

## Rural Manufacture in Lower Canada: Understanding Seigneurial Privilege and the Transition in the Countryside \*

David Schulze

The paper is a discussion of the theoretical implications of capitalist production based on seigneurial privilege in late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Quebec. This phenomenon is evaluated in the context of the Marxist analysis of the transition to capitalism. While earlier interpretations have characterized such production as essentially mercantile and/or feudalistic, the author considers that it matches Marx's description of the transitional phenomenon of manufacture, the form of capital's first appearance.

L'article est une discussion des implications théoriques de la production capitaliste basée sur le privilège seigneurial au Québec, à la fin du dix-huitième et au début du dix-neuvième siècles. Ce phénomène est apparent dans le contexte de l'analyse marxiste de la transition au capitalisme. Tandis que les interprétations antérieures ont traité cette production d'essentiellement marchande et/ou féodaliste, elle se range à la description par Marx du phénomène de transition qui est la manufacture, la forme de la première apparition du capital.

### Theory: The transition

The nineteenth century saw the emergence of industrial capitalism in Quebec (Lower Canada); that much is acknowledged by any historian of the period. This implied a transition from a predominantly rural society specializing in agricultural production to a predominantly urban one, characterized by industrial production.

Marxist analyses offer a clear and precise characterization of this transition, seeing it as a change in the mode of production; that is, in the social existence of labour. The change was from a primarily agrarian society of petty producers, whose surplus "whether in direct labour or in rent in kind or in money, is transferred under coercive sanction" to "a society producing commodities for exchange in the market, whose principal classes were capital owning entrepreneurs and propertyless wage-earners," the surplus of the latter being appropriated by the former through the sale of labour-power as a commodity.<sup>1</sup>

### The Historical Context

Within the Marxist school, no fully satisfying work of synthesis has been published which enables us to place early nineteenth century Lower Canada in context. Tom Naylor's thesis is that "Anglo-Canadian merchants, factors and representatives of British joint-stock mercantile companies, in collaboration with a Franco-Canadian landed class, intermediated flows of primary staples from the U.S. [sic] to Britain along the St. Lawrence route."<sup>2</sup> Stanley Ryerson suggested that capitalist industry developed along three paths: first, via the timber trade; secondly, manufactories and machine shops as a more direct outgrowth of the industrial revolution in England and, thirdly, a rural French Canadian industrial capitalism. Capitalist development was then blocked by land monopolies and seigneurial tenure which impeded settlement,

the spread of communications, and the growth of a home market, as well as by the imperial trade favoured by the English Canadian merchant-landowners.<sup>3</sup> These analyses strike me as being at once too pessimistic and too simplistic, for reasons which will be made clearer below.

I suggest that Lower Canada is not usefully thought of as belonging to Ernest Mandel's category of "less developed countries" in the period of freely competitive capitalism (for him, roughly from the beginning of the Industrial Revolution to 1860). I quote at length:

The concrete articulation between these countries, which were at that time capitalist "developing nations", and the capitalist world market was two-fold. On the one hand, the import of cheap machine goods from abroad with the accompanying "artillery of cheap prices" was the great destroyer of traditional domestic production. [...] But ... local machine industry was able to take the place of local domestic industry in about ten years, i.e., the foreign products simply cleared the ground for the development of "national" capitalism.

On the other hand, the rapid specialization in their foreign trade was able to secure important sectors of the world market as outlets for these rising capitalist economies. The profits thus realized became, in their turn, the main source for the local accumulation of capital.

It is also true, of course, that integration into the world market and conditions of relative underdevelopment in this phase had very negative effects on primitive accumulation of capital in these countries. The exchange of commodities produced in conditions of a lower productivity of labour was an unequal one; it was an exchange of less against more labour, which inevitably led to a drain, an outward flow of value and capital from these countries to the advantage of Western Europe. The presence of large reserves of cheap labour and land in these countries logically resulted in a capital accumulation with a lower organic composition of capital than in the first industrialized countries. But the extent of this drain and of this lower organic composition were not sufficient to pose a serious threat to the indigenous and independent accumulation of capital -- at least not in those countries where social and political class forces were already capable of replacing the destruction of an artisanate by the development of national large-scale industry.<sup>4</sup>

The most important point, with reference to Quebec's economy is that it was decidedly not "underdeveloped" (as in much of Latin America, for instance), nor was its development chiefly "mercantile," in the sense of being

predominantly oriented toward circulation as such rather than (capitalist) production. For instance, it is true that production in this period was affected by increased British demand for Canadian wheat and timber, created by Napoleon's Continental Blockade which greatly affected Lower Canada's development, but the growth of the population (estimated at 65,000 in 1765 and over 1,000,000 one hundred years later<sup>5</sup>) also had an effect since production was for both an export and a domestic market.

