignior did not establish these, he could lose the privilege. He usually established a mill and oven if it was profitable, and if it was not, it was a privilege he could do without.

The weight of evidence appears to favour the seignior, a not unexpected result. One further comment should be made. After the experience of the Crown in the lack of application of the Edict of Marly as it affected the seigneors, the French government, in 1743, reiterated its policy of leaving the governors and intendants in charge of granting lands. They, therefore, again favoured the favoured class.

---

64 "Arrêt du conseil supérieur de Québec portant règlement, qui fait défense au sieur Duchesnay de concéder aucun emplacement, dans le bourg de Fargy à Beauport à plus haut titre de redevance au'a celui d'un sol de cens et un poulet de rente...par chaque arpent...29 mai, 1731", AR, vol. 2, pp. 161-163. See also AR, vol. 2, pp. 219-222.


66 "Déclaration du Roi concernant les Concessions dans les Colonies, 17 juillet 1743", Gouvernement de Québec, EDITS, ORDONNANCES ROYAUX DECLARATIONS ET ARRETS DU CONSEIL D'ETAT DU ROI CONCERNANT LE CANADA, vol. 1, p. 572.

67 See below for a further proof.
The owners of seigniories in the period 1729 to 1748 belonged to a privileged group. Every grant in the period was made to an individual classed, in the present study, as a member of the bourgeois class. Guy Frégault, in a study on the expansion of the seigniorial system, named some of the recipients: Sabrevois, Péan, Denys de La Ronde and Ramezay. In another work on the seigniorial system, that of Alfred Vanasse, there is a listing of the seigniories granted in the period. Vanasse follows Frégault in his evaluation of the class structures in New France. He attributes to the seigniorial class a monopoly of land grants, and calls this group, as does Frégault, his mentor, an aristocracy, as distinct from a commercial group. They err.

The inter-mingling of class lines is clearly revealed by an analysis of the recipients of seigniories in the period 1729 to 1748. Jean d'Ailleboust, sieur d'Argenteuil was granted a concession in 1736. It was reunited to the King's domain in 1741, but later sold by d'Ar-

---

70 Vanasse, vol. 1, p. 102.
71 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 6, p. 5.
73 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 5, p. 28.
genteuil to Joseph Gautier. As well as being a seignior, d'Argenteuil was an army officer, and all of the members of the d'Ailleboust family were involved in the fur trade. Philippe-Marie d'Ailleboust, sieur de Cuisy, brother of Jean, was granted an arrière-fief on l'île Jésus in 1739. It was reunited to the domain of the seignior in 1742. The interest of this family, the d'Ailleboust's, is evident in the space they occupy in the index to Roy's work: their name(s) appear as the fief and seigniory d'Ailleboust; d'Ailleboust d'Argenteuil; de Cerry; de Coulonge; de Cuisy; de Manthet; des Musseaux; de Perigny; and in ten other individual notations. They were officers, post commandants, merchants and land owners.

The seigniory of Aubert-Gayon or Aubert-Gallion was granted to Thérèse de Lalande-Gayon, widow of François Aubert, in 1736. François Aubert, of the LaChesnay family, had been a member of the Superior Council. His widow, by a previous marriage, had been a member of the Le

---

76 Le Jeune, vol. 1, p. 333.
77 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 1, pp. 139-140.
79 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 6, p. 6.
Moyne family. Beauharnois, the governor, and his brother Claude, received a grant of a seigniory which today still bears their name, or is called Villechauve. This grant was sold to Michel Chartier de Lotbinière after the conquest of New France. It is not believed that it is necessary to comment on Beauharnois' possible influence.

Beaujeu père, mentioned as a post commandant, a chevalier de Saint-Louis, captain in the Troupe de la Marine, and who was, as well, an administrator, received a grant in 1733. It was reunited to the Crown in 1741, but re-granted to his son in 1752. Louis-Liénard de Beaujeu, the son, received as well another grant in 1755. The seigniory of Beauvais was granted to Philippe-René Le Gardeur, sieur de Beauvais in 1734, and reunited to the Crown in 1741. Others who received lands were Charlotte Le Gardeur, the daughter of a deceased army officer. The grant was enlarged in 1738, and sold after the conquest to

---

83 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 6, p. 7.
84 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 228.
85 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 6, p. 7, and vol. 4, p. 266.
87 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 267.
89 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 6, p. 8.
Joseph-Gaspard Chaussegros de Lery, an engineer in the colony, as had been his father. Sabrevois de Bleury, noted as a freight monopolist, supplier of timber to the State, and at one time an officer, also received a grant which was reunited and later regranted. His holdings were eventually sold to Gabriel Christie, a British army officer. Others receiving lands were Daine, a member of the administration; Boucher de Laperrière, a captain and post commandant; Louis Fornel, a merchant; François Foucault, a garde-magasin at Quebec; his lands were sold, after the conquest, to James Murray, the first British governor of Quebec. François-Etienne Cugnet, as usual, appears, as does Dagneau Douville. The Bishop of New France,Dosquet, was granted lands. Guillaume Estèbe, a member of the Superior Council, and a merchant, received a grant, as did Angélique Le Gardeur, the widow of

91 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 6, p. 8, and vol. 5, pp. 41-42.
92 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 6, p. 9.
93 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 256.
95 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 5, p. 56.
96 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, pp. 245-246.
97 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 250.
99 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 5, p. 36.
100 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, pp. 237-238.
Aubert de Gaspé. François-Antoine de Contracoeur, the seignior of Contracoeur, was given lands which were reunited, but later regranted to François Daine, the administrator, who sold them in 1763. The intendant, Gilles Hocquart, received a grant, as did Chavoy de Noyan, married to Catherine d'Ailleboust de Manthet; Louis Denys de La Ronde owned Lacolle or Beaujeu, which was reunited in 1741, regranted to Daniel-Liénard de Beaujeu in 1743, and sold to Gabriel Christie in 1765. The Beaujeu's were related to the Charly family.

Lafontaine de Belcour, another member of the Superior Council, and a fish and fur merchant, received a grant. Lery, the engineer-in-chief of New France, Joseph Le Moyne, the chevalier de Longueuil,

102 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 5, p. 49.
103 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, pp. 276-278.
104 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 5, p. 57.
105 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 5, pp. 244-245.
109 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 211.
110 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 6, p. 27; vol. 4, pp. 257-258; and vol. 5, pp. 37-40.
112 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, pp. 273-274.
and Louis Lepage, the seignior of Terrebonne, were all recipients.  

The "...lieutenant-général de la Jurisdiction de Montréal..." Pierre Raimbault, as well as Geneviève de Ramezay, the two Vaudreuil's, Louis-Joseph Rocbert, garde-magasin at Montreal, Sabrevois, a relation of Sabrevois de Bleury, and Thomas-Jacques Taschereau were all granted lands. Taschereau was the Marine Treasurer representative in New France, was married to a de la Gorgendière, and was a brother-in-law of the Vaudreuils. He was also a partner in the Saint-Maurice Forges.

114 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 5, pp. 52-53.
115 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 5, pp. 31-32.
117 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 5, pp. 48-49.
120 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 1, pp. 13-14. See also P.A.C., DOCUMENTS RELATIFS A LA PROVINCE DE QUEBEC: A: DOCUMENTS GENERAUX: REGISTRES D'INTENDANCE, pp. 41-265 for a listing of grants made in the period. The Roy work is more useful as it provides the possibility of cross-referencing the names and the seigniories. It should be noted that the documents concerning the seigniorial régime are both at Ottawa and at Quebec. In some cases the originals are in the Public Archives of Canada, and at other times are to be found at the Archives de la Province de Québec. Ottawa has transcribed the important series on deposit at Quebec. Most of the documents in Ottawa are from collections of post-conquest origin. Many seigniories were sold after 1760, and some of the new, and British, seigniors, accumulated titles for their lands. Often, these were of pre-1760 origin. The documents must have been held at the seigniory level. A full study of the régime requires consultation of the collections both in Ottawa and Quebec.
The acts of *foi et hommage* in the period support the evidence presented above. Again we find a few names constantly appearing as owners, or part owners of more than one holding. François-Antoine de Pécaudy, already noted as the owner of Contracoeur, made his avowal for an Island on Lake Champlain. Claude-Pierre de Pécaudy, in 1745 the seignior of Contracoeur, gave his *foi et hommage* for 1/5 of 1/3 of the seigniory of Saint-Ours. Marie Pécaudy de Contracoeur offered her avowal for a part of the lands of Saint-Denis. The wife of Hughes-Jacques Péan, Marie-Françoise de Pécaudy de Contracoeur, who, between them owned the seigniories of Saint-Michel and Livaudière, also purchased part of the lands of La Durantaye. In the same document are encountered the now familiar names of Louis Saint-Ange Charly, Louis Lepage, La Corne, Saint-Ours Deschaillons, and others.

Marriage, as has been previously mentioned, was also a means of acquiring power, position, and in this instance, land. Nicolas-Blaise

---

122 P.A.C., FH, p. 13.
123 P.A.C., FH, p. 142.
124 P.A.C., FH, p. 164.
125 P.A.C., FH, pp. 171-174.
126 P.A.C., FH, pp. 206-216.
de Bergères, sieur de Rigauville, a recipient of a seigniory, and of the favours of Hocquart, also owned Berthier, a holding acquired as part of his wife's dowry. He later sold this holding.

The famous abbé, Louis Lepage, whose resignation was demanded from the Chapter of Quebec because of his too-great concern with commercial matters, was the son of René Lepage, the seignior of Rimouski. Pierre and Thierry Hazeur, partners in the tile trade with Sarrazin, their brother-in-law, were also the proprietors of Malbaie. Sarrazin, a doctor, member of the Superior Council, recipient of numerous bonuses from the State, involved in commerce, also owned lands and a house in Quebec City, and a small seigniory from which he derived a small income.

Multiple ownership, while it should not be over-emphasized, was a fact. Beauharnois and Hocquart wrote that:

Le Sr de Tonnancour est réellement propriétaire des trois

---

130 l'abbé Auguste Gosselin, L'EGLISE DU CANADA DEPUIS MONSEIGNEUR LAVAL JUSQU'A LA CONQUETE, deuxième partie, p. 199.
131 Gosselin, p. 201.
132 "Beauharnois et Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 18 octobre 1734", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 61, pp. 3-6.
concessions donc nous avons Monseigneur, demandé la ratification. Nous joignons à cette lettre un mémoire détaillé qui explique à quel titre le d. sr Tonnancour en est en possession.

Multiple or family ownership was not restricted to de Tonnancour. The Desauniers', Le Moynes', Bouchers' and la Gorgendières' are but a few examples. Also notable is that all of them were engaged in commercial and/or administrative endeavours.

It is evident that not one class received seigniories, if by this we understand a seigniorial class. Rather, one class did receive the grants, but they were a bourgeois-land-commerce class composed of landowners, fur traders, merchants, and administrators. There exists strong evidence suggesting that this phenomenon was not restricted to the period 1729 to 1748, but more probably was a continuation of a feature dominant throughout the whole of the French Régime in Canada.

One of the other means of illustrating the fundamental nature of the seigniorial system in Canada, under the French, is a consideration of the permanent residences of the seigniors. Munro, as noted, viewed them as living on their lands, a sort of rustic aristocracy. The census of Quebec of 1744, and the aveu of 1731 indicate a slightly different trend: the seigniors were city residents, absentee landlords. The evidence is presented, in the following pages, in a tabular form.

See social and economic characterizations in the Roy work on the seigniories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation as listed</th>
<th>Page, Census</th>
<th>Page, Roy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel de Beaujeau</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>IV, 264-265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas-Gaspard Boucault</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>IV, 83-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe d'Ailleboust de Cery</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>I, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etienne Charest</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1, 114,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François-Etienne Cugnet</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>111,193,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François Daine</td>
<td>Lieutenant-général</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>V, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschaillons</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11, 164-165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François Foucault</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>111,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques de Lafontaine</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IV, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Eustache Lanouiller</td>
<td>Grand-voyeur</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>IV, 257-258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Lanouiller</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>IV, 236,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph-Gaspard Chaussegros de Lery</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>IV, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustache Chartier de Lotbinière</td>
<td>Dean of the Chapter, Councillor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>II, 171-173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes-Jacques Péan</td>
<td>Major des ville et chateau, Québec</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>111,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignace Perthuis</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>IV, 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>René-Ovide Rouville</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas-Jacques Taschereau</td>
<td>Councillor, Treasurer</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1,17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


136 Page of census on which name appears.

137 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, assorted volumes.

138 Occupation not listed, but internal evidence in present study provides function.
Table 18

City of Montreal, 1731, Resident Seigniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Page, Aveu</th>
<th>Page, Roy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d'Ailleboust de Perigny</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>IV, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sieur de Beaujeu</td>
<td>Officer, administrator, commandant</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sieur de Blainville</td>
<td>Officer, commandant</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>IV, 266-267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Blondeau</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>19, 51, 88,</td>
<td>111, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89, 149 (143)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuisy d'Argenteuil</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>52, 152</td>
<td>111, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sieur de Cavagnial</td>
<td>Officer, administrator</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>IV, 170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


140 Unlike the Quebec listing, the occupation in this aveu was not given. The occupation is inferred from internal evidence within the present study.

141 Page of aveu on which name appears.

142 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, assorted volumes.

143 Several page listings in aveu indicate that individual occupied, or was grantee of several properties, and/or houses, and/or lands under cultivation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Page, Aveu</th>
<th>Page, Roy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poulin de Francheville de Gannes</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>16, 146</td>
<td>11, 239-241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>36, 65</td>
<td>11, 155, 161-162, IV, 87-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyon Després</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>9, 11, 16, 22,</td>
<td>1, 37-39, 91, 11, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertel de la Frenières</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1, 243, 11, 6, IV, 95-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lignery</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>73, 149</td>
<td>11, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linctot</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>19, 130</td>
<td>1, 151 IV, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chevalier de Longueuil Jean-Baptiste, Jacques and the sieur Neveu</td>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>11, 18, 131</td>
<td>1, 163-165 II, 55-58 1, 238, IV, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dame Portneuf</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>30, 43</td>
<td>1, 238, V, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Raimbault sieur and veuve Ramezay Repentigny, père, fils</td>
<td>Judicial officer</td>
<td>26, 145</td>
<td>IV, 216, 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etienne Rocbert de la Morandièdre sieur de Varennes</td>
<td>Garde-magasin</td>
<td>9, 59, 63, 88</td>
<td>IV, 102, 219-220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquis and Marquise de Vaudreuil</td>
<td>Administrator and his Mother</td>
<td>13, 23 (144)</td>
<td>IV, 170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

144 The Vaudreuil's owned a piece of land without a house on it. The purpose was to have an unrestricted view of the waterfront, see p. 13, aveu.
Several features of the seigniorial system, considered to date, indicate the revisions claimed necessary earlier in this study. Those to whom lands were granted were of the elite, the bourgeoisie of New France. They were officers, merchants, administrators, post commandants, and, specially important, close to sources of power. They inter-married. They lived, not in rustic simplicity, but in the cities of the colony. A study of their possible revenue will further illustrate these bourgeois features.

Trudel, in his work on the seigniorial system, commented on the duties of the seignior. He emphasized the restrictions placed on the land recipients. He noted that among the rights of the seignior were the cens et rentes, the milling toll, droit de commune, lods et ventes and corvée. He entitled this section, rather sarcastically, "Burden-some Rights." The lods et ventes was a tax of 1/12 on the value of the land sold by the tenant. The seignior in turn paid a droit de quint, a tax of 1/5 of the value of the seigniory sold, and due to the State. Both of these taxes had as a primary purpose the checking of land sales and speculation. Trudel implies that these obligations sat

145 Trudel, REGIME, p. 12.
146 Trudel, REGIME, p. 12.
147 Trudel, REGIME, p. 12.
148 Trudel, REGIME, p. 10.
149 Trudel, REGIME, pp. 10-12.
lightly on the shoulders of the censitaire, and provided an effective restriction on the seigniors. He does not, however, provide any base from which we may compare these dues, nor does he provide or concern himself with a section on the sales which did take place.

It is not the intent of the present section to imply that the dues were high, or that untoward speculation took place. It is, however, the purpose of this study to place the dues and the sales within a context. Land was, as has been said, but one part of the activities of the commercial class. Land was given almost free to the seigniors. If any incomes were earned, these were gained by the labour of others. It was also income to be added to other sources of revenue.

The seigniors received income from several sources within the system: leases of land; sales of land; and sales of seigniories. In some cases, frequently enough, the tenant's land was sold, and the seignior received the 1/12 of the value of the land, as was his right.

Jeanne Lemelin, the widow of Charles Jolliet, leased land to Louis Volant, a merchant of Quebec, and himself a seignior. He rented, for six years, the lands and islands about Mingan. The annual rent was 800 livres. The acquired privileges were the rights to farm, fish, hunt.
and trade.

In the seigniory of Varennes, in 1738, land was sold by one tenant to another. The sale price was 1,400 livres plus the assumption of the usual dues, in this case 3 livres per year plus two capons. Cugnet purchased lots in Quebec City. He was, as well, a seignior. The purchase in 1731 was for a lot measuring 125' X 70', and the price was 8,000 livres. The sale was made by Aubert de la Chesnaye. Cugnet also purchased two other lots: one in 1723 worth 2,900 livres, and the other in 1735 worth 7,000 livres. Nicolas-Jacquin, dit Philibert, purchased a lot in Upper-Town, Quebec, in 1734, for 8,000 livres, and another in the following year for 2,500. Two years later he bought three parts of a lot for 1,200 livres. The land purchased in 1735 for 2,500 livres had been previously sold to Madelaine Ruette d'Auteuil, in 1726, for 1,600 livres. A sergeant, Jean-Baptiste Lecocq, dit St.

151 "Bail à ferme par Jeanne Lemelin, veuve de Charles Jolliet d'Anticosti, à Louis Volant de Hautebourg, négociant à Québec, de la terre ferme de Mingan et des Isles et ilets qui en dépendent pour six années, 1 octobre 1748", P.A.C., GREFFES, Barolet, vol. 1, pp. 61-62.

152 "Cession d'un terrain situé à Cote St. Michel paroisse de Varrennes, par Christophe Lussier à Jean Baptiste Laleu dit Lamontagne, Varrennes, 14 juillet 1738", P.A.C., DOCUMENTS RELATIFS A LA PROVINCE DE QUEBEC: F: DOCUMENTS RELATIFS AUX SEIGNEURIES ET AUTRES LIEUX: VARENNES. (Hereafter P.A.C., and name of seigniory.).


154 P.A.C., AD, pp. 66-70.

155 P.A.C., AD, pp. 53-57.
Onge, purchased a lot in 1731 for 4,600 livres. This non-commissioned officer must have been parsimonious indeed to save this amount from his picayune salary.

Maurice Blondeau, Montreal merchant and a seignior, sold land in 1729, 1730, 1731 and 1732. He sold a concession in 1731. He leased farms in 1731 and 1732, and had obligations due to him from three persons in 1730.

In the same city, Charlotte Denis, the widow of Claude de Ramezay, sold a lot for 1,050 livres. Other sales of lands took place in the seigniory of Saint-Vallier. The price: 1,050 livres.

In La Durantaye, it was 350 livres. In Montreal, a lot was sold for 600 livres. The same lot, one day later, was sold for 800 livres.

In the seigniory of Saint-Ours, lands were sold for 500, and 2,000 livres. The latter sale was made for 300 livres cash, and 1,700 term, bear-

157 Roy, GREFFES, vol. 16, Index, p. 179.
159 "Vente de terre à Prisque Bélanger...St. Vallié (sic), 25 novembre, 1747", P.A.C., SAINT-VALLIER.
160 "Vente d'une terre par Charles Campagne a Prisque Belander dans la seigneurie de la Durantaye, 25 juillet 1733", P.A.C., LA DURANTAYE.
161 "Contrat de vente de Mme La Valtrie à Charpentier...29 juillet 1731", and "Contrat de vente de Denis Charpentier à Pierre Dubrueil, 30 juillet 1731", P.A.C., Montreal.
ing an annual interest of 85 livres or 5\%.

In the concession owned by Jean-Baptiste Neveu, sales were made for lots valued at 800 livres, plus cens et rentes, and for 1,000 livres with no mention of dues.

Sales of houses, although not directly related to the subject at hand, do reveal status, and in some cases, involvement in economic affairs, at least by influence. Henry Dusautoy, a "visiteur au bureau du Domaine..." purchased a house for 14,000 livres in 1744. The visiteur, according to a report written by Bigot, received an annual salary of 1,200 livres. This individual, however, was also the controller of the Domaine. He also happened to be the brother-in-law of François-Etienne Cugnet, the director of the Domaine. Michel Sarrazin, the doctor-administrator-merchant-seignior, and reputed to be one of the insolvents of the colony, owned a house valued at 6,500 livres.

Seigniories, in spite of the droit de quint, or 1/5 tax to be

162 "Contrat de vente faite par...Contracoeur le pere, au profit de François Dupré, 1 août 1737", and "Vente de Jean Pierre de Miniac a François Hudon dit Beaulieu...Québec, 16 septembre 1740", P.A.C., SAINT-OURS.


165 "Mémoire concernant le Régie pour la perception des Droits ordonné être lever au profit de Sa Majesté dans la Colonie de Canada...4 juillet 1749", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 121-2, f 59.

166 See Chapters X and XI.

paid by the vendor, were sold. Trudel failed to note that the State usually remitted 1/3 of the droit de quint. The most extreme case, and it was not the rule, is the seigniory of Terrebonne. L'abbé Louis Lepage bought the lands from François-Marie Bouat in 1720 for 10,000 livres. Bouat had purchased the seigniory from Louis Lecomte-Dupré two years previously, in 1718, for the sum of 5,268 livres. In 1745, Lepage sold the holdings to Louis de Chapt, sieur de La Corne, for 60,000 livres. More representative are the sales of François Leneuf, sieur de la Fresnière, a captain in the Marine Troops, of his lands called Saint-François Leneuf, to Joseph Marchand, a merchant, for 10,000 livres, or the sale by the heirs of Pierre Nôel Le Gardeur, who sold the seigniory of de Tilly for 11,000 livres in 1748. Portneuf was sold by Charles and Bonaventure Le Gardeur de Croisille to Eustache Lambert Dumont, and his wife, in 1742 for 12,000 livres. Two years later,

168 See P.A.C., C 11 G series re sales. Each sale is recorded as well as the amount of the droit de quint. The application for, and the granting of the remission of 1/3 is almost always the case.  
169 On the sales of supplies from this seigniory, see Chapter IV, THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE STATE: 3. The relevance of State purchases, and exports from the colony of New France is there noted.  
172 "Vente des fiefs et seigneuries de Villieu(Tilly)...23 août 1748", P.A.C., GREFFES, vol. 6, Panet, p. 10.  
173 "Acte de vente de la seigneurie et baronnie de Portneuf...12 octobre 1742", P.A.C., GREFFES, vol. 6, Latour, p. 65.
Dumont, a lieutenant, sold the lands to the Ursulines of Quebec for the same sum. It is noted, however, that part of the lands came to Dumont from the dowry of his wife, Charlotte Petit.

Claude-Pierre Pécaudy, sieur de Contracoeur, purchased lands in the seigniory of Dumesnil in 1741 for 6,000 livres. The seller: Louis le Picard de Leteland. Pierre Joseph Céleron acted for the latter. One-half of the fief of Verchères was sold in 1745 for 8,010 livres. The Vaudreuil family, that is the first Vaudreuil, and then his sons and heirs, purchased and sold seigniories, and lands. Bourchemin, or Bourchumin, for example, was purchased, and then sold to Dosquet, the Bishop of New France. Dosquet had also, previously, requested a land grant so that he might set a good example. His grant was reunited to the domain of the Crown in 1741.

Joseph Gauthier, in his act of foi et hommage of 1748, declares

174 "Acte de vente de la terre et seigneurie de Portneuf...6 juin 1744", P.A.C., GREFFES, vol. 1, Boucault, pp. 33-46.
177 "La Dame de Thierson au Ministre, Québec, 28 octobre 1731", and "Dosquet au Gouverneur, Québec, 17 octobre 1731", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 55, p. 211, and vol. 56, p. 104. See also Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, pp. 108-111.
himself the seignior of Varennes, and of two other contiguous lands. These he had purchased from Jean d'Ailleboust and Geneviève de Ramezay for 1,800 and 1,500 livres respectively. The Hazeurs, of the Chapter of Quebec, and related to Sarrazin, sold La Malbaye for 20,000 livres de France in 1733. The money of the metropolis was valued more highly than was the currency of the colony.

Other sales of lands occurred after the period under consideration, that is, after 1748, but these belonged to, or were acquired by the vendors prior to 1748. One-half of Kamouraska, plus 3/5 of the remaining half, was sold in 1758 for 9,700 livres plus some debts owed to General Hospital of Quebec and to a priest, Charles Auclair. Villeray was sold by the heirs of the lands between 1754 and 1758 for 6,400 livres. Joseph Blondeau's heirs sold the seigniory of Rivière-de-Loup for 6,000 livres in 1756. The provisions were 6,000 livres plus a lifetime pension of 400 livres to the widow, and a "...pot de vin..." of 500 livres. The eventual cost to the purchaser was 9,966 livres, 13 sols and 4 deniers. Louis de Chapt, the purchaser of Terrebonne, sold

179 P.A.C., FH, pp. 292-300.
183 P.A.C., VILLERAY.
Kaskarinet for the sum of 20,000 livres. Hyacinthe Simon Delorme purchased the fief of the Rivière Marka from Pierre François Rigaud, seigneur de Vaudreuil, for 4,000 livres.

That there were sales of lots, lands and seigniories is evident. The droit de quint, while it may have acted as a check, did not act as a total bar to sales. Further, not only were lands sold, but there appeared to be a fair amount of speculation in lands, not merely through the acquisition of seigniories, but as well, through rapid purchases and sales. From the sales of lands we will turn to the profits from lands.

Revenues from seigniories, according to Trudel, were low. He provided the following table to illustrate this:

- cens: 6 sols (0.30)
- rentes: 60 sols (3.00)
- milling tolls: 14 minot out of 200
- corvée: 3 days a year.

He valued wheat at 4 livres, the minot, and the corvée at 2 livres per day. Two objections must be made to his statements: when he claims that these exactations were low, it must be asked, compared to what? A relative value within a determined context must be established, and not a rough and unproven equivalence in current currency terms. What, for example, does a minot of wheat represent? What of a day's corvée?

---

And further, the *censitaire's* income was restricted to his farm, while that of the seignior's was but part of a larger revenue. The second objection is that Trudel does not include all of the charges. He omits, for example, that in addition to a milling toll, there was also a provision for the *droit de commune*. Again, and it must be remembered, it was not that the seigniorial rights were too burdensome, but rather, that the seignior gained an income with little effort.

The seigniorial dues in New France may have been low, compared to those of France, but they appear high when compared to those prevalent in the colonies to the South. Bond, in a study on the quit-rents in the British-American colonies, claims an average of 2 to 4 shillings per hundred acres, or, in terms of the currency of New France, 2 to 4 livres per hundred acres. In the introduction to the same work, Charles Andrews wrote that these were not a heavy burden, "...although the requirement, often imposed, that the payment be made in silver rather than produce, was difficult to meet, owing to the scarcity of hard money." This was, as we have seen, a condition prevalent in New France as well.

The significance of a *minot* of wheat must also be established. In 1729, the Superior Council of Quebec established the *minot* as being

---

the quantity of wheat required to feed one person for one month. Lunn uses the same value. A day's corvée was, as Trudel wrote, 40 sols or 2 livres per diem. This, again as Trudel noted, was no more than three days per year. However, three days' corvées from many censitaires would either assist in the cultivation of the seigniorial domain, or could be converted into a cash or produce income.

Other aspects too lightly passed over by Trudel are the droit de pêche and the droit de commune. The first was a blanket permit allowing the seignior to fish the waters fronting the tenant's land, or the right to 1/11 of the catch. This would be a source of food for the seignior. The droit de commune had a cash value. In Jacques Le Moyne's seigniory of Cap-de-la-Trinité it was 5 sols annually per head. Charlotte Denis, the widow of Claude de Ramezay, one time governor of Montreal, charged 4 livres, 10 sols, 6 deniers for the right, in the seigniory of Sorel. Her concessions also provide an equivalence of capons to money, another due which Trudel neglects. The conversion was

191 Trudel, REGIME, p. 13.
192 "Terrier du Fief et Baronie de Portneuf...2 avril 1742", P.A.C., GREFFES, vol. 3, Dulaurent, pp. 5-132.
193 "Cap de la Trinité...Jacques Lemoine sieur de Martigny...16 juin 1736", P.A.C., AD, vol. 5, p. 146.
two capons or 20 sols. In an evaluation of the value of a seignorial right, it is essential, then, to keep in mind that apart from cens et rentes, milling rights, and the corvée, there were other dues which had, as a cumulative effect, an income accretion factor. This income required very few obligations on the part of the seignior, and was but a part of his revenue.

Some idea of the value of a seigniory may be gleaned from a letter written by Dartigny and Villeray, two seigniors, to the Minister of Marine in 1749. Some of their lands in the city of Quebec had been confiscated for use by the State. They complained of the resulting loss of income for, they had rented the lands for 4 livres per foot. They requested compensation. François-Antoine de Pécaudy granted a concession in 1736. The dues were 6 livres per arpent of frontage; 2 to 3 munts of wheat, and 2 capons. Half of this was to be paid in argent tournois, that is, 25% higher than the currency of New France. Converting the dues into currency terms, the total for one concession was 32 livres, plus such rights as milling and commune which were not given. As there were five concessions, the total would be 160 livres. This

---

194 "Concession par Dame Charlotte Denis Veuve de Claude de Ramezay à Jean Baptiste St Martin, Montréal, 9 janvier 1733", and "Concession... à des Montmarque, Montréal, 7 mars 1733", P.A.C., SOREL.


196 "Concession a Benoit, Joseph Bernard, François Sansoucy, J. Bte Felix, François Benoist, 19 mars 1736", P.A.C., SOREL: DOCUMENTS LEG-AUX.
represents, for the seignior, not $160.00 as Trudel presents it, but 
\( \frac{1}{4} \) to \( \frac{1}{2} \) of an annual wage for a worker in New France. Evaluating in a context rather than in modern comparative terms changes somewhat the level of the dues.

Pierre Rigaud de Vaudreuil, sieur de Cavagnial, granted lands in 1743. His average cens et rentes was well above the rate of 1 livre per arpent used by Trudel. For 2 arpents, 8 perches, the dues were 10 sols of cens, and 7 livres tournois rentes. François Messier conforms to the average set by Trudel of 1 livre per arpent. However, he does impose an additional burden: after Messier's death, the tenant is to have three requiem masses said for the repose of the soul of the deceased seignior. One other odd, and notable fact was evident in the seigniory of Montreal. These lands were owned by the Gentlemen of Saint-Sulpice. In the aveus for the Island, it is striking that the wealthy people, those with the largest holdings, or those who have government posts, paid a relatively low rent for their lands. Less well off persons

197 Trudel, REGIME, p. 13.

198 Trudel, REGIME, p. 12.

199 "Concession a Louis Séguin dit Laderoute par Pierre Rigault de Vaudreuil, sr Cavagial (sic), Montréal, 12 août 1743", and "Concession a...Jean Baptiste Séguin, Montréal, 24 janvier 1743", P.A.C., VAUDREUIL.

200 "Concession par François Messier sieur de St. François, seigneur de Cap St Michel, paroisse de Varennes, à Augustin Messier, Cap St. Michel, 13 avril 1737", P.A.C., VARENNES.
paid higher dues.

As we consider the revenues of seigniories, it is well to retain
the revenue levels for purposes of comparison. An average salary, it
will be recalled, was 600 livres per year. This was for an artisan, and
was a high average. Terrebonne and Des Plaines, the holdings of l'abbé
Lepage, returned 780 livres of rentes, 22 livres of cens, and 62 minots
of wheat plus 42 capons to its owner in 1736. In addition, although
these are never reported in the aveus, there were milling rights and
droit de commune, and fishing rights. As well, Lepage sold to the State.
The cash equivalent of these returns is 849 livres, approximately.

The seigniory of Portneuf, purchased and sold for 12,000 livres,
produced an annual income of approximately 463 livres. In this case we
know that there were no mill rights as there was no mill. Nor, for that
matter, was there a manor house, nor a seigniorial domain. Some addi-
tional income, however, was forthcoming from sales of lands by censit-
aires. Also, in the document, it is noted that some tenants have not as
yet taken firm contracts, but will do so at the prevailing dues. The

201 "Fief de l'Isle de Montréal", P.A.C., AD, vol. 4, pp. 1-236.
202 "Fief de Terrebonne et des Plaines, 20 mars 1736", P.A.C.,
203 "Terrier du fief et Baronnie de Portneuf à M Eustache Lambert,
Ecuer, sieur Dumont, lieutenant dans les troupes du détachement de la
marine entretenues pour le service du Roy en ce pays...Sur lequel fief
et Baronnie il n'y a encore aucun domaine d'établie ni même de principal
manoir ni moulin banal...2 avril 1742", P.A.C., GREFFES, vol. 3, Dulaurent,
pp. 5-132.
income, relevant to the value of the seigniory, was small. Dumont, however, received a salary as an officer, and was also involved in the fur trade.

The *cens et rentes* on the Grand Isle de Varennes, a part of the seigniory, were worth 40 *livres*. Raimbault, an administrator and resident of Montreal, received approximately 295 *livres* from his fief of Simblin. Expressed another way, part of this figure represents enough wheat to feed five people for a year, and permit the seignior to have a capon once a week, if he so desired. The sieur de Martigny, Jacques Le Moyne, was the owner of Cap-de-la-Trinité. He could have had capon twice a week. His income, without milling rights, or rights to the commune, was about 232 *livres per annum*.

One-half of the lands of Varennes produced 345 *livres* in income for Jean-Baptiste Jarret, a post commandant. He was married to Madeleine d'Ailleboust. Jean-Baptiste Couillard, "...Conseiller du Roy et son Lieutenant particulier au siège de la prevosté et lieutenant général de l'amirauté de cette ville..." was the proprietor of one-half of the lands of Varennes.

---

204 "Grande Isle de Varenne, n.d.", P.A.C., VARENNES.
205 "Fief de Simblin, 26 juin 1736", P.A.C., AD, vol. 5, pp. 131-144.
lands of la Rivière du Sud. He received no less than 1,336 capons annually. In money value, his share of the revenues was 547 livres.

There is no recording of the milling right. He also owned part of l'Islet Saint-Jean. The revenue from this small holding was about 95 livres per year.

The present study cannot present a full re-interpretation of the seigniorial system of New France. It is not its purpose. However, the necessity of revision, specially of the works of Munro, Adair, Diamond and Trudel, is apparent. It has been demonstrated that the seigneors belonged to a special group, one which, however, belongs more properly under the appellation bourgeois rather than aristocratic or seigniorial. The seigniorial class, as it is generally understood, did not exist, if for no other reason than it was an urban based, and not a rural class. The seigniorial-bourgeoisie was not a single, agricultural based group, but rather was composed of individuals committed to a wide range of economic, administrative and land exploiting activities. The incomes derived from the seigniories, in terms of sales, speculation, land transfers, or from dues, while not absolutely high, were relatively high. The key to the proper understanding of the system lies not in a consideration of the land returns and policy in terms of irrelevant absolutes, but in placing these within a context.

CHAPTER VIII

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE ADMINISTRATION: 1:

THE SUPERIOR COUNCIL

...In order to gain an influence proportionate to its real importance every political force has to be organized, and before it can be well organized, a number of factors, important among them are time and tradition, are indispensable. This is why, in one country or another, we see an actual disproportion between the importance that a class has acquired in society and the direct influence it exerts in the government of the country. One thinks at once of the French bourgeoisie before 1789...

So wrote one man. Let us examine the Superior Council of New France. What was the rôle of the Council? Who were the councillors? What salaries did they receive? Did they hold other positions, and did they have other sources of revenue? Did they, and this is the most important question, "gain an influence" proportionate to the "importance that a class" should "exert in society"?

There has been accord amongst the four principal writers on the subject of the Superior Council. Its powers, specially by the 1730's, were restricted to judicial ones. It was subordinate to the governor, who held, theoretically at least, the supreme authority in New France.

1 Mosca, p. 145.
3 Delalande, p. 331.
The Bishop, or his representative, held the second position, and the intendant, who actually presided over the Council, the third. The latter, was as well the administrator responsible for financial matters, and with an administration separate from the Council.

In the period presently under study, the Council had seventeen members, of which twelve were councillors; one of these was a cleric.

In addition to the governor, Bishop or his representative, and intendant, there was an attorney-general and a recording clerk, or more accurately, a cabinet secretary, to use more modern parlance. In French law, in spite of Delalande’s legal quibblings over the rights of the Council, the body was subordinate to the Crown. Lack of power, then, is the traditional attribute of the Superior Council in New France. There is

---

5 Delalande, pp. 99-110.
6 See Delalande, pp. 282-330.
7 See "Arrêt du conseil d'état qui ordonne à M. Talon de faire des règlements de Police, 4, juin 1672"; "Déclaration du roi qui confirme et règle l'établissement du Conseil Souverain de Canada, 5 juin, 1675"; "Procès-verbal contenant les modifications faites par le conseil supérieur à l'ordonnance ou code civil de 1667, avec la dite ordonnance, 7 novembre, 1678"; "Ordre du roi sur ce qui doit être usité dans le conseil souverain, 18 juin, 1704"; "Lettres patentées qui règlent la séance du conseiller-clerc au conseil supérieur de Québec, 25 mars, 1730"; "Lettres patentées en forme d'édit concernant les asesseurs aux conseils supérieurs des colonies, août, 1742"; and "Lettre du roi adressée au conseil supérieur concernant les enrégistremens, 9 décembre 1746", EDITS, ORDONNANCES ROYAUX, DECLARATIONS ET ARRETS DU CONSEIL D'ETAT DU ROI CONCERNANT LE CANADA, vol. 1, pp. 72; 82; 106; 301; 524; 561 and 588. (Hereafter EOR.).
one minor question that might be asked of this interpretation, and re-
tained for future application: why was it necessary for so many direct-
ives to be issued by the Crown if it was accepted that the Superior Cou-
ncil was subordinate?

The legal functions of the Council would, as is natural, be in-
fluenced by its composition. The French monarch recognized this, as is
evident in his instructions to the administrators of the colony, in 1729:

Le Sr. Hocquart parviendra de son coté en traitant avec
douceur et bonté les habitans, en entrant dans leur be-
soins et leur facilitant leurs établissement, en empêc-
hant que le petit habitant ne soit vexé par le puissant,
en empêchant auszy que les officiers de justice ne se
servent de leur pouvoir que pour dispenser de payer leurs
dettes et de vexer leurs voisins en tenant la main que les
juges rendent bonne et briève justice...

No doubt there is a certain amount of diplomaties in this letter; it is
a standard piece of advice. Its necessity, however, is revealed by a
memorial to the Chamber of Commerce of La Rochelle, written in 1734. The
French merchants had occasion to complain of the abuses of justice by
members of the Superior Council of New France. The memorialists pointed
out that much of the commerce of the colony was based on the extension
of credit, and that, among the Canadian merchants

Il ce trouve...entre ces marchands qu'elqu'uns dassé mau-
vaie foy pour (apres avoir jouy pendant plusieurs années
des avances qu'on leur fait) se revolte contre cet usages,
...qui se servent de toutes sorte de chicane pour s'en
soustraire, oubliant tout principe de reconnoissance et

8 "Memoire du Roy aux Srs...Beauharnois...et Hocquart, 19 avril
s'apuyant de credit qu'ils ont au Conseil Superieur de Quebec...

The petitioners go on to claim that there were many cases presently before the Superior Council of the colony, and that members of the Council and/or the intendant, refused to settle cases until further instructions were received from the Court. Delay certainly existed, perhaps even collusion.

Another means of illustrating the uses of the powers of the council members lies in a consideration of the registering of the edicts of the King's council. The Arrêt of Marly which affected the seigniors was delayed thirty years. Edicts affecting their own interests, in a favourable fashion, were often registered immediately. The ARRETS ET REGLEMENTS DU CONSEIL SUPERIEUR DE QUEBEC furnish literally dozens of proofs of this mixture of personal and judicial interests. The reasons are not hard to find, and the answer to this will also permit an evaluation of what may be called the "famine interpretation" of the Council.

---


11 See, as proof, the index of the EOR where the date of the original edict is given, and the date of the registration in the Superior Council of Quebec.

12 In addition to the ordonnances offered in Chapters III, IV, V, and VII, see the listing of the ordonnances of the Superior Council, AR., pp. 643-649.
"La charge de conseiller n'était pas très rémunératrice," Delalande has written. In this he is apparently supported by the governor Beauharnois and the intendant Hocquart. "Le Sr. Delino," they wrote Maurepas, the Ministre de la Marine, "a esté pendant trente ans conseiller, et il a rempli cette place avec tout le desinteressement et l'application qu'on desire d'un bon sujet. Il a avoit autrefois un commerce fort considerable a esté depuiz deux fois de la colonie...La succession a peine pour payer les dettes." Hocquart neglected to mention that de Lino was also a merchant after becoming a councillor. The intendant's purpose was to convince the home authorities to grant de Lino's widow and son a little something. He was successful. Another instance of famine and dire poverty was the "poor Sarrazins". The widow Sarrazin and her son were granted "...800 (livres) pour gratification annuelle jusques a ce que led-fils qui fait ses etudes a Paris soit en Etat d'Exercer lad. place de medecin..." Six hundred livres, it will be remem-

13 Delalande, p. 127.
15 See "Règlement pour la Compagnie du Canada", EOR., pp. 280-284, and Guy Frégault's articles on the Company, "La Compagnie de la colonie", pp. 5-29; 127-149.
16 See "Bordereau...1736"; "Bordereau...1737"; "Bordereau...1739"; "Bordereau...1740", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 114-1, f 18; 56; 126; 297.
17 See also below for Sarrazin's revenues.
18 "Dépenses de Canada,...1735", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 32, f 80.
bered, was a high annual salary for an artisan. The Sarrazins also engaged in commerce, and were seigneurs.

Two points flow from this evidence. First, there was a cry of famine and this must be further investigated. Second, the group or class from which were chosen the members of the Superior Council, if we are to believe the intendant, were merchants, past tense, rather than were merchants, present tense. This must also be investigated. In 1739, the death of Charles Guillimin created a vacancy on the council. The colonial administrators proposed, to fill the seat, "...le Sr. Baudoin le jeune (,) négociant de Québec; c'est un homme âgé de 35 a 40 ans, sage, de bonnes moeurs, d'une honnête famille de Canada, très versé dans les affaires de commerce dans lesquelles il est souvent choisi pour arbite (sic)..." Baudoin was not named, but Charles' son, Guillaume, was.