Crucial to an understanding of pre-industrial Quebec is the fact that the major part of the land occupied by European petty producers was not owned "free-hold," but, in the words of Lord Durham, had "feudal burthens" attached to it.<sup>6</sup> Land, the principal means of production, was held under seigneurial tenure and the privileges of the seigneurs included the right of concession, the right to an annual rent ("cens et rentes"), the right to one-twelfth of the price of sale or exchange of land, the "droit de banalite" (the seigneurs provided a mill which their censitaires were obliged to use at the price of one-fourteenth of their grain) as well as having rights over hunting and fishing. In addition, certain privileges were attached, depending upon the contracts between the seigneur and the first censitaire: "corvee" (obligatory labour), the right to retain concessions which changed hands through the reimbursement of the buyer, and the "servitudes," including the censitaires' obligation to maintain the roads and the right of the seigneur to take or reserve wood, stone, minerals, or land for the construction and placement of churches, manors, farms, mills or public works, as well as the right to forbid the construction of mills or manufactures by others, subject to his conditions.<sup>7</sup>

Louise Dechêne has described the seigneuries of New France not as a "cadre de production," but a "système fiscal, créé pour des structures économiques et sociales quasi-immobiles, qui a survécu à l'extension du marché."<sup>8</sup> Seigneurial tenure was ended in 1854 through a reimbursement of the seigneurs for these privileges by the government and the censitaires, and the conversion of the rights over unconceded land to outright property.

There has been considerable debate on the state of agricultural production in early nineteenth century Lower Canada which I cannot adequately survey here. Generally speaking, I adopt the analysis presented by Serge Courville: that that was no crisis in agricultural production, though the habitant reoriented his production to better meet the changing demands of the market:

En 1844, cette transformation est complétée, l'agriculture étant tout à fait intégrée dans l'espace. Ce qui laisse croire que les malaises enregistrés par les chroniqueurs témoignent plus d'une crise du monde rural que d'une crise agricole comme telle, mettant ainsi en cause davantage les conditions dans lesquelles évolue l'agriculture que les techniques de production de l'habitant...<sup>9</sup>

Using 1831 Census data, Courville was able to make the nature of this "malaise" quite clear: "D'un rang à l'autre, d'une paroisse à l'autre, les taux [de cens et rentes] varient du simple au double ou au triple, parfois plus, pour atteindre sur les fronts pionniers des seuils sans précédents, liés à l'augmentation des tarifs en numéraire et en produits à l'insertion, dans les contrats de concession, de servitudes et de réserves nouvelles (sur le bois notamment) qui grèvent d'autant les conditions de détention des censives."<sup>10</sup>

In their frequent petitions to the House of Assembly, the censitaires themselves eloquently described the general state of the administration of the seigneuries in the early nineteenth century: "That the Petitioners [the

Freeholders of the Parish of St. Nicholas] complain of the Seigniorial Rents which have been raised to three or four times what they originally were, and which may be, as in fact they daily are, raised still higher; [...] of numerous unjust and vexatious reserves, the principal of which are, the reserve of all the timber fit for the Saw Mill or the Lumber Market..."<sup>11</sup>

Most important, in the context of the population increase mentioned earlier, were the difficulties in acquiring land. A group of "divers Censitaires" possessors of Land en roture in this Province" in 1825 observed that "Vast quantities of these Lands [i.e., "of this province"] are at this day lying in a state of nature" due to "an unwillingness on the part of the present proprietors to concede these Lands, being willing to avail themselves of the present rapid increase in the value of landed property in order to be enabled to exact hereafter more lucrative rents and duties, thereby perverting Royal Munificence into a Land speculation."<sup>12</sup>

#### The Problem: Theoretical considerations

This essay's real starting point is Barthélemy Boliette, the seigneur of Lavaltrie from 1822 until his death in 1850, whose biography was published in 1972 in the Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française by Jean-Claude Robert.<sup>13</sup> Joliette was a notary who, in 1822, inherited a quarter of the seigneurie of Lavaltrie through his wife. His uncle, mill-owner and notary at l'Assomption with whom Joliette had apprenticed, had administered the seigneurie for ten years previously. Joliette administered the seigneurie for his brother-in-law and his sister-in-law's husband, the co-inheritors.