We shall see, shortly, that the merchants on the council, active merchants, were the rule and not the exception.

The "famine interpretation" may seem to be further supported by a provision of the French King of 1734. To encourage the citizens of the colony to better prepare themselves to serve on the Council, the monarch made provisions for an annual salary of 300 livres for every council

19 "Beauharnois et Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 24 septembre 1739" P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 120.

20 Delalande, p. 122.
This meant, in effect, a wage of \( \frac{1}{2} \) of the annual revenue of a worker in the colony. One-half, it must be admitted, is not much, but this was but a partial revenue for the councillors. Probably the most significant factor in past underestimations of the wages of the members of the council is that the listings do not give all their employments. This we will do.

Michel Sarrazin was appointed to the Council in 1707. He was, as has been previously noted, a doctor, tile manufacturer, brother-in-law of the Hazeurs of the Chapter of Quebec; son-in-law of a deceased member of the Council, and in addition to being a councillor, was a garde des sceaux. He died in 1734.

As a senior councillor he received an annual stipend of 300 livres from the budget of the Domaine d'Occident. For the same post, he received from the King's budget a like sum, plus a gratification ordinaire, a bonus, of 150 livres. The keeper of the seals received 100 to
150 livres per annum. As the médecin of the General Hospital of Quebec he was paid 800 livres a year. As the médecin des troupes he received 300 livres annually. He acquired, by seizure and auction, the fief of Saint-Jean. He owned 1/3 of the seigniory of the Rivière de la Madeleine; 1/3 of the lands of Grande-Vallée des Monts de Notre-Dame and a like part of l'Anse-de-l'Etang. An examination of seigniorial documents indicates that Sarrazin, like his brothers-in-law, never lived on his lands. He owned, as we have seen, property in Quebec City. His mediocre wages were not 600 livres annually, as Le Jeune has written, but, at a minimum, 1,950 livres, or more than three times the average wage of a worker. To this should be added his returns from his land holdings; his profits on sales to the State; the subsidies he received, and perhaps even revenues from a private medical practice.

Eustache Chartier de Lotbinière was also a member of the Superior

---

27 "Beauharnois et Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 18 octobre, 1732" P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 57, p. 121.
28 "Dépense de Canada, Domaine d'Occident, 1731", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 29, f 27. See also next chapter on Civil Administration.
29 "Dépenses de Canada, 1731", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 30, f 84.
30 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 2, pp. 77-78.
32 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 56.
33 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 152.
Council. He was appointed in 1710; made garde des sceaux in 1717, but later resigned from this post. He died in 1749. He was the son of a prominent seignior, administrator and judicial officer, René-Louis Chartier de Lotbinière. After the death of his wife, Eustache took religious orders, but retained his seat on the council. In the same year that he took the cloth, 1726, he was appointed a member of the Chapter of Quebec, the administrative unit of the See of Quebec, and was to be the representative of the Bishop of New France after the death of Saint-Vallier in 1727. He was named Dean of the Chapter of Quebec in 1739. He owned the seigniory of de Lotbinière. His stipend was 600 livres a year as a canon; as Dean he would receive a double portion, 1,200. As a member of the Council he was paid 300 livres a year, and until his resignation as keeper of the seals, 100 to 150 livres per annum. Occasionally he received a gratuity from the State: 150 livres a year for the years 1736 to 1741. He sold lumber to the government. He was

36 Le Jeune, vol. 2, p. 172. See also Cameron Nish, "The Death, Burial and Succession of Monseigneur de Saint-Vallier", soon to be published, and now in manuscript form.
40 "Bordereau...1736"; "Bordereau...1737"; "Bordereau...1739"; "Bordereau...1740" and "Bordereau...1741", P.A.C., vols., 114-1, f 18; 126; 127 and 114-2, 391.
41 See above Chapters IV and V, and Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 229.
related to Jean-François de Lino and to Louis-Denys de la Ronde, the latter the recipient of subsidies from the State and a fur trade post commandant. De Lotbinière's basic wages, exclusive of his seigniorial returns and sales of lumber, were at minimum, 1,000 livres, and maximum, 1,800, that is, three times the average.

Jean-François Hazeur was the son of "...an enterprising and highly respected merchant", not to mention a member of the Council as well. He was Sarrazin's brother-in-law, and co-owner of the seigniories noted as the property of the latter. The Guillimins appear not once as Council members, but twice. The father, Charles Guillimin, was a noted merchant; he was also a member of the judicial administration. A son was a commissary clerk, that is, in charge of supplies, at Louisbourg. One of his daughters married Jacques le Gardeur de Saint-Pierre, and then, in a second nuptial, she was married to Louis-Luc de la Corne. Both

45 Roy, CS., pp. 180-182.
47 "Liste des sujets qui composent le Conseil Supérieur et les jurisdic­tions Royales de la Colonie", P.A.C., D 2 D, carton 1, and next chapter.
were post commandants. Guillaume, the son who served on the Council after his father's death, as well as a councillor, was a member of the administration, and was married to the daughter of another council member, François Foucault, who in turn had been the garde-magasin at Quebec. Guillaume Guillimin was a seignior, and a supplier of the government.

Nicolas Lanoullier de Boisclerc is a further proof of the intermingling of political and economic functions within New France. He was appointed to the Council in 1722. He had come to the colony in 1712 as the representative of Aubert, Néret, Gayot and Company, at that time leasors of the fur trade monopoly. He was appointed the representative of the treasury of the Ministry of the Marine in New France, and at the same time was the monopolist of the postal services of the colony. To his salary as a Council member it is therefore necessary to add his wages as an administrator, and also the gratuities accorded to him which were

50 See below.
56 Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 1, p. 357n.
as high as 3,000 *livres* per year. He had, in a first marriage, wed a daughter of André de Leigne, a judicial administrator. He owned the lands about the Lac Métis which he had purchased from Louise Le Gardeur. He had also been granted an *arrière fief* in Lepage's seigniory, but failed to develop it. His two brothers, Jean-Eustache and Paul-Antoine-François held other posts in the administration.

Lanoullier was not an exception. Jacques de La Fontaine de Belcourt was appointed to the Council in 1735. He had been Beauharnois' secretary. He was the proprietor of a seigniory; was granted an *arrière fief* in Lepage's holdings of des Plaines, and was a lesor of the Tadoussac trade area. By marriage he was related to the de la Gorgendière and Jolliet families. The former was also related to the

---

58 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 63.
59 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 64.
60 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 236.
61 Le Jeune, vol. 2, p. 67, and see following chapter.
63 "Beauharnois au Ministre, Québec, 5 novembre 1740", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 74, p. 93.
Vaudreuil's. In 1735, Thomas-Jacques Taschereau became a council member. He has already been mentioned as a member of the de la Gorgendière and Vaudreuil families. He was also the representative, after Langoullier, of the treasury of the Ministère de la Marine in New France. He held other administrative posts; was a seignior; a partner of Cugnet in the Saint-Maurice Forges; and had come to Canada as the intendant Dupuy's secretary.

Others serving on the Council in the period 1729 to 1748 were Jean Victor Varin de la Marre. He was the representative of the intendant at Montreal, at the same time as a Council member and did not, as Delalande claims, resign from the Council to accept an administrative post. He was married to a member of the Beaujeu family. François Foucault was another member who held more than one post, for he was a garde-magasin as well as a member of the Superior Council. He was the father-

---

68 See Chapter XI, THE BOURGEOISIE AND MARRIAGE.
69 Roy, CS., p. 181.
71 Delalande, p. 121. See, for Varin's salary as an administrator "Bordereau...1737"; "Bordereau...1739"; and "Bordereau...1741", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 114-1, 55; 119 and 114-2, f 382.
73 See following chapter for importance of the garde-magasin, his wages and his privileges, as well as Chapters III, IV and V.
74 "Bordereau...1736"; "Bordereau...1739" and "Bordereau...1741", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 114-1, f 27; 119 and 114-2, f 382.
in-law of Guillaume Guillimin, noted previously as a member of the same body. Jean-Baptiste Gaillard, Guillaume Estève, Joseph Perthuis and Jean-François Gaultier, all land owners, and all merchants also belonged to the Council. Last, but never least, we find the ever-present François-Etienne Cugnet not merely as a councillor, but as the first councillor. In addition to all of the activities of this most ubiquitous citizen of New France, we will also find him, in the next chapter, as an important member of the civil administration, specifically as Director of the Domaine d'Occident.

In addition to the councillors, the Superior Council included two other important functionaries: the procureur-général, or the equivalent of an attorney-general, and a greffier-en-chef which might be equated with a cabinet secretary as the exact translation to recording clerk is a little weak. Louis-Guillaume Verrier was the attorney-general from 1728 to his death in 1758. The greffier, from 1722 to 1744, was François Daine, an uncle by marriage of the better known Péan. After 1744, Daine was a member of the upper administration.

---

75 Roy, CS., p. 181.
76 Roy, CS., p. 181.
78 Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 1, p. 505n.
The procureur-général's annual salary was 1,500 livres, that of the greffier, 700 livres. Both were drawn on the budget of the Domaine d'Occident. Daine was also greffier-en-chef of the Admiralty Court of Quebec. For this post he received 100 livres annually. The recorder of the Admiralty Court also received, in addition to his stipend, fixed fees for his work. The registration of a permit, for example, was worth 2 livres; a procès-verbal, a like amount. Registration for a voyage to the West Indies produced a fee of 1 livre, 6 sols, 8 deniers. Daine also received fees for fishing permits, war captures, seizures from illegal trade, interrogations, and so on. Daine was a seignior, and had, as many other administrators, married well: in 1744, Louise de Contrecœur was his spouse. Verrier, the attorney-general, in addition to his salary, received several gratuities: 1,000 livres in 1732, and a like amount in the following year. He also gave courses in law. For this,

79 "Dépenses de Canada, Domaine d'Occident, 1729", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 52-53.
82 "Recensement de Québec en 1744", p. 49.
we may presume, he received fees. Daine's basic salary, exclusive of land returns or fees, was 800 livres per year; that of Verrier, 1,500 minimum, and sometimes, 2,500. Both were somewhat above average.

If the Superior Council were considered in isolation, a restricted body, abstracted from all other factors, it might be possible to consider it an insignificant institution. Its lack of ultimate power and subordination to the Crown, would certainly result in the traditional interpretations as expressed by Roy, Cahall, Lanctot and Delalande. However, its composition, and the multiple functions of its members, as well as the financial returns, indicate quite another conclusion. It was a family clique. It was close to, personally, and through administrative functions, the intendant. The group from which its members were drawn may be primarily characterized as the merchant group, but the term marchand or négociant must be extended to cover the seigniorial group as well. Their common interests, political and judicial and economic, were reinforced by marital links. As one slightly later contemporary put it:

Le 3eme ordre est la justice du conseil souverain et les négociants; c'est de ces derniers que sont composés les premiers et l'on peut dire que cet ordre est presque le même que le second, par le rapport qu'ont les militaires dans le commerce, les alliances et même les enfants quy sont faits souvent officiers.

On the following pages these complex links are indicated in a tabular form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Inter-marriage</th>
<th>Occupation (s)</th>
<th>Domestics, 1744</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>François-Etienne Cugnet</td>
<td>Dusautoy-Beaujeu</td>
<td>Councillor, merchant, administrator, entrepreneur, seignior.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François Daine</td>
<td>Contracoeur</td>
<td>Greffier, (double employment), seignior, Councillor, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillaume Estèbe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François Foucault</td>
<td>Father-in-law of</td>
<td>Councillor, garde magasin, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillaume Gaillard</td>
<td>Neveu (89)</td>
<td>Councillor, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-François Gaultier</td>
<td>Father-in-law of</td>
<td>Councillor, merchant.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Guiliâin</td>
<td>Repentigny's</td>
<td>Councillor, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>0 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillaume Guiliâin</td>
<td>Son of a councillor</td>
<td>Councillor, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>son-in-law of a councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-François Hazeur</td>
<td>Son of a councillor,</td>
<td>Councillor, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>0 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brother-in-law of a councillor, Sarrazin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques de LaFontaine</td>
<td>Jolliet, Gorgendière</td>
<td>Councillor, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86 See Chapter II.  
87 "Recensement de Québec en 1744."  
88 Of the Domaine d'Occident.  
89 See Chapter VI.  
90 Dead in 1744.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Inter-marriage</th>
<th>Occupation (s)</th>
<th>Domestics, 1744</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Lanoullier</td>
<td>de Leigne</td>
<td>Councillor, administrator, seignior.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustache Chartier de Lotbinière</td>
<td>Lino, de la Ronde</td>
<td>Councillor, Dean, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Varin de la Marre</td>
<td>Beaujeu</td>
<td>Councillor, administrator</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Perthuis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michel Sarrazin</td>
<td>Hazeurs</td>
<td>Councillor, merchant, seignior.</td>
<td>0 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas-Jacques Taschereau</td>
<td>Gorgendière, Vaudreuil</td>
<td>Councillor, administrator, entrepreneur, seignior.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis-Guillaume Verrier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney-General</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IX

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE ADMINISTRATION: 2:

THE CIVIL ADMINISTRATION

The present section on the civil administration will consider three aspects of the government of New France: the appointments to what may be called the civil service of the colony; the administration of the Domaine d'Occident; and the judicial administration, apart from the Superior Council. All of these branches of government were, on the whole, under the control of the intendant, Hocquart. The men occupying these posts were responsible for the day to day affairs of the colony. Their immediate superior, the intendant, because he was a transient official, has not been considered. Rather, the emphasis has been placed on the permanent staff, the resident Canadiens.

Most of the posts, as might be expected in a civil service, were minor ones. They ranged from the position of Martel fils, an "...écrivain employé a la conduite des journaliers..." at a salary of 300 livres a year, to that of the engineer, Chaussegros de Lery, or the Commissary at Montreal, the sub-intendant, Honoré Michel, sieur de Villebois, de Saint-Michel and de la Rouvillière. De Lery received a basic wage of

2 "Dépenses de Canada, 1729", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 44.
2,000 livres per annum, and the commissaire de la marine 1,800 in 1730, later raised to 2,400 livres per year. The salary ranges were from 300 to 600 livres for the lower echelon of the administration, or for those positions, such as garde magasin, which had special privileges attached to it, to 1,800 to 2,400 livres for the more important functionaries. However, multiple employments, gratuities, additional payments, such as rents, and involvement in commerce and the seigniorial system, significantly raised the income of some members of the administration.

Honoré Michel, the commissary, received his basic wage. He held the post from 1730 to 1747. In the years when Hocquart was absent from the colony, 1736-1737, for example, Michel was granted an extra 3,000 livres a year. He was married to the daughter of Bégon, the governor of Three Rivers. In 1734 he was granted the privilege of shipping goods on the King's ship at the King's expense. His rent in Montreal, 225

---

4 "Dépenses de Canada, 1729", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 44.
6 "Dépenses de Canada, 1738", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 34, f 89.
livres a year, was paid by the government. He was given, almost annu-
ally, a gratification of 500 livres. He received, in 1732, 570 livres
for courses et voyages; 1,000 in 1737 and 300 a year from 1738 to 1744.

Jean Victor Varin de la Marre's career in New France spanned the
years of Hocquart's administration, and most of those of Bigot. Prior
to 1733, his salaries as controller and écrivain principal de la marine
were 1,500 livres a year. In 1734 they were raised to 1,800 per annum.
At the same time, he was a member of the Superior Council; for this he
would receive 300 livres a year. He had an annual stipend of 300 liv-
res a year for voyages. He appears, as well, to have engaged in com-
merce. In 1746 he wrote an explanatory letter to Maurepas insisting that
it had not been his intention to deprive anyone of the trade concession

10 "Ministre à M. de Silly, Versailles, 12 avril 1729", P.A.C.,
B, vol. 53-2, f 487.

11 "Dépenses de Canada, 1732"; "Dépenses de Canada, 1733", P.A.C.,
F 1, vols. 30, f 258, and 31, f 56. Also "Bordereau...1732"; "Bordereau
...1737" and "Bordereau...1744", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 471-472;
114-1, f 22, 53 and 115-1, f 70.


13 "Dépenses de Canada, 1731", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 30, f 84.


15 Roy, CS., p. 181.

16 "Bordereau...1736"; "Bordereau...1737"; "Bordereau...1739";
"Bordereau...1740"; "Bordereau...1741 and "Bordereau...1744", P.A.C.,
C 11 A, vols. 114-1, f 21, 32; 52; 100; 265; 114-2, f 340 and 115-1, f 69.
at Mecatina, but merely to keep a ¼ interest for himself. He was married to a Beaujeu, the daughter of a military administrator who was also involved in the fur trade. His marriage was to a family also related to the Cugnet's.

The engineer of New France had both military and civil functions. Gaspard-Joseph Chaussegros de Lery was the colony's engineer from 1716 until his death in 1756. He was married to a member of a prominent family of New France: Marie-Renée Le Gardeur de Beauvais. One of the assistant engineers was his son. His basic salary, like that of many others, was increased by many little stipends. To his wages of 2,000 livres a year, must be added the 300 a year rent paid to M. Maillou, an architect of Quebec, who supplied the official with a dwelling.

17 "Varin au Ministre, Québec, 6 novembre 1746", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 115-2, f 309.
19 See below, Chapter VIII, and Chapter XI, THE BOURGEOISIE AND MARRIAGE.
22 "Dépenses de Canada, 1729", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 44. Also, "Bordereau...1736"; "Bordereau...1739" and "Bordereau...1741", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 113-2, f 476; 114-1, f 119 and 114-2, f 382.
23 "Dépenses...1732" and "Bordereau...1741", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 113-2, f 476 and 114-2, f 390.
His charges to the *courses et voyages* account were 300 *livres* a year. There is no positive proof that he may have engaged in activities that might be suspect, merely lingering suspicions. Maurepas was happy to be reassured by Hocquart that the price differences for works under de Lery's charge were merely due to lack of care or favouritism on the engineer's part. In addition to the land grant made to him in the 1730's, he owned 1/10 of the seigniory of Saint-Ours, plus 1/5.

An extremely important post in the administration was that of *garde magasin*. Store-keeper would be too loose a translation. It would be more accurate to characterize the *garde magasin* as the head of the distribution system of the King's supplies. It has already been said that in addition to looking after the supplies of the King, the *garde magasin* was permitted to have his own stock adjacent to that of the King's. The possibility of a slight mix up would always exist. Another policy, fraught with dangers, was the extension of credit by the store-keeper, the usual practice as we have seen. It is also noteworthy that in

---

24 "Dépenses de Canada, 1729", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 47. Also "Bordereau...1737" and "Bordereau...1741", P.A.C., C 11 A, vols. 114-2, f 58, and 114-2, f 393.
28 See Chapters III, IV and V.
the trials that followed the conquest of the colony, most of the offic­
29 ials in any way involved with the King's stores were charged. The im­
portance of the post and the possibility of "conflict of interests" may
be seen in the position of Guillaume Estèbe. He was a member of the Sup­
erior Council who was willing to desist, ostensibly anyway, from trading
in his own interest and assume the function of garde magasin. The
three names of most importance in the years 1729 to 1748 were Foucault,
Rocbert and de Tonnancour.

François Foucault was garde magasin à Québec. His wages were 600
livres a year. He never, as store-keeper, received a gratification.
31 In 1743 he was made écrivain principal de la marine. He was granted a
seigniory in 1733; it was reunited in 1741; regranted in 1743; and ex­
tended in 1744. He was married to a Nafrechoux, an important merchant
family in the colony. His daughters were married to Daniel-Hyacinthe
34 Liénard de Beaujeu and Guillaume Guillimin, the latter a member of the
Superior Council. He engaged in commerce and in the fishing trade, the

30 "Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 21 octobre 1740", P.A.C., C II
A, vol. 73, p. 93.
31 "Dépenses de Canada, 1729", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 44.
33 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, pp. 247-249.
35 See above, Chapter VIII.
last with Boucault, a member of the judicial administration. In 1744, widowed, he supported two children and the same number of domestics on his salary of 900 livres. In 1730, before his appointment to the Council, when his overt salary was but 600 livres a year, he drew 4,600 livres in lettres de changes on the French Treasury.

The Roberts, store-keepers in Montreal, held a family monopoly on the post. Etienne, the father, held the position till 1731. His son, Louis-Joseph, succeeded him. They also received a few other stipends. The basic wage was the same as in Quebec. The senior Roberts was given a gratuity of 250 livres. He was also a "...sindic des R.P. Recolets," for which, one presumes, he received a salary. He rented, as did his son, quarters to the government; for this he received 500 livres a year. In 1739, while both were employed by the State at 600

---

37 "Dépenses de Canada, Domaine d'Occident, 1733", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 31, f 59.
38 "Etat des Lettres de Changes...Québec, 22 octobre 1730", P.A.C. F 1, vol. 30, f 65.
41 "Dépenses de Canada, 1729", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 44.
43 See P.A.C., F 3, vol. 12, part i, f 75-76.
livres salaries, one of them, the son, had the additional position of an interpreter of the Abenaki and English languages. The remuneration was 300 livres a year. By marriage the Rocberts were related to the commissary of Montreal, Michel, and to the governor of Three Rivers, Bégon. The son was granted a seigniory, but never developed it.

At Three Rivers, the man who held the post of garde magasin was de Tonnancour. He was paid the relatively modest wage of 150 livres a year. The de Tonnancour who was the store-keeper at Three Rivers was the same man encountered as a provider of the State, Louis-Joseph Godefroy. He was the sub-delegate of the intendant in Three Rivers, as well as the procureur du Roy. The salary of the latter position was 250 livres annually. The son, Louis-Joseph, had succeeded his father.

---

45 "Dépenses de Canada, 1739", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 121-123.
48 "Dépenses de Canada, 1729", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 41.
49 Le Jeune, vol. 2, p. 721, and Chapter V.
52 "Dépenses de Canada, 1729", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 53.
in all of these posts. The Godefroy's also owned extensive land holdings.

Among the apparently less important posts in the civil service, are encountered names of individuals who, like their superiors, engaged in a multiplicity of employments, and often sold to the government as well. Jean-Claude Louet was a notary, a greffier of the Admiralty court, and an écrivain du Roy. The latter post paid 600 livres a year. The greffier, as we have seen, was paid the nominal salary of 100 livres annually, plus fees. The revenues from his private practice must have added to his total remuneration. He also owned ½ of the fief of Deneau or Port Daniel. His son was also in the employ of the government, in the intendant's office. Michel and Jean-Baptiste Martel
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were also in the service of the State. Both were involved in the seignorial system. Both were to be implicated with Bigot after the conquest. The name of another individual who both sold to, and worked for the government, is Pommereau. He sold goods under his own name, and under that of his daughter. Jean-Baptiste Pommereau was married to Françoise Boucher, of the Boucher de Boucherville's. Jacques Barbel rented quarters to the government in Quebec City. He was a notary; held a position on the Admiralty Court; and purchased the arrière fief of d'Argentenay.

The members of the civil administration, those concerned with the

61 "Dépenses de Canada, 1739", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 113-2, f 121-123.
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69 Shortt, CURRENCY, vol. 1, p. 453n.
70 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 1, p. 97.
day to day affairs of the colony, inter-mingled a wide variety of func-
tions and interests, commercial, political, administrative and seignior-
ial. Their basic salaries, while not high, were well above average, 
multiple employment included. They appear, through their positions, to 
have had access to the ear and purse of the mighty. Before considering 
the Domaine d'Occident, there are two other posts, a little apart from 
usual administrative ones, to be considered. These are the capitaine du 
port and the grand voyer.

The first was held by Testu de la Richardière. He was appointed 
at the beginning of Hocquart's régime. The minister, Maurepas, did not 
approve of the port captain's idea of charging merchant ships 3 livres 
per foot of water displacement as a fixed fee, but he had no objections 
to de la Richardière making some kind of a private arrangement. In ad-
dition to any private fees that he might exact, the port captain was paid 
a salary of 500 livres in 1729. Ten years later it was 1,000 livres 
per year. He also, occasionally, received a gratuity; in 1731 it was 
1,000 livres per year. His travel allowance in 1733 was the same a-

---

71 "Ministre à Beaubançois et Hocquart, Versailles, 22 mars 1729", 
P.A.C., B, vol. 53-2, f 466.
72 "Dépenses de Canada, 1729", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 28, f 44.
74 "Ministre à Beaubançois et Hocquart, Versailles, 10 avril 1731", 
The post of grand voyer, in the period under study, was held by Jean-Eustache Lanoullier de Boisclerc, the brother of the more famous Nicolas. "The administration of roads," Glazebrook has written, "bridges and ferries..." was the function of the grand voyer. The basic wage of this official was 600 livres a year. These were drawn on the budget of the Domaine d'Occident. Similar to other officials, he was granted a travelling allowance. Hocquart tried, unsuccessfully, to grant him a seigniory, but failed as the Jesuits had a prior claim.

The administration of the Domaine d'Occident is an example of a sinecure, and of favouritism, specially for two men: Cugnet and Lanoullier. The Domaine was the administrative unit of some of the King's revenues in New France. It was, until 1733, administered by other

75 "Dépenses de Canada, 1733", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 31, f 56.
76 J.-E. Roy, "La charge de grand voyer", pp. 139-140.
78 "Canada, Remplacement, 1730", P.A.C., D 2 D, carton 1.
80 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 4, p. 283.
82 Lunn, ECONOMIC, p. 426. See also Cameron Nish, "Documents relatifs à l'histoire économique du régime français: 1: Les budgets de la Nouvelle-France", pp. 633-634.
than State officials. The revenues of the *Domaine* paid for the judicial administration of the colony; gifts to the Church; and hospitals, as well as providing some rather healthy salaries for the impoverished administrators. In 1747, for example, out of a total administrative cost of 16,951 livres, seven people received 9,450. One-half of this was paid to two men: Cugnet and Lanoullier.

Bigot, in an elaborate report on the *Domaine*, written in 1749, analysed the unit. The peripatetic Cugnet originally came to New France as "...Directeur du Domaine..." in 1719, "aux appointement par chaque année de 3000..." livres. In 1747 he held the same post at the same amount of salary. Lanoullier, Bigot wrote, "...avoit établi (sic) en 1733 Controlleur du Domaine aux appointement de 1800...Il n'en a jamais fait d'autre fonctions que celles de signer les registres de controlle qu'il a fait écrire par un commis de Bureau..." Cugnet and Lanoullier were both seigniors, involved in commerce and members of the Superior Council. Both had also found themselves under the obligation to borrow from the

---
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respective treasuries placed under their care, as we have seen. From the funds of the Domaine, in addition to his small salary of 3,000 livres, Cugnet was paid, in 1733, 400 livres as a gratification ordinaire, and 500 livres as first councillor. His salaries as an administrator were at least eight times the average wage of an artisan, and this does not include any other sources of revenue.

Nicolas Lanoullier also received what can only be called an extraordinary salary. His supplementary grants, given because he had manipulated, badly, the funds entrusted to him, were a special privilege. Hocquart pleaded with Maurepas that Lanoullier be given a lease on the ferme de Tadoussac; that he be granted the privilege of shipping goods on the King's ships, for free; and that his salary as controller be raised. Lanoullier did not receive the privilege of the Tadoussac trade; Cugnet did, and at the rate of 4,500 livres annual rent. Three years later, in 1740, Jacques de LaFontaine, another councillor and merchant, offered the Crown 10,000 livres annual rental for the post. It

---

91 "Soumission de Jacques de la Fontaine et Compagnies, Québec, 18 octobre 1740", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 74, p. 68.
was refused, and Cugnet's lease was continued until after Hocquart had left the colony, in 1748.

Lanoullier, however, was not forgotten. Beauharnois gave him 3,000 livres in 1744 drawn from the returns of the sales of the congées. The governor had been doing this for three years. He requested the minister to continue the grant. The ex-treasury representative, in spite of his supposedly precarious financial position, managed to build himself a home in Upper Town in Quebec City in the same year that he defaulted. The house was sold in 1752 for 14,500 livres, a very considerable sum at that time.

The holders of office in the judicial administration of New France, like all the other administrators, were members of a small group. They dominated all of the upper echelon posts; were members of a complex marital, commercial and landowning group. The supreme judicial body in the colony was the Superior Council. It received the powers of administering justice in 1663, the same year that it was created. The arrival of Talon, and the rise of Crown control, somewhat vitiated these powers.

95 See Nish, REGIME, pp. 50-53.
The Superior Council, and the attorney-general, were, however, but one part of the judicial system. First, under Talon and then with his successors, a more complex system was established, and by the end of the seventeenth century, was fully elaborated, with minor changes. Gareau, in an article on the judicial system of the District of Quebec, claims that the salaries of the officers of justice were set in 1677, and never changed. According to him, the lieutenant-général received 500 livres; the procureur du Roy, 300, and the greffier the same amount. He errs. In 1729, the salaries were 700 livres for the former, and the greffier received 100.

In the years 1729 to 1748 the structures of the judicial system of New France included a district of Quebec, Three Rivers and Montreal. In addition, in 1717, an Admiralty Court was established. One post, a little apart from the others, and a sinecure, was that of the prévôt de la maréchaussé held by the Saint-Simon family, and which paid 500 livres per year. Paul Denis de Saint-Simon was originally appointed to the office, specially created for him, in 1678. In 1714, he was suc-
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96 Gareau, pp. 53-55.
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ceed by his son.

The composition of the judicial system, in 1743, and the wages for the posts are set out below.

**Table 20**

**Wages in the Judicial Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Quebec</th>
<th>Three Rivers</th>
<th>Montreal</th>
<th>Wage (Livres, p.a.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-général</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant particulier</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procureur du Roy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greffier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-général</td>
<td>X (103)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procureur du Roy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two men held the post of *lieutenant-général* in Quebec in the years under study: Pierre-André de Leigne and François Daine. The former came to New France as the intendant Champigny's secretary, and, in addition to his judicial occupations, was involved in the fishing industry. He was related by marriage to Nicolas Lanoullier, of the...

---
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Superior Council, and René-Ovide Hertel de Rouville, a post commandant. He lived with the latter in 1744, and according to the census, was eighty-two years old. His basic salary, "...a peine suffisant pour assurer sa subsistance", was 700 livres a year. He had an almost annual gratuity of 300 livres. In 1737 it was 800, and in 1732, he was given 200 livres for work on the census. Daine, who held the post after de Leigne, married into the seigniorial bourgeoisie, had been a controller of the Company of the Indies, and was himself a speculator in lands. He was, as we have seen, the greffier of the Superior Council and of the Admiralty Court. He was related, by marriage, to the Péan's.
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Jean-Baptiste Couillard de Lеспinay and Nicolas-Gaspard Boucault, merchants and seigniors, were the lieutenants-particuliers in the judicial district of Quebec in the period 1729 to 1748. The former, as well as being a seignior and officer of the judiciary of Quebec, held a post on the Admiralty Court. Boucault was to hold the same offices. The latter was also deeply involved in commerce and the fishing trade.

Others in the judicial administration of the colony were "... Jean-François Mailhiot, négociant...", de Tonnancour, the garde magasin at Three Rivers, the younger Guillimin, Guillaume, Perthuis and Henri Hiché. The last was a store-keeper at Quebec and would later be named to the Superior Council. He was related to Perthuis, négociant, who had married Louise, Henri Hiché's daughter. In fact, they were neighbours. Hiché speculated in lands and was an important furnisher

118 Gareau, pp. 93-96.
119 Gareau, p. 98.
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124 "Recensement de Québec en 1744", p. 52.
of goods to the State. He was, as well, a notary. Pierre Raimbault, 
"...marchand, notaire, conseiller, procureur, sub-délégué de l'intendant, 
lieutenant civil et criminel, seigneur..." was also a member of the 
judiciary, in Montreal.

The consideration of the civil administration of the colony clearly reveals the admixture of functions and interests of the members of this service. By function, by marriage, through commerce and by privileges, these men were bound together. They did not belong to an impoverished group, as has sometimes been claimed. They also, and this has not been sufficiently emphasized, by their day to day activities in the various branches of government, legislative, administrative and judicial, directed the colony. They carried out, theoretically at least, the directives of their superiors, the governor and the intendant, mainly the latter. In cases of dispute, they, and their nominator and ally, the intendant, judged the differences in the first instance. If the matter went to the Superior Council, they were often enough members themselves, or were related to members.

---
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CHAPTER X

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE ADMINISTRATION: 3:

THE MILITARY ADMINISTRATION

The men holding the higher positions in the military administration, similar to those of the Superior Council and the civil administration, belonged to a close and compact group. The composition of this governing unit, apart from the governor-general, was a local governor, gouverneur particulier; a King's lieutenant, lieutenant de Roy, and a major. The district of Quebec, the residence of the governor-general, did not have a local governor. The governors-general in the years 1729 to 1749 were Beauharnois, 1726-1747 and La Galissiennière, 1748-1749. It was not until 1755 that a Canadian, Vaudreuil, was appointed to the post. However, in all cases the local military administrators were Canadiens.

In Quebec, therefore, there are but two posts to consider: the King's lieutenant and the major. The functions of the first were to replace the governor-general in the latter's absence, and to assist in the supervision of the troops and the fortifications. The major has been equated by Roy to the post of "town major" in the British Army. He was in charge of discipline, and saw to the application of army regulations.

2 Roy, OFFICIERS, p. 6.
3 Roy, OFFICIERS, p. 7.
The time devoted to military administration, other than war time, does not appear to have imposed too great a burden on the office holders. The King's lieutenant in Quebec, in 1734, devoted but four or five months to his duties. His salary, then, was gained for relatively little work. The level of his remunerations was on a par with those paid in France to officials in areas with similar populations and responsibilities.

The lieutenants de Roy of Quebec in the years under study were Jean-Baptiste de Saint-Ours Deschaillons, François-Pierre de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, and Paul Joseph Le Moyne, chevalier de Longueuil. Deschaillons and Longueuil, prior to their appointments as King's lieutenants, had served as majors. In the years 1729 to 1748, two others served in the same posts, majors, Jacques-Hughes Péan de Livaudière and Jean-Baptiste-Nicolas Roch de Ramezay.

Jean-Baptiste de Saint-Ours Deschaillons had an active and rewarding military career. He was made a chevalier de Saint Louis in 1738. Prior to assuming an administrative post, he had been a commandant at

---

4 "Beauharnois et Hocquart au Ministre, Québec, 10 octobre 1734", P.A.C., C 11 A, vol. 61, p. 137.
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Detroit and Niagara, and had been involved in the fur trade. These would return the usual salaries, and possible profits. As well, a member of the Order of Saint Louis received a pension, often a small one of 800 livres per year. Saint-Ours also derived income from real estate; he owned two houses in Montreal which returned him 800 annually. He was part owner of the seigniory of Saint-Ours; this returned 400 livres a year. His wife was Marguerite Le Gardeur de Repentigny. She also owned lands. By his marriage he was related to the Bouat's, administrators and merchants. As the major of Quebec he received 1,200 livres a year; as lieutenant de Roy, 1,800. In 1738 he received a gratification of 400 livres, and the same sum again in 1739 and again in 1743. His income, on an average, was over six times the average annual wage of an artisan in New France.
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12 "Projet de Depenses, Domaine d'Occident, 1733", P.A.C., F 1, vol. 31, f 57.
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François-Pierre de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, the son of a past governor of the colony, and brother of another administrator, later to be governor-general of the colony, briefly held the post of King's lieutenant in Quebec in 1749. In the same year he was appointed to the gubernatorial post in Three Rivers, a post which had also been held previously by his brother. He received the Cross of Saint-Louis in 1738. He was related, by marriage, to the Gorgendières' and the Taschereaus', the former a representative of the Marine Treasury in New France, and a partner in the Saint-Maurice Forges. He was also involved in the seigniorial system. His salaries in the various posts were 1,200 livres a year as a major and 1,500 as the governor of Three Rivers. His total income should also include the returns from his seigniories, sales of land, his pension from the Order of Saint Louis, and his share in his father's estate.
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19 See Chapter VII.
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22 See below, Pierre de Cavagnal.
Pierre de Cavagnal, François-Pierre’s brother, was the second Marquis de Vaudreuil. He had been governor of Three Rivers from 1733 to 1742. In the latter year, he was made governor of Louisiana. In 1726, he had been appointed major des troupes in 1729; aide-major and chevalier de Saint-Louis, at an unusually early age, in 1730. He was married, as was his brother, to a member of the Gorgendièrè family. As governor of Three Rivers, the post he occupied in the period under consideration, his basic salary was 1,500 livres a year. In the same year, 1733, he received a gratification extraordinaire of 875 livres. In 1738, the allocation was 1,000 and the same in the following years to 1741. Basically his wages were 2,500 livres a year, well above the average. His other little prebends must have raised this, that is, his pension as a holder of the Cross, his revenues from his lands and his share of his father’s estate. One part of the latter would be the annual rent of 1,500 livres received for the rental of the Vaudreuil home in Montreal to
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Paul-Joseph Le Moyne, _chevalier de Longueuil_, the King's lieutenant of Quebec in 1749, need concern us little in this work, for his rise in the administration was after the years covered by the present study. Suffice it to say that he held the post of town major of Quebec in 1748, and had, like many of his fellow officials, been granted the Cross of Saint Louis; had commanded posts in the hinterland; and was a seignior. He was the son of the first Baron of Longueuil, a governor of Montreal, and a brother of the second, who held the same post.

Jacques-Hughe Péan de Livaudière, major of Quebec in 1733, was the father of the more famous, or infamous, Michel-Jean-Hughes Péan. The father sold to the State, as would his son. Both were involved in the seigniorial system. Jacques-Hughe, as had many others, commanded a
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fur trading post. His successor in the post was Jean-Baptiste-Nicolas
Roch de Ramezay. He also received the Cross of Saint Louis. He had been a post commandant. He was the son of a past governor of Montreal; was married to a Tonnancour, members, as we have seen, of the administration, seigneurs and merchants. As well, he held lands.

Of the four governors of Three Rivers, de Beaucours, Cavagnal de Vaudreuil, Bégon and Rigaud de Vaudreuil, we will consider the first and third. Jean-Marie Josué Boisberthelot de Beaucours was the governor of Three Rivers in 1730, and of Montreal in 1733. His salary in the latter post was, according to himself, and Adam Shortt repeats his claim, inadequate. As governor of Three Rivers he received a salary of 1,500 livres plus a gratification of 1,000 livres annually. In Montreal, occupying the same post, he was supplied with a house rented for the very large sum of 1,500 livres a year. The house also served as a residence

37 Roy, OFFICIERS, p. 12.
38 P.A.C., D 2, vol. 59, f 3.
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of the governor-general when he was in Montreal. De Beaucours, when
governor of Montreal, received a *gratification extraordinaire* of 2,000
livres a year from the King's budget, and a salary of 3,000 a year from
the funds of the *Domaine*. His basic wage was, per year, 5,000 livres,
plus a residence. He too received the Croix de Saint Louis.

Claude-Michel Bégon, another governor of Three Rivers, received
the same emoluments as did the other governors. He was appointed to the
post in 1743. Previously he had been the King's lieutenant in the same
city. His daughter was married to Honoré Michel, the commissary at
Montreal. Bégon was married to a Robert, the family that monopolized
the post of *garde magasin* in Montreal. He had the Cross of Saint Louis
with a pension.

The King's lieutenants at Three Rivers, apart from Bégon, were
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François de Gannes de Falaise, Louis Liénard de Beaujeu, and Pierre, chevalier de Saint-Ours. All three were involved in the fur trade and the seigniorial system. Those holding the post of major at Three Rivers, apart from Rigaud de Vaudreuil, were Jacques-Antoine Renaud Dубuisson and Nicolas-Antoine Coulon de Villiers. The former had been a commandant at Detroit and Michilimackinac. He was a chevalier de Saint-Louis. His daughters were married to men deeply involved in the fur trade. His own wife was the daughter of Jacques Bizard, after whom the island about Montreal was named. The father-in-law had been a cohort of Frontenac. His seigniory, little developed, was useful mainly as a fur trading station. The Villiers' were also involved in the fur trade, and he was the son of the seignior of Verchères.

In Montreal, the military administration included three posts, the same as in Three Rivers: the governor, King's lieutenant, and major. The governors, other than de Beaucours, were Jean Bouillette de la Chasseigne and Charles Le Moyne, the second Baron of Longueuil.
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let de la Chassaigne, named governor in 1730, was the brother-in-law of the previous incumbent, the first Baron de Longueuil. His successor was Paul-Joseph Le Moyne, the second Baron. De la Chassaigne, as governor, received a gratification extraordinaire of 2,000 livres a year, and a salary of 3,000 livres annually. His successor would receive the same. The second Baron of Longueuil was appointed in 1749. No comment, other than the close succession of the post, need be made.

The three King's lieutenants in Montreal in the period under study were François de Gannes de Falaise, whom we have already encountered; the second Baron of Longueuil, and Gaspard Adhemar de Lantagnac. We will consider the latter. He had been a major in the same city. He was the nephew of the first Marquis de Vaudreuil. In addition to his military career, he was involved in the tile industry. He received the Cross of Saint Louis in 1742. He had married, in 1720, the daughter of
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Mathieu Martin de Lino, the first councillor of the Superior Council, and an important merchant in the colony.

The post of major in Montreal, as well as being held by Le Moyne and de Lantagnac, was held by Pierre-Jacques Chavoy de Noyan. He held the Cross of Saint Louis; was a seignior; and was married to Louise-Catherine d'Ailleboust de Manthet, the widow of Jean-Baptiste Charly.

All of the upper military administrative posts were held by very few men. All of the men who formed the upper echelon were relatively well paid. All were involved, directly or through marital relations, with members of the fur trade bourgeoisie. All belonged to a privileged group, close to the governors and intendant, and all were rewarded with the much sought-after Croix de Saint-Louis, with its attendant pension.

There is a further military-civil administrative post to consider: the capitaine de côte or militia captain. This personage has been the object of a fair amount of praise, most of it exaggerated. Benjamin
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70 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vols. 4, p. 245 and 5, pp. 32-33. See also Le Jeune, vol. 2, p. 364 and Chapter VI, above, re the importance of the Charly family in the fur trade. Also, below, Chapter XI, THE BOURGEOISIE AND MARRIAGE.
Suite, for example, has written of the capitaine de côte that Every one of them was an habitant - the foremost in his locality for intelligence, activity and good character. He was the true representative of the people, and at the same time he was an agent of the central power, an homme de confiance, a factum in every sense of the word. He dealt directly with the governor-general, and with the lieutenant-governor, the judges, the curé, the seigneur, and with every family. He served without pay, but the honour was great, and no capitaine de la côte would ever accept remuneration.

Without being facetious, one might add that none was ever offered.