Within the first two years of his administration, the majority of arrears on the part of the censitaires were paid off by them, partly in the form of labour and wood. Joliette then established the Village d'Industrie by

building a complex of saw mills at a cost of 128,467 livres on one of the two seigneurial domains (which also provided much of the wood at first). By 1842, these mills employed approximately thirty people. He obtained the wood from his own seigneurie (in part through the "droit de retrait"), from property in the neighbouring township of Kildare and by buying the rights to wood on neighbouring seigneuries, apparently running the lumber shanties himself. Later on, he built a distillery which he sold to an associate and which burned to the ground shortly afterwards. He also made plans for glass manufacturing, but these were never carried out. At the end of his life, he had a twelve-mile railroad built to expedite the shipment of wood from Joliette to Quebec City (financed, in part, by shares sold to his censitaires).<sup>14</sup>

Robert's article has not gone unnoticed in the literature, but the commentaries which are available have not solved, to my satisfaction, the problem of how to understand the economic activity of a man who was a "capital owning entrepreneur" employing "propertyless wage-earners" -- with funds and resources accumulated through a form of coercive sanction, however modified. Robert himself chose to analyze a Canadian seigneur and the village he founded using the concepts of urbanization and the entrepreneur. The concept of a transition between modes of production, characterized by different means of appropriating surplus (and, by implication, the dynamic of class conflict) are absent from his study.

Fernand Ouellet, historian of early nineteenth century Quebec, saw seigneurs like Joliette as "intéressants dans la perspective de la mise en place du conflit entre capitalisme et propriété seigneuriale" but concludes that it is chiefly anglophone bourgeois seigneurs who thus put the seigneurial system in question, while among the bourgeois francophones "la primauté va décidément dans l'ensemble aux considérations sociales."<sup>15</sup>

Joliette received considerable attention from Gerald Bernier and Daniel Salée, two political scientists attempting a neo-Marxist analysis of the economy of Lower Canada, whose over-all analysis is similar to Naylor's and which cites his work. They define Lower Canada as an "économie marchande" whose essential characteristics are: a "hypertrophie" in circulation at the expense of production, the dominance of capital accumulated and recycled through exchange ("capital marchand"), the exploitation of land for speculative purposes and/or mercantilist ones (i.e., the categories of goods produced are determined by external demand), and the enlarged reproduction of dominant, non-capitalist relations of production. "Forme de production insolite s'il en est, elle revêt certaines allures capitalistes, mais procède d'une logique fondamentalement féodaliste." The manufacturing potential of Lower Canada was largely ignored by the "bourgeoisie marchande" and the expansion of capitalist relations of production finally came through a gradual passage from artisanal production to manufacturing.<sup>16</sup>

In a manner not unlike Ouellet, who mentions Joliette only to put him aside since he has already decided that for francophone bourgeois seigneurs "l'attrait des valeurs nobiliaires" is prime, Bernier and Salée decide his activities are not genuinely capitalist:

Dans le cadre d'une économie à dominante marchande, la capitalisation de la rente foncière est essentiellement tributaire des impératifs du capital marchand; tant que persiste, à tout le moins, le caractère mercantiliste dominant des fonctions économiques. La construction de canaux ou l'érection de moulins à scie sont d'abord motivées par la nature des activités commerciales en cours dans la colonie. Elles sont directement fonction des échanges avec la métropole; d'une part, les nouveaux canaux dans Beauharnois sont essentiels à l'amélioration des échanges marchands, et, d'autre part, le développement de l'industrie du bois dans Lavaltrie est complètement dépendant de la demande britannique pour ce produit.<sup>17</sup>

This is further supported with the following:

Ainsi donc, bien que les initiatives économiques de certains seigneurs puissent revêtir une apparence typiquement capitaliste, elles s'accomplissent en réalité non pas sur la base d'extorsion de plus value, ce qui est le propre du capitalisme, mais sur la base de corvées obligatoires, du travail gratuit en remboursement de dettes et de rapports de soumission/exploitation de nature essentiellement féodaliste.<sup>18</sup>