Stanley, in his book on CANADA'S SOLDIERS, repeats essentially Suite's claims, but adds that militia rank did not carry over to the regular army, that is, the troops from France or the troupes de la Marine made up of les Canadiens. Claude de Bonnault also discerns an incipient democracy in the selection and appointment of the capitaine de côte.

The views of these three historians appear a little apart from the reality. The capitaines were very seldom mentioned in the documents of the times. This is, one would think, a slight reflection on their importance. That the post was desirable, without pay, is possible. That the seigniors would often be under the orders of their censitaires is to be doubted, for the seignior would be an officier in the troupes de la Marine and would outrank the militia officers. A further objection to

72 Stanley, p. 22.
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the thesis advanced by Sulte, Stanley and Bonnault, is to be found in the work of the latter. Every important rank above that of capitaine de côte was held by a merchant-seignior, and not by a habitan.

The Colonel des milices du Canada was Joseph Fleury de la Gorgendièr d'Eschambault, a seignior, merchant, representative of the Company of the Indies, as had been his father, and related by marriage to the Taschereau's and Vaudreuil's. The chef de bataillon ou de division was Jean-Baptiste de Saint-Ours and Deschaillons. He had been a post commandant at four different posts, was a chevalier de Saint-Louis, major de Québec and a King's lieutenant. He owned three seigniories. It would be difficult to class him as a habitan. The militia major of the government of Quebec had as a patroness Madame de Vaudreuil, and he was a seignior. The same post on the Côte du Sud was held by Jacques Couillard des Près, and by Charles Joseph Amyot, sieur de Vincelotte.

In the cities of New France the capitaine was a habitan, but only in the sense of being a resident of a city. Pierre Trotier Desauniers, merchant, syndic and seignior was one. Etienne Charest, merchant, seig-

---
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nior, and married to Catherine Trotier Desauniers was another. In Montreal the colonels were Jean-Baptiste Neveu de la Bretonnière, and Maurice Blondeau, merchants, seigniors, fur traders, but not habitants in any rustic sense of the word. The captains of the city militia were their kith and kin, Pierre de Lestage and Thomas Ignace Trotier Duffy Desauniers.

The military administration of the colony, and the civil and judicial administration, were dominated by a few families. They belonged not to a military aristocracy, but to a military-seignorial-merchant-administrative elite. The administrative group derived its powers from the army, post commands, commerce, land system, marriage and access to the corridors of power. They were, when compared to the average habitant, a plutocracy.

---
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CHAPTER XI

THE BOURGEOISIE AND MARRIAGE

Marriage in New France, and in the British-American colonies, as we shall see, served several purposes quite apart from those associated with emotional or species perpetuation needs. The intendant Hocquart quite clearly recognized one of these purposes when he gave Varin permission to marry the daughter of Beaujeu: "...cet établissement fait l'honneur au Sr. Varin et l'attacherà particulièrement au service du Roi en cette Colonie..." Marriage also served the interests of the merchants and of the so-called aristocratic class, although these purposes were not so clearly stated. Social position could be attained by marriage, as could an entrée into wealth: money married position and position married money. In some cases, that of Henri Hiché for example, position married land. Perhaps in a small colony such as New France a high degree of intermarriage was to be expected? But perhaps size was not the only factor. This appears correct for when we examine the more populous British-American colonies to the South, we see the same marital characteristics.

Frederick B. Tolles, in his work on the Pennsylvania merchants, notes that the dominant political, economic and social groups intermar-

---

ried. East, in his monograph on the merchants of the British-American colonies, wrote that "Through marriages and other family relationships, commercial, landed and officeholding interests became widely intermingled." The marital state of the society of the Colony of New York, according to Virginia Harrington, "...formed a single, privileged ruling class as against the rank and file of small freeholders, tenant-farmers, shopkeepers, artisans and laborers. Generations of inter-marriage had welded...a large, interrelated clan whose interests could not be far separated." L.W. Labaree, in the extensive quotation below, gathers together all the strands:

Some of the leaders could point with pride to an aristocratic background or connections in England as an explanation of their position in America; others owed their rise to thrift, hard work, and foresight, or to sheer native ability; still others had taken advantage of opportunities to acquire land or other forms of wealth by methods that do not always bear too close inspection. Whatever the origin of such men's position, however they came to the top, they tried to stay there themselves and to pass on to their children the standing in the colonial society which they had acquired.

Very soon there came into being groups of leading families, made up of men of wealth and position, their children, and their children's children. It was inevitable that such families should intermarry, and so they did, not just occasionally, but repeatedly, until in some cases, notably in Virginia and New York, their genealogical trees became veritable jungles of interwoven branches...the chief merchants...and the leading lawyers and other professional men usually became affiliated with the dominant group.

---
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Let us examine New France.

Louis Liénard de Beaujeu, (1683-1750), was a soldier, fort commandant, administrator and seignior as was his son Louis Liénard de Beaujeu, sieur de Villemonble, (1716-1802). The sieur de Villemonble married Louise-Charlotte Cugnet, daughter of François-Etienne Cugnet. Charlotte Liénard de Beaujeu, the daughter of Louis senior, and sister of Villemonble, married Jean-Victor de la Marre, the representative of the intendant in Montreal. Daniel-Hyacinthe-Marie de Beaujeu, (1711-1755), was married to Michelle-Elisabeth Foucault, the daughter of the garde magasin at Quebec, who was also a seignior, merchant and member of the Superior Council. This de Beaujeu is sometimes called Daniel Liénard de Beaujeu fils. One of his daughters married into the Saint-Ange Charly family and Daniel was the father-in-law of François-Xavier Charly. The Charly's were important fur traders.

---
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This one family, the Beaujeu's, were active in the fur trade, the administration and the seigniorial system. They were related by marriage to families concerned with all aspects of the political and commercial life of the colony.

Maurice Blondeau, primarily preoccupied with the hinterland and the seigniorial system, was related to several families concerned with the army and the trade posts of the interior, as well as the land system of New France. His daughter Suzanne married Joseph Hertel de Pierreville. Another child, Apolline, was wed to Louis-René Godefroy de Linctot, while a third, Marie-Madeleine, had as a spouse Pierre-Joseph de Céleron de Blainville. All three husbands were post commanders, and the latter was notorious for his interference with the trade rights of others.

The "jungle" of which Labaree has spoken is nowhere better illustrated than with reference to the Boucher family. A mémoire attributed to Gilles Hocquart made the point quite well when he referred to the Boucher's as:

This family is established at Boucherville near Montreal.

14 Bonnault, p. 425, and Le Jeune, vol. 1, p. 333. See also section on Godefroy family, below.
15 See Chapter VI, THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE HINTERLAND.
the eldest who is nearly 90 years old, has more than 150
children, grand-children, brothers, nephews, great-nephews.

A few examples only are given, those relevant to the period 1729
to 1748. Joseph Boucher de la Broquerie was married to Marie-Clémence
Gamelin-Maugras. The Gamelins were a very important commercial clan
and also held large tracts of land. One of the family, Ignace Gamelin,
was a Montreal merchant, and a partner of Cugnet in the Saint-Maurice
Forges. As well, the Gamelins were LaVérendrye's partners, that is,
suppliers of capital, for his hinterland explorations-exploitations.

Jeanne Boucher married Charles de Sabrevois, (1699-1774). The latter
was the brother of the better known Clement de Sabrevois, sieur de
Bleury, (1702-1781), a merchant, lumber dealer, seignior and transport
monopolist. LaVérendrye was also related to the Bouchers. His mother
was the daughter of Pierre Boucher, the elder statesman, and ex-governor
of Three Rivers. His father, René Gaultier de Varennes, had also been
a governor of the same city. Pierre Boucher de Boucherville had as
a wife Anne Marguerite, daughter of Pierre Raimbault, a merchant, seig-

---
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nior, and judicial administrator in Montreal. A son of Pierre Boucher, the long-lived patriarch of the family, Jean Boucher, sieur de Montbrun, married into the Charest family. Charlotte-Ursule, daughter of Pierre Boucher de Niverville, joined Jean-Baptiste Neveu in heavenly, and perhaps commercial nuptials. The Neveus were merchants, fur traders, and seigniors.

The Bouchers were indeed a "jungle" of relationships. It is safe to say that they were a family immersed in the administration, seigniorial system and the trade of the hinterland. Through marriage they were involved with every important family in the colony. They were not restricted to Boucherville, but had tenacles, both personal and marital, which stretched throughout the colony.

On October 20, 1742, there was a double wedding in New France. Etienne Charest, a member of the merchant and fur trading bourgeoisie, and the second of that name, married Marie-Thérèse Trotier Desauniers. His brother, Joseph Charest, married Marguerite Trotier Desauniers.

---


In every document, apart from the marriage contract, Marie-Thérèse is called Catherine Charest and not Marie-Thérèse.
The Charests were also related to the Bouchers by the marriage of Françoise-Claire Charest to Jean Boucher, sieur de Montbrun. The Charests were cousins to the Desauniers as well as being in-laws.

The Charly family, previously noted as being involved in the fur trade, was related to the Charests and Trotiers, as well as to the d'Aillebousts and the de Tonnancour. Jean-Baptiste Charly was married to Louise-Catherine d'Ailleboust de Manthet. Louis-Charles de Saint-Ange Charly wed Anne Ursule, the daughter of René Godefroy, sieur de Tonnancour. The latter family was involved in the administration, in commerce and in the seigniorial system, specially in the Three Rivers area. Jacques Charly, the last to be mentioned, joined himself to Thérèse Charest in matrimony.

François-Etienne Cugnet, a man who tends to dominate the period under study, was married to Louise-Madeleine Dusautoy. Cugnet, as we have seen, was the chief functionary of the Domaine d'Occident. His brother-in-law was another. His daughter, as noted, was married to a

---
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François-Etienne's son, François-Joseph, (1720-1789), wed, in 1747, Marie-Joseph, the daughter of Jacques Belcour de Lafontaine. The latter, a merchant, seignior, member of the Superior Council, and engaged in the fishing industry, also had business interests with merchants and administrators in Louisbourg. This one man, Cugnet, better than anyone else illustrates the tremendous mixture of occupations and functions in the colony. He was an administrator with multiple employments; a member of the Superior Council; the most important partner in the Saint-Maurice Forges; he furnished goods to the State; was a seignior and property owner; and he was a protegé of the intendant, Hocquart. Through marriage he was related to other administrators, merchants and post commandants.

Mention has been made, particularly in the chapter on THE BOURgeoisie and the Hinterland, of the Douville family. Three brothers shared in the fur trade, as either administrators of the posts, or as merchants supplying the posts. They were Philippe Dagneau Douville, sieur de la Chaussé; César Dagneau, sieur de Quindre; and Alexandre Dagneau. Their close family relationship was extended through marriage to encompass other families involved in commerce, the administration and the seigniorial system.

---

31 See above and Chapter IX on civil administration.
Philippe Dagneau Douville was married to Marianne Jarret de Verchères; César Dagneau to Marie-Anne Picoté de Belestre and Alexandre Dagneau to Marie Coulon de Villiers. Alexandre was thus the son-in-law of a post commandant, Nicolas Antoine Coulon de Villiers. He was also the brother-in-law of another commander, François Duplessis Fabert. A sister, Marie-Claire Dagneau, married into a family concerned with both the seigniorial system and the hinterland, the Saint-Ours: her husband was Pierre de Saint-Ours.

The d'Ailleboust family, as were the Dagneaus, was involved primarily in the trade of the hinterland. They were, however, notable land owners as well. Marie-Catherine, the daughter of Jean-Baptiste d'Ailleboust des Musseaux, (1666-1730), married René Godefroy, sieur de Linctot. A son, Nicolas-Marie, was wed to a member of the Trotier family: Marie-Louise Trotier Desrivières. Louise Charlotte d'Ailleboust Dargenteuil was wed to Pierre Margane, sieur des Pôrets et de Lavaltrie.

---
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(1678-1756), Lavaltrie's sister, Madeleine Louise, in turn, had married
Paul d'Ailleboust de Perigny. The Manthet branch of the d'Aillebousts
was related to the Noyans: Catherine d'Ailleboust de Manthet married
Pierre Jacques Chavoy de Noyan. This was Catherine's second marriage;
hers first had been to Jean-Baptiste Charly. Marie Madeleine d'Aille-
boust de Manthet is described in the listing of the congés as the wife
of Jean-Baptiste Jarret, sieur de Verchères. The results of this un-
ion were to establish a relationship not merely between the d'Aillebousts
and Verchères, but with the Douvilles and Villiers for the Verchères had
also married into these families.

The Damours family, more noteworthy in the earlier history of
New France, still occupied a position in the commerce of the colony in
the period 1729 to 1748, although not as important a one as they had had
previously. Land and the fur trade were their important interests. Ma-
thieu Damours de Clignancourt was wed to Madeleine Guyon Després. The
latter's family were important merchants supplying a large part of the
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meat to the government in the district of Montreal. Madeleine Damours de Plaine married into another notable merchant family: the Bondy. She was united in matrimony to Jacques Douaire Bondy.

The complex of family relations may also be seen in the web of the Denys family. They were involved in the seigniorial system, the hinterland, sales to the State, and were the recipients of subsidies from the government. Louis Denys de la Ronde, (1675-1741), married Louise Chartier de Lotbinière. Charlotte Denys de la Ronde was the mother of Jean-Baptiste-Nicolas Roch de Ramezay. It follows that the father was the elder Ramezay who had been governor of Montreal. The son, in turn, was a post commandant, an administrator and a seignior. Eustache Chartier de Lotbinière, (1688-1749), a seignior, lumber dealer, administrator, Dean of the Chapter of Quebec and a member of the Superior Council, married the daughter of the engineer of New France, Louise Chaussegros de Lery. Angelique Chartier de Lotbinière wed the son of Mathurin-François Martin de Lino. The senior de Lino was a merchant, seignior, member and first councillor of the Superior Council. Begin-

46 See Chapter V.
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ning with a marriage of the Denys family, we see the extension through marital links to Denys-de Lotbinière-Ramezay-de Lery and de Lino.

François Foucault, merchant, administrator, and seignior, married into the Nafrechoux family, an important commercial clan. Michelle-Elisabeth, François' daughter, married a Beaujeu in 1737. Another daughter, Marie-Claude Geneviève, was wed to Guillaume Guillimín. The Guillimins, father and son, were involved in commerce, the seigniorial system and the administration. Both the Guillimins and Foucault were members of the Superior Council.

The Gamelins, merchants and seigniors, were related to the fur trade and seigniorial bourgeoisie. Ignace Gamelin, the partner of Cugnet in the Saint-Maurice Forges, took as a wife Marie-Louise Dufros de la Jammeray. The latter was the heir of René Gaultier de Varennes. Marie-Clémence Gamelin-Maugras, as we have seen, was part of the Boucher family by her marriage to Joseph Boucher de la Broquerie. The Gamelin-Maugras' were also related to LaVérendrye.

53 See Chapter VIII.
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Foucault, as has been said, was married to a Nafrechoux. So was François de Gannes de Falaise, (1677-1746). He was a member of the fur trade bourgeoisie and the administration. His wife was Marguerite Nafrechoux, "...fille de sieur Isaac Nafrechoux, marchand bourgeois..." Their marriage contract reveals the benefits that might accrue from a marriage to both families. The intended husband belonged to the social elite. The wife brought to the marriage, as part of her dowry, two houses valued at 8,000 and 18,000 livres respectively, plus cash to the value of 4,000 livres. Falaise's property was worth 8,500 livres. One-third of the property was to be common and two-thirds was endowed onto the wife. It is not, however, merely the marriage contract which is interesting, but the marital links that are revealed. Families such as the Nafrechoux, Foucaults, Beaujeus and Guillims, families involved in every important economic and political activity in the colony formed personal unions.

Joseph-Fleury de la Gorgendièrie, (1676-1755), was one of the most important merchants in the colony, as well as a seignior. He was also the representative of the Company of the Indies. He married the daughter of Louis Jolliet, Claire. His sister, married first to Le Verrier, married a second time. Her husband was the second marquis de Vaudreuil.

---

57 "Contrat de Mariage de François de Gannes de Falaise, Capitaine d'une compagnie des troupes du détachement de la marine et de Marguerite Nafrechoux, Montréal, 29 novembre 1713", P.A.C., GREFFES.
Two daughters of Joseph-Fleury also made noteworthy marriages: Marie-Claire to Thomas-Jacques Taschereau, the representative of the Marine Treasury in New France, and partner in the Saint-Maurice Forges, as well as a seignior. The other daughter, Louise-Thérèse, married Rigaud de Vaudreuil, governor of Three Rivers, brother of a future governor general of the colony, and a seignior. Another member of the la Gorgendiére family, Marie-Thomas, a niece of the Marquis de Vaudreuil, married Thomas-Ignace Trotier Duffy Desauniers. Thomas-Ignace's father, Pierre Trotier Desauniers, was related to the Charests by his marriage to Catherine. Gorgendiére's grand-daughter, Charlotte, wed Joseph Lamarque de Marin, a man, who with his son, commanded posts in the hinterland. It is this complex of marital, commercial and political relations that makes very questionable some of the comments of Guy Frégault on the lack of dowry available to the Marquis de Vaudreuil when he married Gorgendiére's sister. It is true, as Frégault wrote, that little money was brought to the marriage, but assets may take different forms.

The Guillimin family, Charles, (1676-1739), and his son Guillaume, (1713-1771), were important merchants, administrators, and involved in

---
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the seigniorial system. The son, as noted previously married a daughter of François Foucault. His sister made a marriage into what is sometimes erroneously called the military aristocracy, but which, in the present work is termed a bourgeois class. Her husband: Jacques Le Gardeur de Saint-Pierre. Marie-Joseph Guillimin-Le Gardeur made a second marriage. Her spouse was Louis-Luc LaCorne. Charles' other daughter, Geneviève-Elisabeth was wed to another member of the fur trade bourgeoisie, Charles Regnard Duplessis de Morampont.

François Hazeur, (1638-1708), a merchant, councillor, and seignior, had children who occupied posts in the administration of the church and of the civil society. Michel Sarrazin was his son-in-law. Jean-François Hazeur, (1678-1723), his son, was a councillor. Marie-Ursule, his sister, was wed to Sarrazin. His brothers were clergymen. Pierre Hazeur, the sieur de l'Orme, was the representative of the Chapter of Quebec at the French Court. Joseph Thierry, the other brother, held important posts in the Chapter at Quebec. Sarrazin extended these relations to the fur trade group. His daughter, Charlotte-Louise, in 1746, married Jean-Hypolite Gaultier de Varennes. The Varennes were

related to the Bouchers.

The Hervieux', another family notable for its concern with the trade of the hinterland, were related to the seigniorial, and administrative bourgeoisie as well. Marie-Anne Hervieux was married to Jean-Baptiste Hertel de Rouville. Marie-Michelle Hervieux was wed to François Josué Dubreuil La Corne, (1710-1753). Luc La Corne's first marriage had been to Marie-Anne. His second, as we have seen, was to Marie-Joseph Guillimin.

Henry Hiché, a notary, administrator and seignior married several times. One of his marriages was to Marguerite Le Gardeur; it appears to have been quite a profitable union. Hiché received, as part of the dowry, the seigniory of Kamouraska. In 1723, these lands had been sold for 15,000 livres. Hiché's daughter, Marie-Madeleine, married Jean-Baptiste Ignace Perthuis, a merchant, seignior, and administrator. His father, Charles, had also been an important personage in the colony.

---
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The perpetually insolvent Nicolas Lanoullier, had, in a first marriage, wed Jeanne-Catherine de Leigne, daughter of a member of the judicial administration. Lanoullier was also related, by extended marital links, to the Rouville family, important commandants and seigniors.

René Godefroy, sieur de Linctot, (1675-1748), married twice. His first nuptials were to a daughter of Jean Le Moyne, and his second was to Marie-Catherine, daughter of Jean-Baptiste d'Ailleboust des Musseaux. His sons also married well, and reveal economic-marital links. There is a "...reçu de Louis Linctot à Sr Blondeau de 4000 livres a compte sur 10,000 prêtées en son contrat de mariage en date du 15 septembre dernier." Louis René Godefroy, sieur de Linctot, (1709-1745), had married Appoline Blondeau of the Montreal-based, fur trading Blondeaus.

An inquiry into the marriage of Paul-Louis Lusignan, a post commandant, further illustrates marriage as a means to power, position and wealth. He married Madeleine Bouat. He was the brother-in-law of

77 Gareau, pp. 74-78; Roy, MARRIAGE, vol. 1, Barbel, p. 32, and Le Jeune, vol. 2, p. 66. The latter errs in his identification of Lanoullier's marriages. He only lists the second and not the first.
78 Gareau, pp. 74-78.
Jean Poulin de Courval, a merchant. Lusignan's father-in-law was François-Marie Bouat, a merchant, administrator and seignior. He owned Terrebonne, later to be sold to l'abbé Lepage. Bouat's second wife was Agathe Le Gardeur de Repentigny. Louise-Jeanne, another daughter of Bouat, married François Daine, administrator, merchant and seignior. Madeleine-Thérèse first wed Jean Poulin de Courval and then Jean-Baptiste de Gannes de Falaise. A son of this marriage, François-Marie, married Marie Jeanne Gaultier de Varennes. Beginning with the Lusignan marriage, we see the line extending itself to Lusignan-Bouat-Daine-Courval- de Gannes-Varennes: land, fur trade, administration and commerce.

Pierre-Thomas Tarieu Lanaudière, sometimes known as Lapérade, (1677-1757), was mainly concerned with the army and the hinterland. He married Marie-Madeleine de Verchères. His daughter, Marguerite-Marie-Anne, wed Richard Testu de la Richardière, the port captain of Quebec, and an important transport-trade figure. Marguerite made a second marriage: her husband was Antoine Coulon, sieur de Villiers. Jean-Baptiste Neveu, sieur de la Bretonnière, was a notable merchant of the colony. His main interests were sales to the government, and the fur

84 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 1, pp. 260, 266.
trade. His daughter, Marie, wed Hector Rouer de Villeray, a member of the Superior Council and a seignior. Jean-François Neveu, the son of Jean-Baptiste, married Charlotte-Ursule Boucher in 1737.

Pierre Jacques Chavoy de Noyan, previously noted as having wed Catherine d'Ailleboust de Manthet, had marital ties of some interest. His wife's previous union had been with Jean-Baptiste Charly. Noyan was also related to the Le Moynes, the first Baron being his uncle. Without delving too deeply into the marital relations of the Le Moynes, let us merely note a few of the links. René Godefroy, sieur de Linctot, as mentioned, married a daughter of Jean Le Moyne. Jean Bouillet de la Chassaigne, a governor of Three Rivers and Montreal, was the Baron of Longueuil's brother-in-law, by his marriage to Marie-Anne Le Moyne. Paul Joseph Le Moyne, the chevalier de Longueuil, previously encountered

87 "Contrat de mariage du Sr. Jean François Neveu Et Demoiselle Charlotte Boucher, Le 5 juin 1737", P.A.C., PRE-CONQUEST PAPERS: H: BOUCHER DE BOUCHERVILLE.
88 Roy, SEIGNEURIE, vol. 5, p. 245.
as a member of the fur trade aristocracy, seignior and administrator, wed Marie Geneviève de Joybert. The Joyberts were, by marriage, related to the Vaudreuil family, for, the first marquis married Louise-Elisabeth Joybert. A linear linking of the names produces Noyan-d'Ailleboust-Charly-Le Moyne-de la Chassaigne-Vaudreuil. This rather impressive list includes governors of Three Rivers, Montreal and New France, fur trade commanders, and extensive seigniorial interests, as well as merchants.

Nicolas-Marie Renaud d'Avène, sieur de Méloizes, (1696-1743), was a post commandant, administrator, seignior and recipient of subsidies from the government. He was married to Angélique Chartier de Lotbinière. Their daughter, named after her mother, was the wife of Michel Jacques Hughes Péan. Péan's father had also occupied a variety of posts, commercial and administrative, in New France. Jean-Baptiste Pommereau, a merchant and administrator, whom, as we have noted, sold to the government under his daughter's name as well as his own, was married to a Boucher. His wife, Françoise Boucher, was the daughter of

96 See Frégault, BIGOT, vol. 2, for details on her involvement with the intendant at the time of the conquest.
98 In the census of 1744, p. 23, he is called Michel Jean Hughes Péan.
Pierre Boucher de Boucherville and Charlotte Denys. Pierre Raimbault, seignior, merchant and administrator, had, as a second wife, Louise Nafrechoux. His daughter, Marguerite, wed a Boucher. Another Raimbault, Marie-Louise Catherine, married Julien Trotier Desrivières, a branch of the Trotier family.

Etienne Rocbert, and his son were, as has been previously noted, the monopolists of the post of garde magasin in Montreal. They were also, by marriage, related to the Varennes, Bégons and Honoré Michel de Villebois, sieur de la Rouvillière, "...conseiller du Roi, commissaire de la marine, ordonnateur et subdélégué à l'intendant du Canada..." married Marie Catherine-Elisabeth Bégon, the daughter of Claude Michel Bégon and Marie-Elisabeth Rocbert. Rocbert fils, was married to Marguerite Barbe de Puygibault; her mother was Marguerite de Varennes. The marital links result in alliances between the chief civil administrator of Montreal, a governor of Three Rivers who, in turn, was the brother of a past intendant of New France, a family deeply involved in the fur trade, and a family holding the most important position in terms

103 Roy, GREFFES, Guillet de Chaumont, pp. 171-172.
of distributing the King's supplies, and extending credit to the mer-
chants of the colony.

The illustrations of marriage as a means to political power, eco-
monic power and social power are many. Any one individual may be tak-
en as a point of departure, and the web traced by direct and indirect
relationships. The Sarrazins, Taché, de Tonnancours, Trotiers, and
others could serve as further examples. However, the question remains:
what does this survey of some of the marital relations reveal? Was it
ture, as Charlevoix has written, that there was a class of "...gentils-

104 hommes and officers"? Was there, as is written in a memoir attri-
uted to Gilles Hocquart, the intendant, a noble class and an officer
class separate from a seigniorial class and a merchant class? It is
very doubtful. What is quite evident in the marital society of New
France is that there is a pattern, and this pattern resembles that
found in the British-American colonies. The web was based not on pop-
ulation numbers; but on interests. There existed a degree of social
mobility which was striking, but not a vertical mobility in the sense

104 "Charlevoix on the Canadians", Charlevoix, Histoire de la Nou-
velle-France, cited and translated by Nish, REGIME, pp. 131-132.

105 "Memoire to the Minister containing a characterization of the
French-Canadian population, Novembre 8, 1737", Munro, Seigniorial Doc-
uments, pp. 185-188, cited and translated by Nish, REGIME, pp. 132-134.
that a habitan, in the pejorative meaning of the word, could move up. Rather, there was a horizontal mobility which tended to wipe out any class lines between those concerned with purely economic functions, usually termed a bourgeois activity, and those belonging to a nobility or aristocracy. The important families in the colony intermarried. They encompassed among themselves all the important privileges to be derived from political and economic power. The merchants, fur traders, seigniors and administrators, due at least in part to their marital links, make a social classification based upon what has been termed the classic concept impossible. There was no First, Second or Third Estate in the usual sense of these terms.
The complexity, and perhaps the significance of marital relations may be better appreciated by the following table. A few of the families listed in the chapter have been selected, and a narrow and broad listing has been presented. The narrow listing is that which is evident from a consideration of the evidence presented, that is, father-in-law, brother-in-law, etc. In two cases, the d'Ailleboust and the Boucher families, a broad and narrow listing has been provided. The broad listing is an extension, to whatever degree of relationship that may result from marriages. It is presumed that it was possible for a political, social or economic relationships to exist merely from the fact of having a contact, even a distant one.

D'AILLEBOUST

**Narrow:** De Manthet, de la Madeleine, Perigny, des Musseaux, Linctot, Trotier, Lavaltrie, Noyan, Charly, Verchères, Douville, Villiers, Duplessis Fabert.

**Broad:** Trotier, Neveu, Boucher, Gamelin-Maugras, Sabrevois, Sabrevois de Bleury, LaVérendrye, Raimbault, Charest, de Tonnancour, Charly, Linctot, Lavaltrie, Verchères, Noyan, Dagneau Douville, Villiers, Duplessis Fabert, Blondeau, Saint-Ours, Boishebert, Blainville.
BOUCHER

Narrow: Gamelin-Maugras, Sabrevois, LaVérendrye, Raimbault, Charest, Neveu.

Broad: Gamelin-Maugras, Sabrevois, Sabrevois de Bleury, LaVérendrye, Raimbault, Charest, Neveu, Trotier, Charly, d'Ailleboust, de Tonnancour, Varennes, Pommereau, Denys.

BEAUJEU

Narrow: Cugnet, Varin, Foucault, Charly.

DAGNEAU-DOUVILLE

Narrow: Verchères, Belestre, Villiers, Duplessis Fabert, Saint-Ours.

CHARLY

Broad: Trotier, Neveu, Boucher, Gamelin-Maugras, Sabrevois, Sabrevois de Bleury, LaVérendrye, Raimbault, Charest, d'Ailleboust, de Tonnancour.

DENYS

Narrow: de Lotbinière, de Lery, de Lino, Ramezay, Boucher.

FOUCAULT

Broad: Beaujeu, Cugnet, Varin, Charly, Nafrechoux, Guillimin, de Gannes.

GORGENIERE

Narrow: Jolliet, Vaudreuil, Taschereau, Trotier, Marin.

GUILLIMIN

Narrow: Foucault, Le Gardeur, La Corne, Duplessis de Morampont.
NOYAN

Narrow: d'Ailleboust, Le Moyne, Linctot, de la Chassaigne, Joybert, Vaudreuil.

RAIMBAULT

Broad: Boucher, Sabrevois, Sabrevois de Bleury, LaVérendrye, Gamelin-Maugras, Charest, Neveu, Trotier, Charly, d'Ailleboust, de Tonnancour, Nafrechoux.

TROTIER

Broad: Charest, Neveu, Boucher, Gamelin-Maugras, Sabrevois, Sabrevois de Bleury, LaVérendrye, Raimbault, Charly, d'Ailleboust, de Tonnancour, de la Gorgendiève, Damour.
A thesis, according to the definition offered in WEBSTER'S NEW COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY, is a "...proposition which a person advances and offers to maintain by argument." It differs from a hypothesis in that the latter is "A tentative theory or supposition provisionally adopted to explain certain facts and to guide in the investigation of others."

We have now reached the state where there remains but to consider the thesis, and arrive at the condition described by Chester G. Starr as that where "...historians commonly concur...that if our evidence is adequate we can assign a positive degree of validity to specific facts and can expect all men of sane minds to accept our demonstrations."  

Our demonstration must inevitably lead back to the original hypothesis, and in particular to an appreciation of the reasons which necessitated its formulation. Superficially the work hypothesis appears to be an inversion of the usual procedures employed in historical works. Usually, in the writing of history, facts are presented, and the facts lead ipso facto to some conclusion or other. The particular question under study, the existence or non-existence of a bourgeoisie in New France had,
however, been studied by others. It was already "history as written". Ouellet, Hamelin, Frégault and Brunet had advanced arguments, evidence and demonstrations. There was a slight problem: the lack of concordance in their views. Two of the controversialists, Brunet and Ouellet, it soon became apparent, were more concerned with the post-conquest period. This was true, but less so, of Hamelin and Frégault. One positive result of the hypothesis, then, was to restrict the argument to participants who had actually done research on the problem.

The resolution of the contradictions between the opposing groups could be accomplished by three means: an analysis of the evidence they advanced; the evaluation of the use to which they put this evidence and an appreciation of the internal logic of their works. The first, the evidence advanced, was a simple problem to resolve. Did there exist in the works of Hamelin and Frégault sufficient evidence, cold, hard data, to support their arguments? The introduction, even in the hypothesis of this work, of additional evidence leads inevitably and conclusively to a "no". No! There was not sufficient evidence advanced by either Frégault or Hamelin. Too many questions were still unanswered; too many contradictions remained.

The use of evidence by Hamelin and Frégault has a direct relation not to their historical honesty and accuracy, but rather to the classifications, and the classificatory terms under which they placed this evidence. Words such as rich, poor, bourgeois, grande bourgeoisie, nobility, aristocracy, seignior, profit, resources, population, and many
others, were used as if they were facts. "The remarkable thing about this view", F. A. Hayek has written about this tendency, "is that most of the assertions to which it has given status of "facts which everybody knows" have long been proven not to have been facts at all; yet they still continue, outside the circle of professional economic historians, to be almost universally accepted as the basis for the estimate of the existing economic order."

First, in the hypothesis, and then throughout the study, a series of interrogatives were applied to the evidence, and particularly to Hamelin's evidence. To a lesser extent, the same was done to the data, factual and conceptual, used by Frégault, but, as the latter had not done as thorough a study as the former, it was less necessary. In particular, the hypothesis began placing the evidence, the activities of the personages involved, within a time and concept frame. If, as Hamelin stated, fortunes were too low to permit capital formation, then what constituted a sufficient fortune? In another instance, a means of determining social status on the basis of money was advanced. The capitulation and the lettre de change were the means. Hamelin, however, totally neglected to give the base of his judgement. He appears to have arbitrarily claimed a social classification by projecting a 20th century value back to the 18th century.

3 See below for further conceptual anachronisms.
The internal logic of Hamelin's and Frégault's works follows from the relations of their evidence, and the classifications of this evidence. One cannot, by any known canon of logic, conclude that a class did not exist, and at the same time neglect to define this class. To write a footnote explaining this neglect is not sufficient. In Frégault's case there are two comments to be made. In effect, he was writing of the loss of a bourgeois class without ever establishing by evidence the existence of that class. Further, the evidence that he did prefer tended to contradict his implicit concept of the class structures of Canadien society. The hypothesis, the context of the study to follow, was the imperative point of departure. As has been said, superficially the work hypothesis appeared to be an inversion of usual historical procedures. In fact, the historian, as he begins his research, and later as he writes, always arranges his evidence in categories and under headings, but he seldom, much too seldom, questions, defines or describes the houses which the facts inhabit. Hamelin wrote the ECONOMIE ET SOCIETE EN NOUVELLE-FRANCE, and Frégault wrote CANADIAN SOCIETY DURING THE FRENCH REGIME without ever establishing the connotations of such words as économie, société, Canadian or bourgeois.

The purposes of the hypothesis can now be re-stated: a review of the arguments pro and con the existence of a Canadian bourgeoisie; the awareness of the need for more research to prove or disprove Hamelin's and Frégault's assertions; the examination and presentation, in a cursory fashion, of the evidence available in the writings of others, and a test-
ing of some of the fruits of research; a definition of terms and finally, the formulation of a tentative thesis, called quite properly, a work hypothesis.

The comparative value of the currency of New France, and there must be insistence on comparative, was established. The livre, the most common unit of statistics, was equal to the shilling. Twenty shillings were equal to the English pound, Halifax, or about twenty five shillings to the pound sterling. Five to six livres were equal to the Spanish dollar. The important ratio for the understanding of colonial trade in America is twenty to twenty five to one, \(20 : 25 \times 1\). This ratio is valid over a fairly long period, in spite of many fluctuations. The interesting problem of past and present currency equivalents was briefly examined but grave reservations were made as to its reliability, and more important, its utility for understanding the period studied.

The value of the commerce of New France was then given. In the period 1729 to 1748 there was a steady increase in trade. The Canadian economy, however, usually had a deficit with its metropolis. This, it was established, was not unusual. A comparison of French and British trade statistics, for the years studied in the present work, revealed that most colonial areas of North America had trade deficits with their homelands. This was pronounced in the colonies of the Northern and Central regions. It was possible to conclude from the evidence provided by the statistics, and comparisons of statistics, that New France was within
a normal pattern of colonial development. Without fear of contradiction, one can assert, if we restrict the comparison to New York and Pennsylvania, that the trade of the French colony was greater than that of these two British-American colonies. The assumed, and stated primacy of the English and/or protestant commercial ethic was revealed to be somewhat suspect.

Wages are another means of determining the value of currency, and may also indicate the economic and social positions of those receiving them. The evidence indicated that the wages in New France were similar to those in the British-American colonies. Further, that an average wage of 600 livres a year, for an artisan or skilled laborer, was the norm and could be used as a base for comparison. Below 600 and above 600 became criteria. This base line was to become an important factor in determining the economic and social status of individuals in later chapters.

The hypothesis was sustained. The argument established, as a thesis, that the volume of commerce of New France was normal, given the physical environment. In some instances the volume was high, particularly when compared to similar geographic and demographic areas. The meaning of the word high, when applied to volumes of commerce and wages, was established. High and low were then meaningful.

Hamelin, in his book, had asserted that there was a relation between the existence of a bourgeois class, rational exploitation of re-
sources by means of capital and credit, and profits, and the stability of the monetary system. He denied that these conditions existed in New France. To prove his contentions, he examined the fur trade and the price of wheat; commented on the currency of the colony; and cited from the letters of the administrators of the colony.

There are strong methodological and factual grounds for questioning the validity of Hamelin's conclusions. His own evidence, if properly used, indicated that a return of 150 to 200% in the highly speculative fur trade was a normal profit. Further, the percentage controlled by the Canadians was quite sufficient to produce adequate profits. His views on the interest rate were found to be erroneous. On purely factual matters, Hamelin, it was seen, restricted his considerations to too narrow a base. Profits, and capital, were derived from not just two economic activities, the fur trade and sales of wheat, but from a multitude of commercial endeavours. He failed to describe the rôle of the government as a source of capital. Méloïzes, Pommereau, Estèbe, Brouage, Cugnet, to name but a few, received most active assistance, in terms of capital and credit, from the metropolis and colonial governments. A further weakness in Hamelin's study was to consider in too cursory a fashion the monetary system, specially after 1729. The creation of currency, and various forms of exchange, public support of these media of exchange, and the relative stability of the monetary system were signs of economic progress and not stagnation. The failure of the system after the conquest of Canada was not a fault of the Canadian economy, but rather the
ability of the French State to meet its obligations to the Canadians at that time.

Hamelin also neglected to study fully the means of entrepreneurship in the colony. He appears to have approached the problem from the criteria of 20th century capitalism rather than the more normal base of pre-capitalist and pre-industrial revolution economic society. Credit sources, it was seen, were available. The continuous extension of large sums of money in the form of credit by the colonial and metropolitan merchants, as well as by the State, indicated that commercial endeavours did not lack for sources of capital and credit. Foucault, Dagneau Douville, Charly, and the d'Aillebousts, to mention a few, borrowed and lent money for capital purposes throughout the period studied. At times capital was acquired by the use, perhaps abuse, of a government post, specially in the case of Lanoullier or Cugnet. Such peculations, while perhaps morally reprehensible, did help the economy, and appear not to have damaged the perpetuators very much. Another too neglected aspect of past works, has been a considerations of the relationships between entrepreneurship and privilege. Carl Bridenbaugh, in his brilliant study on the Southern colonies before the American Revolution, made the point that "In an aristocracy wealth guarantees status; status conveys privilege; privilege insures power." This, as a rule of thumb, prevailed in New France.

Carl Bridenbaugh, MYTHS AND REALITIES, p. 15.
A second thesis, supported by argument, was then possible. If one of the criteria for the existence of a bourgeois class is a sufficient amount of profits, and another is the existence of an entrepreneurial group, then the commercial group in New France was bourgeois. The average wage of 600 livres per year established in the third chapter, when compared to some of the figures cited in the fourth chapter, took on a new meaning. We can begin to appreciate the significance of a fortune of 50,000 livres, the meaning of having 2,669,358 livres circulating in different forms of currency, or what a subsidy of 6,000 livres represents.

Another aspect of this second thesis is an awareness of some of the names which begin to appear: Cugnet, Lestage, Lanoullier, Guillimin, de Lino, de la Ronde, Méloïzes, Pommereau, Estèbe, Beaujeu, Brouage, Desauniers, Martel, de Tonnancour, the Douvilles, Foucault, Charly, d'Ailleboust, and others. These names are encountered again and again, in commerce, as recipients of government subsidies, as land owners, as army officers, as post commandants and as administrators. Very tentatively, one-third of the way through the study, it was possible to see the main outlines of the dominant class in the colony, dominant not merely in commerce, but in every important activity, economic, political and social.

The examination of the purchases by the State provided arguments for a further thesis. The volume of government purchases, and the profits accruing from sales to the State, as well as the monopoly or semi-monopoly of the sales by a few individuals, all contributed to sustaining the position that a group of men, leaving aside for the moment the more
accurate social appellation, benefitted from, and controlled the system. The carriage trade within the colony, repairs of fortifications, suppliers of timber and pitch for the shipyards, and general merchandize was controlled by a very narrow group. A further aspect of this argument is that those selling to the State did not belong to any one group, in the classic sense of being members of the Third Estate, but rather included people usually associated with the noble class or Second Estate. One more thesis is possible: the persons selling to the government were often employed by the government as well. Others selling to the State were members of what has usually been characterized as the military aristocracy or as belonging to the seigniorial class. Another evident tendency was to be seen: these people were often related by marriage.

By the fifth chapter it was possible to see that the classic class structure concept, when applied to New France, did not fit the evidence. Further, the commerce of the colony was of a relatively high order. That the State, rather than paternalistically retarding the economy, was actively encouraging it by subsidies, State enterprises and purchases. And, perhaps most important, a group, perhaps a class, with a strong economic and political base, dominated the society.

The argument of the chapter on the hinterland established the nature and functions of what has too often been simply termed a military aristocracy. Evidence abounds, all indicating that this simple classification fails to do justice to the multitude of activities participated
in by this group. The salaries of this underpaid group, underpaid ac-
cording to a governor at least, were, if the high estimate of Jacques
Chavoy de Noyan is to be believed, without trading in furs, fourteen
times the average wage. A more modest, and credible claim could be sub-
stantiated: they were only five times the average. The moderate return
of an officer commanding a post, and not trading, was established at
3,000 livres. This group cannot by any criterion by considered poorly
paid. The evidence also established that they did trade, even after 1742
when, ostensibly, the State did not permit it. The evidence also sup-
ports the argument that an "in group" existed. The post commandants were
a favoured coterie, allied among themselves, or, by marriage, with the
administrators and merchants of the colony. Villiers, Dagneau Douville,
Duplessis Fabert, the d'Aillebousts, the de Repentignys, the Ramezays,
the Charlys and the Blondeaus, to name a few, provide the proof. It was
also established that this group, and again for the moment we put aside
the question of class designation, could not be considered merely as a
military elite. They were also seigniors, at the very least, and often
merchants and traders as well, that is, when they were not administrators
in addition to everything else.

A further argument of the chapter concerned the means of financing
the trade, and the possible profits to be derived from it. Extremely
close and complex commercial relations were seen to have existed between
the so-called merchant group and the so-called military group. In part
this was based upon power and privilege, in part upon marital relations,
and in part on capital resources. Members of the army, of the commercial world, and of the administration, were seen to have all participated in the exploitation of the hinterland. An analysis of the privileges to trade, and the hirings for the trade, and of capital obligations coupled with the use of a very low profit percentage, all tended to demonstrate the nature of the trade of the hinterland: it was a monopoly by army men, merchants, and produced a fair return on capital invested.

The nature of the seigniorial system necessitated a return to comparative analysis prior to an examination of the contemporary period, that is, from 1729-1748. The views of Munro, Adair, Diamond and Trudel were carefully scrutinized, and found to be wanting. Far from being merely a system of colonization, one of Munro's claims, or even an experiment in feudalism, a view advanced by Diamond, or Adair's characterization as a group which lacked economic importance, the seignior and the system were seen to manifest at least some of the attributes associated with bourgeois exploitation. An analysis of the recipients of the seigniories in the period under study indicated that they were given to the same persons considered in previous chapters involving sales to the State, subsidies from the State, and the post commandants. They were merchants, army officers, and administrators. Some of them, to name names, were Beaujeu, Gorgendièrè, Cugnet, Lafontaine de Belcourt, de Lery, Rocbert, and Sabrevois de Bleury. The restrictions imposed by the government, and the financial returns of a seigniory, required a critical evaluation of the revisionist position of Trudel. It was necessary to revise the re-
visionist, and carry his argument further. The Edicts of Marly, it was seen, were applied with greater severity to the *censitaire* than to the seignior. The latter's position of power was the main reason. The seignior's desire to speculate in land was also seen to have been a factor.

Trudel's concept of the burden, or lack of burden, of seigniorial dues was challenged. An understanding of these dues requires, and again it must be emphasized, a base of equivalence. This is only possible if we keep in mind two factors: the land was given to the seignior for little, or nothing, and the returns from these lands must be equated with a number having a relevance for the times. Some of the seigniories were seen to have returned a small cash revenue, but a fairly large one in terms of produce. The seigniories examined produced 40 to approximately 800 *livres* per year, exclusive of land sales, or produce sales. This was, as noted, part of the income of the seignior.

The results of the argument, in summary form, were that the seigniorial system was administered in favour of a privileged group. The returns, in absolute figures, were moderate, but as they formed but a part of a total income, were significant. And further, that the men designated as merchants, officers and administrators all derived benefits from the system. The traditional interpretations, those of Munro and Trudel in particular, were seen to have been based on too many unexamined presuppositions, and at times, simply erroneously interpreted facts.
The three chapters on the administration, that on the Superior Council, the civil administration and the military administration, tested and examined the relations that, in the words of Mosca, "...a class has acquired in the society and the direct influence it exerts in the government of the country." All three branches of the administration were staffed and dominated by the group encountered as participants in other aspects of the society of New France. Merchants, land owners, fur traders and post commandants, recipients of State subsidies, and the principal furnishers to the government, were seen to have been the men appointed to the three branches of the administration. Two other factors considered in this section were: 1) the stability of the administration in that the governor, intendant and most of the other officials held their offices throughout the period 1729 to 1748. This permitted the initiation, and application of permanent, long range policies. 2) The other important factor is that the salaries, far from being low, were high, and that quite often there was multiple employment. Some of the members of the administration were de Lino, a merchant and land owner; Guillimin, father and son; Michel Sarrazin, and his father-in-law and brother-in-laws; François-Etienne Cugnet; de Lotbinière; Foucault; Taschereau and so on; all derived income from several administrative sources, not to mention lands and commerce. The arguments of the three chapters demonstrated conclusively that there was a relation between a class and political power, at least in New France. That this class belonged to the Second Es-

---

Mosca, p. 145.
tate, in the classic concept, is impossible to support. That the individuals belonged to a group, a very cohesive one, is evident.

In the penultimate chapter, that on marriage, the many themes and arguments were united through the holy bans of matrimony. The extent of the intermarriage between the prominent, and so often mentioned families and individuals who dominated the political and economic life of the colony, was established within narrow and broad confines. The over-all pattern of marital relations, and the possible effects of marital relations were suggested. The marital structure of the society of New France was also seen to be similar to that which prevailed in the British-American colonies. The links between power, commerce and marriage, in the area to the South, have been noted several times. The actual effects of similar conditions in New France may be asserted as a thesis without too many reservations.

This is the evidence. This is the argument. It is on this basis that we must characterize the society of New France, and determine if there was, or was not, a bourgeois class. It may be objected that the writer has already, and often in the study, called people bourgeois. True, but two qualifications must immediately be made. The author already knew the results of the research. And, the hypothesis had permitted a tentative class designation. From the statement of the hypothesis, and the presentation of the arguments, we may now turn to a more definitive statement of the thesis, with, as usual, a necessary qualification.
We must begin the definitive statement of the thesis by a return to the point of departure, the hypothesis. In particular we must return to the base, the criteria, the standards used by the opponents of the thesis, Hamelin and Ouellet. Implicit, but never explicit in their arguments are the connotations and ideas associated with their use of the word bourgeois. Let us admit, that on the basis of some of their criteria, there was no bourgeoisie in New France. However, it is possible, as a matter of fact, it is demonstrable, that their basis of judgement is erroneous. They use Marxian, and post-Marxian terms and economic values. They use the word bourgeois as it is commonly associated, by Marxians, as part of the concept of capitalism. "In many ways it is misleading to speak of "capitalism" F. A. Hayek has written, "as though this had been a new and altogether different system which suddenly came into being towards the end of the eighteenth century; we use this term because it is the most familiar name, but only with great reluctance..." F. S. Ashton brings an even greater precision to this view, and the anachronistic tendencies of some writers:

In particular, everything that has happened since the early Middle Ages is explained in terms of capitalism - a term if not coined at least given wide currency by Marx. Marx, of course, associated it with exploitation. Sombart used it to mean a system of production differing from the handicraft system by reason of the fact that the means of production are owned by a class distinct from the workers - a class whose motive is profit and whose methods are rational, as opposed to traditional methods....Above all he stresses the capitalist spirit. Other elements, such as that innovations in the system are carried out by borrowed

---

6 F.A. Hayek, "History and Politics", in Hayek, p. 15.
money, or credit, have been added by later writers like Schumpeter. But nearly all agree that capitalism implies the existence of a rational technique, a proletariat that sells its labor (and not the product of its labor), and a class of capitalists whose aim is unlimited profit.

After listing a few more objections, Ashton concludes "It is bad economics", to which it might be added, that it is also bad history. Ashton goes further. He claims that the stress placed on the industrial revolution, the scientific revolution, and the spontaneous concept of developing capitalism is erroneous. "It is no longer men and women, exercising free choice, who effect change, but capitalism, or the spirit of capitalism...Whatever that is, it is certainly not economic history. It has introduced a new mysticism into the recounting of plain facts." Ashton, then, makes his most telling point: "It takes the facts out of their settings." Neither the protagonists nor the opponents have properly appreciated this aspect of historical reconstruction. What is needed, above all else, is relevant criteria.

The facts in their setting reveal that it is impossible to view the social structure of New France as conforming to those implicit in the words, and concepts, of Old Régime. The tripartite division of society

---

8 Ashton, p. 59.
9 Ashton, pp. 60-61.
10 Ashton, pp. 61-62.
into the First, Second and Third Estates, clergy, nobility and the rest of the population, including the bourgeoisie, was not evident in New France. What is evident is that the facts in their setting do not lead conclusively to a bourgeois class, in the Marxian-cum-Ouellet-cum-Hamelin sense, or the imprecise middle class of Frégault. The reason is quite simple: this class concept did not originate till much after the period under study. The word bourgeois, when used in New France, meant a resident of a city, and not a member of a class as such.

We can go one step further in our analysis of the classes of New France, and this with reference to the so-called noble class, l'aristocratie. There is no evidence that this class existed as the term is generally understood in the classic estates concept. The word most commonly used was gentilhomme, gentleman, or perhaps officier. Another term of social classification was habitant. In some never very defined way it meant a member of a class, but as often it meant simply an inhabitant of the colony. It was applied to high and low, the dominators and the dominated. In other words, the question of class structure simply was not a great problem in New France. There was, however, the matter of prerogatives, and these were associated with status within the society. The rights of precedence, in communion, for example, or the right to wear a sword or a hat before the courts indicate that some differences of social status did exist.

The facts in their setting do reveal some evidence which may be
related to criteria. All who have dealt with the problem of the bourgeois class concur in the view that money is one of the valid bases of judgement. Another criterion that may be used, a factual criterion, is the general economic activities of a group. A further criterion, usually accepted, is the dominance of the political society by a group having extensive economic interests. Another criterion, particularly notable in the relatively small societies of the Americas, is the tendency to intermarriage among the "better sort", the chief political administrators, the principal land owners, the members of the professional classes, and the chief merchants and traders. The facts in their setting most clearly reveal that the society of New France contained a cohesive group, a synonym for a class, which conformed in general and in detail, in every way, to these criteria.

One of the terms favoured to designate this group, this class, is colonial bourgeoisie. What is insisted upon is that whatever class designation is used, the word bourgeois must appear. Bridenbaugh has suggested another term, "bourgeois aristocracy", which is the most acceptable definition yet presented. In both designations, colonial bourgeoisie and bourgeois aristocracy, the implications, in terms of historical analysis, or class analysis, are that a class in the colonial society of New France existed, and that this class by its economic, political and social activities fulfilled the requirements of a bourgeois class.

---

The use of these two appellations, however, still is not quite satisfactory. A word, a French word, is needed to characterize, as accurately as possible, the functions and classification of those called bourgeois in New France. With all due apologies to Molière, the phrase suggested is BOURGEOIS-GENTILHOMME. In New France, this man, and these men, were not the bumbling, pretentious fool of the play, barely able to speak a civilized French, and understanding little of the use of cutlery. The merchants, administrators and the post commandants were, for their times, well educated. They lived, according to contemporary testimony, and the inventories of their wills, well. Their libraries were surprisingly large. It is usually agreed that they drank a little too much. The words bourgeois and gentilhomme were used to describe them, but never hyphenated. Rather, the words appeared separated by a comma: "...bourgeois, gentilhomme." 12 It is to this class that Cugnet, the Vaudreuls, de la Gorgendièrè, Raimbault, the Bouchers, Taschereau, and the many others mentioned in this study belonged: les bourgeois-gentilhommes de la Nouvelle-France.

12 This is the description given of Ignace Aubert in 1744. See 1744, p. 9.
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Garde-Magasin. See King's Stores.
Gardener, wages of, 59.
Garigue, Philippe, work of, 10, 12, 15.
Garrison, C.E., 27, 29.
Gatineau, sieur, 82.
Gaucher Gamelin family, 141.
Gaultier, Jean-François, 210, 213.
Gaultier, Joseph, 170, 187.
Gentilhomme (Gentilshommes), 26, 31, 36, 153, 270, 292.
Glazebrook, G.P. de T., 226.
Goguet, Denis, 90, 100, 112.
de la Gorgendière, Alexis Fleury, 90.
de la Gorgendière, Charlotte, 262.
de la Gorgendière family, 174, 177, 208, 209, 238, 239, 273, 294.
de la Gorgendière fils, 102.
de la Gorgendière, Louise-Thérèse, 262.
de la Gorgendière, Marie-Claire, 262.
de la Gorgendière, Marie-Thomas, 262.
Gottschalk, Louis, 11.
Gourdeaux, 107.
Gouverneur Particulier, 235, 243, 244.
Governor-General. See New France, Governor of.
Grand Voyer, 225, 226.
Grande Valée, lands of, 204.
Gratification(s), 61, 198, 202, 204, 205, 207, 208, 211, 216, 217, 220, 225, 228, 232, 237, 239, 241, 242, 244.
Greffier. See also Superior Council, Secretary of, 223, 230, 231, 232.
Green Bay. See Fort Baye des Puants.
Grondines, seigniory of, 155.
Group(s). See Class(es).
Guard, wages of, 58.
Guanière, 108, 112.
Guillimin family, 261, 262, 273.
Guillimin, Geneviève-Elizabeth, 263.
Guillimin, Marie-Joseph, 263, 264.
Guillory, Simon, 136, 144.
Guindon, Hubert, 10, 12, 15.
Guns, 112.
Guyon family, 130.
Guyon, Joseph, 110, 113.
Guyon Després, François, 89, 103, 110, 180.
Guyon Després, Madeleine, 258.
Habitant(s), 27, 247, 248, 270, 292.
Hall, Douglas, 91, 92.
Hamelin, Charles, Michel, Marie, Augustin, 147.
Hamelin, Ignace and Jacques, 143.
Hamelin, Jean, 2, 3, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 23, 26, 27, 29, 33, 50, 65, 66, 67, 68, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 92, 93, 148, 276, 277, 278, 280, 281, 282, 290, 292.
Hamelin, Louis, 155.
Hamelin et Cie., Louis, 135.
Hamilton, John, 43.
Harrington, Virginia, 35, 250.
Harvey, Pierre, 26, 68, 148.
Havy, Jean-François, 112, 139.
Havy et Lefebvre, 94, 107, 139.
Hayek, F.A., 277, 291.
Hazeur family, 83, 203.
Hazeur, François, 263.
Hazeur, Jean-François, 206, 213, 263.
Hazeur, Marie-Ursule, 263.
Hazeur de l'Orme, Pierre, 83, 176, 188, 263.
Hazeur, Joseph Thierry, 83, 176, 188, 263.
Hemp, 112.
Heneker, Dorothy, 155.
Hertel family,  
265.
Hertel de la Frenières, Zacharie-François,  
180.
Hertel de Pierreville, Joseph,  
252.
Hertel de Rouville, Jean-Baptiste,  
264.
Hertel de Rouville, René-Ovide,  
178, 232.
Hervieux family,  
264.
Hervieux, Jacques,  
29.
Hervieux, Marie-Anne,  
264.
Hervieux, Marie-Michelle,  
134, 264.
Hervieux, sieur,  
28, 103, 113, 140, 142.
Héry,  
148.
Hiché, Henri,  
102, 136, 233, 264.
Hiché, Louise,  
233.
Hiché, Marie-Madeleine,  
264.
Hinterland. See also Furs, trade in.  
trade of, 68, 116-152, 251, 252, 254, 256, 257, 259, 263, 264, 266, 268, 284;  
and permits to trade, 119, 135, 285;  
and profits, 119, 134, 147-151;  
Historians, American. See History, American.
History,  
American, 3, 30;  
Canadian, 3, 153;  
Comparative, 3, 5, 26, 30, 34, 57;  
Economic, 2, 277;  
hypothesis, uses of/in, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 18, 19, 25, 26, 33, 36, 38, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 289;  
inter-disciplinary, 3;  
and psychology, 7;
of seigniorial system, 8;
social, 2;
social and economic, 2, 4;
and statistics, 7;
study of social class(es), 3. See also Class(es).
uses of thesis in. See History, hypothesis in.
Hocquart, Gilles,
  1, 2, 3, 60, 66, 67, 69, 72, 80, 81, 82, 83, 88, 94, 99, 111, 117,
  120, 122, 124, 125, 126, 135, 137, 173, 176, 199, 201, 215, 217,
  218, 225, 226, 228, 249, 252, 256, 270.
Houses, sale(s) of,
  185.
Hubert dit Lacroix, Pierre,
  145.
Hudson's Bay Company,
  116.
Hurons,
  123.
Hypothesis. See History.
Ile Jésus, arrière-fief of, 170.
Imbert, Jacques, 100, 101, 102.
Income. See also Wages. 190;
and class(es), 6, 58, 59, 72, 73, 122.
Indian(s), 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 151, 221.
Individualism, 37.
Industry, 21.
Innis, H.A., 139, 147, 148, 151.
Interest rate, 73, 79.
Interpreter, 59, 221.
Investment(s). See also Capital. 18, 68, 69.
Iron, 111.
l'Isle Royale, 102, 105, 106, 107.
James, Clifford L.,
  91.
Janitor, wages of,
  59.
Jehanne, Pierre,
  100, 101, 112.
Jesuit(s),
  164, 226.
Jolliet, Charles,
  182.
Jolliet, Claire,
  261.
Jolliet family,
  208.
Jolliet, Louis,
  261.
Joybert family,
  268.
de Joybert, Louise-Élisabeth. See also Vaudreuil, Louise-Élisabeth.  
  268.
de Joybert, Marie-Geneviève, 
  268.
Kamouraska, seigniory of,
  188, 264.
Kaskarinet, seigniory of,
  189.
King's Stores,
    61, 72, 81, 87, 88, 94, 107, 172, 174, 180, 207, 209, 216, 219, 220,
    221, 222, 233, 242, 251, 269.
Labarre, W.L., 31, 34, 158, 159, 250, 252.
Laborer(s), 21, 250.
Labrador, 86.
Lacolle, seigniory of, 173.
La Corne de Chapt, Louis, 141, 147, 175, 186, 188, 206, 263, 264.
La Corne Dubreuil. See Dubreuil.
La Durantaye, seigniory of, 175, 184.
LaFontaine de Belcourt, Jacques, 173, 178, 208, 213, 228, 256, 286.
LaFontaine de Belcourt, Marie-Joseph, 256.
Lafontaine, Jean-Baptiste, 96.
La Galissonière, Roland Michel Barin, 119, 122, 124, 235.
Laisser-faire, 37.
La Jammerais et Cie., 135.
Lake Champlain, lands in, 175.
Lake Erie, 127, 131.
Lake Huron, 127, 132.
Lake Métis, 208.
Lake Michigan, 126, 127, 132, 140.
Lake Ontario, 126, 127.
Lake Superior, 85, 127, 133, 136, 142.
Lalande-Gayon, Thérèse, 170.
Lamarque, Charles Nolan, 138, 144.
Lamorille. See Lemaître-Lamorille.
Lamp oil, 111.
Lanaudière, Marguerite-Marie-Anne, 266.
Lanaudière, Pierre-Thomas Tarieu, 266.
Lanctot, Gustave, 212.
Land, leases of, 182; sales of, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 188, 189, 192, 196, 232, 233, 238, 287. See also Seigniory, sale(s) of.
Lanoullier, Nicolas, 70, 72, 125, 178, 207, 208, 209, 213, 226, 227, 228, 229, 231, 265, 282, 283.
Lanoullier de Boisclerc, Jean-Eustache, 84, 100, 101, 178, 208, 226.
Lanoullier, Paul-Antoine-François, 208.
de Lantagnac, Gaspard Adhemard, 244, 245.
Lapérade, Charles François, 144.
Laperrière Marin, 129, 141, 142, 144.
Laplante, Louis et Cie., 135.
Larche, Charles, 110.
Larche, Léonard, 103.
La Rochelle, 45, 48, 66, 81.
La Rochelle, Chamber of Commerce of, 199.
La Ronde de Clignancourt, 143.
La Ronde, Charlotte Denys de, 259.
La Ronde, Louis Denis de, 85, 123, 129, 133, 136, 137, 140, 141, 144, 169, 173, 259, 283.

---

9 Variant spelling: Denys.
Lauzon, seigniory of, 164.
de Lavalterie, Madeleine Louise, 258.
de Lavalterie, Pierre-François-Margane, 90, 135, 257.
La Vérendrye family, 140.
Lawyer(s), 35, 250.
Lecocq dit St.-Onge, Jean-Baptiste, 183.
Lecomte-Dupré, Louis, 186.
Lefebvre, Jean. See also Havy & Lefebvre, 139.
Le Gardeur, Angélique, 172.
Le Gardeur, Charlotte, 171.
Le Gardeur, Louise, 208.
Le Gardeur, Pierre Nôel, 186.
Le Gardeur de Beauvais, Marie-Renée, 218.
Le Gardeur de Courtemanche, Jean-Baptiste, 141.
Le Gardeur de Croisille, Charles and Bonaventure, 186.
Le Gardeur de Repentigny, Agathe, 266.
Le Gardeur de Repentigny family, 131, 132, 155, 180, 285.
Le Gardeur de Repentigny, Marguerite, 237, 264.
Le Gardeur de Repentigny, Pierre, 129.
Le Gardeur de St.-Pierre, Jacques, 121, 131, 132, 137, 206, 263.
Léger dit Richelieu, Jean, and pitch, 98.
Léger, François, 109, 111, 112.
Legras, Jean-Baptiste, 138.
de Leigne, Jeanne-Catherine, 265.
de Leigne, Pierre-André, 208, 231, 232.
Le Jeune, L. 204.
Lemelin, Jeanne, 182.
Le Moyné, Charles, 14, 243, 244, 245, 267.
Le Moyné family. See also Longueuil. 133, 140, 171, 177, 267.
Le Moyné, Jean, 265, 267.
Le Moyné, Marie-Anne, 267.
Le Moyné, Paul-Joseph (Chevalier de Longueuil), 120, 123, 129, 166, 173, 180, 236, 240, 267.
Le Moyné de Martigny, Jacques, 89, 191, 195.
Leneuf de la Fresnière, François, 186.
Lepage, Germain, 84.
Lepage de Sainte-Claire, l'abbé Louis, 84, 98, 103, 107, 167, 174, 175, 176, 186, 194, 208, 266.
Lepage, René, 176.
Le Proust, Joseph, 113.
de Lery family, 260.
de Lery fils, Joseph-Gaspard Chaussegros, 172.
de Lery, Louise Chaussegros, 259.
Lestage, Pierre, 70, 141, 145, 248, 283.
Letourneau, Jacques, 107.
Letters of exchange. See also Currency. 29, 33, 76, 221, 277.
Lewis, Arthur W. 32, 95.
Liberal professions, 21.
Lieutenant-Général, 230, 231.
Lieutenant Particulier, 231, 233, 247.
Lieutenant de Roy, 60, 235, 236, 237, 238, 240, 242, 244.
de Lignery, Constant le Marchant, 128, 140.
de Lignery, François, 140, 180.
Ligou, D., 27, 29.
Linctot, Louis-René Godefroy, 133, 143, 146, 180, 265.
de Lino family, 260.
de Lino, Maturin, 102.
de Lino, François Mathieu Maturin, 25, 71, 201, 244, 259, 283, 288.
de Lino, Jean-François, 206.
Livaudière, seigniory of, 175.
Loan(s), 139, 146-147.
Lods et Ventes, 181, 193, 194.
Longueuil family, 79.

Variant spelling: Mathurin, Martin.
de Longueuil, Baron Charles et Baronne
107.
de Longueuil, Baron Charles,
126, 240, 244.
de Longueuil, Chevalier de. See Le Moyne, Joseph.
de Lotbinière, Angelique Chartier,
259, 268.
de Lotbinière, Angelique Chartier (fille),
268.
de Lotbinière, Eustache Chartier,
85, 178, 204, 205, 206, 214, 259, 288.
de Lotbinière family,
260.
de Lotbinière, Louis Chartier,
259.
de Lotbinière, Michel Chartier,
171.
de Lotbinière, Rene-Louis Chartier,
205.
de Lotbinière, seigniory of,
205.
Louet, Jean-Claude,
223.
Lough, John,
39, 51.
Louisbourg,
47, 96, 206, 256.
Louisiana,
239.
Louval,
108, 109, 110.
Lower, A.R.M.,
14.
Lumber,
45, 46, 48, 49, 93. See also Individual products: shingle(s);
Barrel(s).
industry, 84, 85, 167, 259;
sales to the state, 84, 95, 99, 103, 167, 205, 206, 253, 284.
Lunn, Elizabeth Jean,
Lusignan, Paul-Louis,
129, 265, 266.
McGill University,
154.
*Magasin du Roi.* See King's Stores.
Mailhiot, Jean-François,
233.
Mailou, Pierre,
97, 218.
Major du Roy,
60, 235, 236, 237, 239, 243, 244, 247.
Malbaie, seigniory of,
176, 188.
Malhot, François,
146.
Mandrou, Robert,
22, 24.
Marchand-Bourgeois. See Bourgeois-Marchand.
Marchand, Joseph,
186.
Marin fils, Joseph, (Lamarque de Marin),
129, 133, 262.
Marin Hurtubize et Cie.,
135.
Marin Hurtubize, Paul,
128, 120, 130, 133, 138, 140, 141, 143, 144.
Marin Laperrière. See Laperrière.
Marine, Commissaire de la,
60, 215, 269.
Marine, Controlleur de la,
60, 217.
Marine, Ecrivain Principal de la,
217, 220.
Marine, Ministry of,
66, 192, 201.
Marine Treasury,
70, 76, 80, 81, 101, 102, 108, 112, 125, 174, 207, 209, 238, 262.
Marka, fief of the Rivière,
189.
Marly, Edicts of,
153, 161, 162, 164, 168, 200, 286.
Marriage. See Class(es) and Marriage; New France, marriage in.
Marsolet, Jean,
113.
Martel, Michel,
61, 215, 223, 224, 283.
Martel de St. Antoine, Jean Baptiste Grégoire,
87, 223, 224.
Marx, Marxian,
13, 18, 290.
Maryland,
53, 54.
Mason, wages of,
58, 59.
Massachusetts,
31.
Maugras. See Gamelin-Maugras.
Maurepas, Jean-Frédéric Phélipeaux,
58, 66, 70, 81, 117, 119, 120, 124, 125, 162, 217, 218, 225, 228.
Maurice,
97.
Mazière,
129.
Mazurier,
107.
Meat, sales to the State,
110, 111, 131, 258, 259.
Mecatino, post of,
218.
de Meloizes, sieur Nicolas-Marie Renaud d'Avène,
85, 86, 268, 281, 283.
de Meloizes, Madame,
102.
Mer de l'Ouest. See Individual Forts: Grande Portage, Saint-Pierre etc.
Mercantilism,
30, 31, 37.
Merchandise, purchase of by State. See also Individual Products.
95, 103, 104, 111, 112, 113, 114, 233, 234.
Merchant(s),
33, 34, 35, 36, 66, 73, 87, 114, 199, 234, 250.
Canadian. See New France, Merchant(s) in/of.
Merchant-Seignior,
247.
Messier, François,
193.
Michel,
126.
Michel de Villebois, Honoré,
60, 215, 216, 222, 269.
Mignot,
97.
Militia-Captain, 154, 245-248.
Mineral resources, 85, 136, 137.
Mingan, lands of, 182.
Mining. See Mineral resources.
Molasses, 112.
Monetary system. See Currency.
Money, and bourgeoisie. See also Currency. 6, 29, 30.
Montalban, 30.
de Montfort, François, 89, 90, 103, 106, 135, 136, 146.
Montreal, census of 1731, 179-180, 193;
City of, 28, 76, 87, 97, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 113, 126, 141,
174, 184, 216, 221, 231, 237, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 251, 252,
269;
Governor(s) of, 88, 141, 191, 240, 241, 259, 267, 268;
seigniory of, 193;
Université de, 1, 12.
Mosca, Gaetano, 21.
Munitions. See Merchandise.
Munro, W.B., 8, 153, 155, 159, 161, 162, 177, 196, 286, 287.
Murray, James, 172.
Nafrechoux family, 220, 260, 261.
Nafrechoux, Louise, 269.
Nafrechoux, Marguerite, 261.
Nails, 112.
Négociant(s), 25, 114, 202, 212, 233.
Nettels, Curtis P., 31.
Neveu, Jacques, 180.
Neveu, Jean-Baptiste, 89, 112, 113, 141, 143, 165, 180, 185, 254, 266.
Neveu, Jean-François, 267.
Neveu, Marie, 267.
Neveu, sieur, 180.
New England, 53, 54, 56, 57, 61, 64, 75.
agriculture of, 45, 46, 47. See also Individual Products, i.e., Peas, Wheat, etc.
army of, 8, 86, 116, 117, 118, 122, 124, 125, 126, 151, 170, 171, 178, 179, 180, 181, 235-248, 250, 252, 266, 270, 283, 285, 286, 287; bourgeoisie of/in, 2, 5, 12, 15, 17, 18, 25, 30, 66, 73, 91, 93, 181, 196, 275-294. See also section under Class(es).
capital in. See Capital.
clergy of, 13, 84, 156, 198;
commerce of/commercial activities in, 27, 39ff, 45, 46, 57, 64, 66, 77, 78, 79, 85, 89, 90, 93, 104-113, 116, 122, 125, 140, 145, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 252, 262, 268, 279, 280, 283, 284, 286, 288; commercial class(es) of, 7, 12, 24, 25, 30, 39-65, 66, 73, 90; comparison with British America, 6, 26, 37, 50, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 75, 91, 158, 190, 270, 289;
conquest of, 2, 13, 15, 28, 30, 87, 171, 276, 281;
cost of living in, 44;
credit in, 7, 66-93, 144-147, 199;
currency in, 39-44, 64, 66, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 93, 192, 280, 281, 283. See also Currency.
entrepreneurship in, 7, 66-93, 138, 139, 144-147, 282, 283;
exports of, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 55, 56, 57, 64, 99, 116, 279. See also Individual Products.
Governor(s) of, 117, 122, 124, 235, 242, 262, 268;
history of, 1, 3, 4, 10, 15, 26, 30, 94, 153, 258, 276;
imports of, 48, 49, 50, 55, 56, 57, 64, 279;
income in. See New France, wages in.
industry in, 12, 34, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 93;
merchand in, 9, 174, 175, 181, 213, 214, 238, 245, 248, 249-274, 285, 289;
monopoly (ies) in, 79, 100, 106, 111, 137, 283;
population, 45, 57;
prices in, 44, 49, 116, 148, 190-195;
profits in, 66, 67, 68, 72, 79, 92, 93, 119, 147-151, 281, 283, 286;
ship-building in, 00, 100, 101, 102, 103;
shipyards in, 58, 284;
society of, 5, 12, 13, 24, 25, 30, 79, 152, 161, 248, 275-294;
state of, sales to, 93, 94-115, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 256, 259, 283, 284, 286. See also Products: Wheat, Lumber etc.
subsidy(ies) in, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 98, 99, 150, 176, 204, 259, 268, 283, 284, 286;
wealth in, 67, 70, 71, 277.

New Jersey, 63.

New York, colony of, 32, 33, 35, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 62, 64, 153, 250, 280.

Nobility. See Aristocracy.

nobles. See Class, aristocratic.

Nova Scotia, 43.
Noyan. See Chavoy de Noyan.
Noyelles, Nicolas-Joseph, 128, 141.
Noyelles and Company, 144.
Obligation(s). See Loan(s).

Officer(s). See New France, army of.

Old Régime. See Ancien Régime.

Ordonnance(s) (media of exchange). See Currency.

Ouellet, Fernand,
7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 36, 276, 290, 292.
Padre, wages of, 59.
Papin, Pierre, 28.
Pascaud's, merchants of France, 90, 91.
Paternalism, 17, 30, 32, 36, 94.
Pays d'en haut. See Hinterland.
Péan, Michel-Jean-Hughes, 240, 268.
Péan de Livaudière, Hughes Jacques, 60, 144, 166, 169, 175, 178, 210, 232, 236, 240, 268.
Peasant(s), 21.
Pécaudy, Claude-Pierre, 175, 187.
de Pécaudy, François-Antoine, 165, 175, 192.
de Pécaudy, Marie-Françoise, 144, 175.
Pennsylvania, 53, 54, 56, 64, 249, 280.
Perthuis, Charles, 264.
Perthuis, Joseph, 210, 214.
Petit, Charlotte, 187.
Veuve Philibert, Marie Guerin, sales to the State, 112.
Le Picard de Leteland, Louis, 187.
Picoté de Belestre family, 132.

11 Known as Ignace Perthuis.
Picoté de Belestre, Hélène, 143.
Picoté de Belestre, Marie-Anne, 257.
Picoté de Belestre, Pierre, 129.
Pine planks, 46, 84.
Pitch, 98, 99, 284.
der des Plaines, fief of, 208.
Plutocracy, 248.
Pommereau, Jean-Baptiste, 85, 86, 100, 112, 113, 224, 268, 281, 283.
Pommereau, Mademoiselle, 101, 224, 268.
Porlier, G.-J., 135.
de Portneuf, Pierre, 129, 180.
Portneuf, seigniory of, 186, 194.
Post Commandant. See Hinterland.
Poulin, Pierre, 80.
Poulin de Courval, Jean, 266.
Poulin-Cressé. See Cressé.
Power, economic, 8, 12, 17, 22, 30, 31, 34, 85, 92, 93, 114, 181, 248, 270, 271, 282;
and marriage, 175, 248, 249, 250, 270;
political, 12, 17, 22, 30, 31, 34, 85, 92, 93, 114, 181, 197, 248, 270, 271, 282;
social, 12, 17, 27, 35, 85, 114, 181, 270, 282.
Procureur du Roy, 222, 230, 231.
Prévôt de la Maréchaussé, 230.
Prices. See New France, prices in.
Privileges, and birth, 20;
and functions, 20.
Production, means of, 18.
Profit(s). See New France, profit(s) in.
Protestant(s), 138.
Protestant Ethic, 13, 16, 36, 57. See also Ouellet, Fernand.
de Puyaibault, Marguerite Barbe, 269.
Quebec, census of 1744, 177; Chapter of, 84, 85, 101, 176, 188, 203, 205, 259, 263; City of, 76, 97, 103, 104, 105, 109, 176, 183, 192, 204, 220, 224, 229, 231, 235, 236, 238, 240; General Hospital of, 188, 204. de Quindre. See Dagneau de Quindre.
Radicalism, 37.
Radibault, Anne-Marguerite, 253, 269.
Radibault family, 274, 294.
Radibault, Marie-Louise Catherine, 269.
de Ramezay, Claude, 184, 191, 259.
de Ramezay, Geneviève, 88, 174, 180, 184, 188, 191.
de Ramezay, Jean Baptiste Nicolas Roch, 89, 125, 126, 129, 133, 147, 169, 180, 236, 241, 259.
Ranger, Pierre, 29.
Raudot, Jacques, 154.
de Raymond, chevalier, 129, 131.
Reid, Allana, 111.
Rent(s), 216, 217, 218, 221, 239, 241.
Reparations (for the State), 96-97, 284.
de Rigauville, Nicolas-Blaise des Bergères, 117, 164, 176.
Rimouski, seigniory of, 176.
Rivière-du-Loup, seigniory of, 188.
Rivière-de-la-Madeleine, seigniory of, 204.
Rivière-du-Sud, lands of, 195-196.
Robinaud, Louise-Catherine, and investment, 69.
Rocbert family, 242.
Rocbert père, Étienne,
   87, 180, 220, 221, 269, 286.
Rocbert fils, Louis-Joseph,
   87, 174, 220, 221, 269.
Rocbert, Marie-Elisabeth,
   269.
Rouen,
   81.
Rouville. See Hertel.
Roy, Pierre-Georges,
   163, 170, 212.
Ruette d'Auteuil, Madeleine,
   183.
de Sabrevois, Charles, 174, 253.
St. Ange Charly. See Charly.
Saint-Denis, seigniory of, 175.
St. Francois Leneuf, lands of, 186.
St. Jean, fief de, 204.
St. Jean, l'Islet, 196.
St. Maurice Forges, 79, 80, 81, 140, 141, 174, 209, 238, 253, 256, 260, 262. See also Francheville; Cugnet; Gamelin.
St. Maurice, seigniory of, 79.
Saint-Michel, seigniory of, 166, 175.
Saint-Ours family, 155.
St. Ours, Jean-Baptiste Deschaillons, 60, 129, 140, 175, 178, 236, 237, 247.
Saint-Ours, Pierre de, 243, 257.
Saint-Ours, seigniory of, 175, 184, 218, 237.
Sante-Palaye, J.B.L. de, 19.
Saint-Simon family, 230.
Saint-Simon, Paul Denis, 230.
Saint-Sulpice, gentlemen of, 193.
de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de la Croix, 205.
Saint-Vallier, seigniory of, 184.
Saint-Vincent, Henri-Albert, 86.
Sales to the State. See New France, state of, sales to.
Salutary neglect,
37.
Sarrazin, Charlotte-Louise,
263.
Sarrazin family,
201, 202, 270, 288.
Sarrazin, Michel,
83, 98, 103, 166, 176, 185, 188, 203, 204, 206, 214, 263, 288.
Sarrazin, Nicolas,
137.
Scieur de long, wages of,
59.
Seamstress, wages of,
59.
Sée, Henri,
18.
Seignior(s). See Individual names.
income of, 182-196;
urban residents, 178-180.
Seigniorial dues,
167, 168, 181, 182, 183, 185, 189-196, 287. See also Lods et Ventes, Cens et Rentes.
Seigniorial system. See New France, seigniorial system of.
  droit de commune in, 181, 189, 190, 191, 194;
  droit de pêche in, 191, 195;
  droit de quint of, 181, 185;
  milling toll in/of, 181, 189, 190, 192, 194, 195, 196;
  revenues from, 189-196, 287;
  sale(s) of, 181, 182, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 194, 196, 264, 266.
  See also Land, sale(s) of.
Seven Years War,
78.
Shingle(s),
46.
Ship-building. See New France, ship-building in.
Shoes,
112.
Shortt, Adam,
241.
Simblin, fief of,
195.
Sir George Williams University,
12.
State,
82, 83. See also headings under New France.
Smith, Adam, 62.
Social group. See Class(es).
Social mobility, 270. See also Class mobility.
Social status, 7, 12, 25, 26, 35, 79, 277, 282, 292.
Social structures, 18, 23, 25, 26, 35, 159, 292. See also headings under Class(es).
Society(ies), colonial, 19, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 35, 117, 159.
Sol, Paul, 29.
Sombart, Werner, 14.
Sorel, seigniory of, 191.
Soulanges, seigniory of, 166.
Spoons, 112.
Stanley, G.F.G., 117, 246, 247.
Starr, Chester G., 275.
Statistics, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 64, 104, 105, 109, 279, 280;
and currency, 6.
Status, social. See Social status.
Stockings, 112.
Stoves, 112.
Subsidy(ies). See New France, subsidy(ies) in.
Sugar, 112.
Sulte, Benjamin, 246, 247.
Superior Council, 25, 71, 80, 83, 85, 161, 190, 197-214, 229, 230, 234, 235, 259;
Attorney-General of, 198, 210, 211, 229;
multiple functions of members of, 201, 202, 203, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 227;
powers of, 198, 199, 200, 212;
salary(ies) of members of, 197, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 211, 212;
secretary of, 197, 210, 232.
Surgeon, wages of,
59.
Taché family,  
270.

Taché, Jean-Paschal,  
100, 101, 112, 113, 114.

Tadoussac,  
82, 208, 228. See also Domaine d'Occident.

Talon, Jean,  
29, 230.

Taschereau family,  
238, 294.

Taschereau, Thomas-Jacques,  

Tawneyism-neo,  
13. See also Ouellet, Fernand.

Tenant farmer. See Censitaire(s).

Terrebonne, seigniory of,  
174, 186, 188, 194, 266.

Testu de la Richardière, Richard,  
96, 225, 266.

Texier et Auger,  
142, 147.

Three Rivers, City of  
76, 79, 97, 104, 105, 108, 109, 113, 216, 222, 223, 231, 233, 238,  
239, 241, 242, 243, 255.

Three Rivers, Governor(s) of,  
60, 216, 222, 238, 239, 241, 253, 262, 267, 268, 269.

Tile(s), Tile industry,  
85, 93, 95, 98, 167, 176, 244.

de Tilly, seigniory of,  
186.

Tobacco,  
112.

Tolles, Frederick B.,  
249.

de Tonnancourt, Anne Ursule Godefroy,  
255.

de Tonnancourt, l'abbé Antoine-Charles, and ship-building,  
101.

Tonnancourt family,  
255, 270.

de Tonnancourt, Louis-Joseph Godefroy,  
de Tonnancourt, René Godefroy, 165, 255.

Tonneller, wages of, 59.

Tonty, Alphonse de, 123, 128, 131.

Trade, 49-53, 64, 151. See also New France, exports; New France, imports.

Trade permits for Hinterland. See Congé(s).

Transportation, 95, 96, 103, 122, 266, 284.

Treasury notes. See Currency.

Trotier family, 144, 255, 257, 269, 270, 274. See also Desauniers, Desrivières.

Troupes de la Marine. See New France, army of.

Troupes, Médecin des, 204. See also Sarrazin, Michel.

Trudel, Marcel, 8, 44, 155, 157, 160, 163, 167, 181, 186, 189, 190, 191, 193, 196, 286, 287.

---

12 Variant spelling: Trottier.
Ursulines,
187.
Utrecht, Treaty of,
1, 74.
Vacher, wages of, 59.
Vallier, M. de, (of the Seminary of Quebec), 107.
Vanasse, Alfred, 169.
de Varennes, Dame, 140.
Varennes family, 263, 269.
de Varennes, Grand Isle, 195.
de Varennes, Jean-Hypolite Gaultier, 263.
de Varennes, Marie-Jeanne Gaultier, 266.
de Varennes, René Gaultier, 253, 260.
Varennes, seigniory of, 183, 188, 195.
Varennes, sieur, 180.
Varin de la Marre, Jean Victor, 60, 103, 209, 214, 217, 218, 249, 251.
Vaudreuil family, 180, 187, 268, 294.
Vaudreuil, Louise-Elisabeth, 247, 268.
Vaudreuil, Philippe de Rigaud, 124, 187, 244, 268.
de Verchères family, 130, 132, 155, 209, 258.
de Verchères, Jean-Baptiste Jarret, 120, 121, 128, 129, 145, 146, 150, 195, 258.
de Verchères, Marie-Madeleine, 266.
de Verchères, Marianne Jarret, 257.
Verchères, seigniory of, 187, 243.
Verrier, Louis-Guillaume, 210, 211, 212, 214.
Villain, 19.
Villechauve, seigniory of, 171.
Villedonné, Etienne, 128.
de Villeray, Hector Rouer, 192, 267.
Villeray, seigniory of, 188.
Villiers family, 258, 285.
de Villiers, Marie Coulon, 257.
de Villiers fils, Nicolas-Antoine Coulon, 130, 266.
de Villiers, Nicolas-Antoine Coulon, 129, 130, 134, 140, 143, 243, 257.
Virginia, 32, 35, 53, 54, 158.
Vivres, purchase of by State, 95, 103, 105-108.
Volant, Louis, 140, 182.
Voyageur(s), 148.
Wabash River,
127.

Wage(s),
   average, 9, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 122, 150, 193, 194, 201, 203, 204, 206, 228, 237, 239, 283, 285. See also New France, wages in.
   levels, 57, 58, 59, 122, 194, 197-214, 215-234, 280. See also New France, wages in.
Weber, Max,
18.

West Indies,
50-53, 64, 211.

Wheat,
47, 192, 194;
   price of, 66, 189, 190, 281;
   sale of, 66, 106, 107, 108, 281;
   trade in, 74.

Wine(s),
112.

Worker(s),
19, 100, 203, 204.