The assertion that the labour for the seigneurs' seemingly capitalist activity was provided by corvée and as repayment of debts is simply untrue. Joliette did receive some of the arrears due to him in the form of labour,<sup>19</sup> just as at least one other seigneur, Joseph Drapeau at la Baie-du-Ha!Ha!, built his moulin banal (but never anything else) with corvée labour in 1844-45.<sup>20</sup> However, neither arrears nor, especially, corvée, could have guaranteed enough labour for undertakings like Joliette's, nor was it necessary, given that the population was increasing while land for settlement became more inaccessible. As the curé wrote of the Village d'Industrie's first inhabitants:

gens inconnus qui viennent déjà assaillir nos portes le sac au dos.  
[...] Ces gens sans le sou s'établissent dans le voisinage du moulin...<sup>21</sup>

It could, perhaps, more reasonably be objected that the work-force of many of the capitalist seigneurs' enterprises may sometimes have been part-time farmers and thus not yet a proletariat in the sense of subsisting only through the sale of its labour-power, though not for Joliette it appears.

Much more important, however, is Bernier and Salée's insistence that production responding to demand in the métropole, conditioned by exchange, is not genuinely capitalist, but merely another incarnation of merchant capital. This results from a fundamental misconception of the nature of merchant capital, shared by authors such as Naylor. To cite Marx: "...merchant's capital is penned in the sphere of circulation ... its function consists exclusively of promoting the exchange of commodities"<sup>22</sup>

(emphasis added). Joliette's activity in large part was in fact intimately connected to production: his mills, for instance, match Marx's formula for capital, "in which living labour stands in the relation of non-property to raw material, instrument and the means of subsistence required during the period of production."<sup>23</sup>

For Bernier and Salée, the introduction of new, capitalist relations of production seems to be only directly attributable to a gradual passage from "artisanat" to manufacture.<sup>24</sup> This suggests a misunderstanding of Marx's description of the two forms of transition to capitalism:

First, the merchant becomes an industrial capitalist. This is true in crafts based on trade ... Second, the merchant turns the small masters into his middlemen, or buys directly from the independent producer, leaving him nominally independent and his mode of production unchanged. Third, the industrialist becomes merchant and produces directly for the whole market.<sup>25</sup>

Marx calls the last way "the really revolutionising path," in which "the producer becomes merchant and capitalist, in contrast to the natural agricultural economy and guild-bound handicrafts," but he does not put in doubt the extent to which the first path (merchant capital taking over industrial production) fully constitutes industrial capitalism. Moreover, he recognizes the connection to circulation as crucial to that transformation, not somehow non-capitalist.

Perhaps the example of Barthélemy Joliette does not make this theoretical point sufficiently clear. A better example would be Simon McTavish, fur trader and seigneur of Terrebonne from 1802 until his death in 1804 after which the executors of his will administered the seigneurie until it was sold to Joseph Masson in 1832. The fur trade was indeed merchant capital, with only an incidental use of wage-labour relative to over-all activity; namely, the exchange of commodities between two different modes of production. A

portion of McTavish's merchant capital became industrial capital at Terrebonne, from where voyageurs departed for the interior and had to be supplied with provisions:

[McTavish] ran a store and two very modern flour mills, built a bakery that made biscuit for the northwest, set up a sawmill and encouraged the manufacture of barrels. He was not content just to collect the seigneurial rents but tried to channel the region's surplus production to his mills. The wheat he processed was intended for the local market and for export.<sup>27</sup>

It seems that, as with Joliette's developments, those of McTavish attracted a pool of labourers, giving birth to the village of Terrebonne.<sup>28</sup> In this form, then, merchant capital had invested in industrial capitalist production, albeit in a subsidiary function, having provided a market through trade.

It should be noted that the technology most important in the capitalist production discussed here, the mill, was itself in the midst of a transition. "Merchant milling" for commercial purposes, using a technology that increasingly required a small labour force, was displacing the "custom milling" for local use (often merely the farmer's personal use) that had been artisanal, needing only a master miller, his journeyman and apprentice. In this sense, then, seigneurs like Joliette were also following the non-revolutionary path in terms of a transition to capitalist milling operations.<sup>29</sup>

The activity of capitalist seigneurs does not, however, merely raise the theoretical issue of merchant capital. Marx explicitly deals with the type of enterprise in which Joliette and McTavish were involved. We quote him here at length because his remarks are so directly relevant:

The original historical forms in which capital appears at first sporadically or locally, side by side with the old modes of production, but gradually bursting them asunder, make up manufacture in the proper sense of the word (not yet the factory). This arises, where there is mass-production for export -- hence on the basis of large-scale maritime and overland trade, and in the centres of such

trade ... Manufacture does not initially capture the so-called urban crafts, but the rural subsidiary occupations, spinning and weaving, the sort of work which least requires craft skill, technical training. Apart from those great emporia, in which it finds the basis of an export market, and where production is, as it were by its spontaneous nature, directed towards exchange-value -- i.e. manufactures directly connected with shipping, including shipbuilding itself, etc. -- manufacture first establishes itself not in the cities but in the countryside, in villages lacking guilds, etc. The rural subsidiary occupations contain the broad basis of manufactures, whereas a high degree of progress in production is required in order to carry on the urban crafts as factory industries. Such branches of production as glassworks, metal factories, sawmills, etc., which from the start demand a greater concentration of labour-power, utilise more natural power, and demand both mass-production and a concentration of the means of production, etc.: these also lend themselves to manufacture. Similarly papermills, etc.

[...] For its first prerequisite is the involvement of the entire countryside in the production, not of use values, but of exchange values. Glassworks, papermills, ironworks, etc. cannot be conducted on guild principles. They require mass-production, sales to a general market, monetary wealth on the part of the entrepreneur. Not that he creates the subjective or objective conditions; but under the old relations of property and production these conditions cannot be brought together. (After this the dissolution of the relations of serfdom and the rise of manufacture gradually transform all branches of production into branches operated by capital.)<sup>30</sup>

For Marx, rural manufacture is a preliminary form of capital production, appearing in the countryside before the transformation has fully taken place in the town -- where it later leads to a concentration of production which subordinates the countryside and enforces rural backwardness.<sup>31</sup> It requires a concentration of labour and of the means of production, needs natural power and mass production, and requires monetary wealth (the latter, by Marx's definition, "accumulated through mercantile profits"<sup>32</sup>). Could there be a more succinct summary of the essential elements of Joliette's activity? In fact, it is virtually a list of the potential resources offered by the Canadian seigneurie.

Moreover, regarding the role of monetary wealth and the connection between the question of rural manufacture on the one hand, and the question of merchant to industrial capital on the other, it is useful to cite Marx on

one more point: "[Capital's] original formation occurs simply because the historic process of the dissolution of an old mode of production allows value, existing in the form of monetary wealth to buy the objective conditions of labour on one hand, to exchange the living labour of the now free workers for money, on the other.<sup>33</sup>

By establishing a strict definition of capitalism which Joliette does not match, Bernier and Salée have missed the point: we are dealing here with an inherently transitional form. The presence of semi-feudal elements is not proof of its non-capitalist nature, but an indication of its position relative to the eventual full development of a capitalist mode of production in Quebec.

#### Characterizing the phenomenon

In discussing capitalist production by seigneurs, most authors have been content to deal with Joliette and, occasionally, Joseph Masson. There has been no real attempt to enumerate the use of seigneurial privilege such as Joliette's, nor is there any reason to if one does not view them in terms of control of the means of production -- that is, class relations -- nor if, like Bernier and Salée, one regards the phenomenon as somehow illegitimate.<sup>34</sup>

Unfortunately, the most likely source for a quantitative analysis of the phenomenon, the census, is of only minimal use since, for the three major censuses before commutation (1831, 1842, 1851), neither ownership of mills, nor numbers of employees are listed with any regularity. For at least the 1851 census the printed totals are, in my experience, unreliable, so that the larger picture would have to be reconstructed from a tabulation of the manuscript. Moreover, since there is reason to believe that the enumerators

of the 1851 census missed many of the Ontario mills, there is a strong possibility their Quebec counterparts did the same, so that even the manuscript would be inaccurate. In all likelihood, a roughly reliable quantitative portrait of this phenomenon could only emerge after exhaustive searches of the notarial, judicial and (remaining) seigneurial records, a project not within the scope of this analysis.

In spite of these difficulties, certain aspects of the industrial capitalist use of seigneurial privilege are readily apparent, even after an analysis of only the secondary and printed primary sources. To begin with, the question must be posed not in terms of seigneurs, but of seigneurial privilege, or it becomes a study of biographies rather than of relations of production. When Thomas Mears and Peter McGill (Jr.) ran saw mills and shanties in the seigneurie of La Petite Nation, they rented mills built by the Papineaus, paid for the privilege of "coupe de bois" and used a labour force provided by the Papineaus' concession of marginal land. By 1851, one of the saw mills employed ten men, the other forty. The former was sold to Alanson Cook in 1852; but Louis-Joseph Papineau reserved the land and the rights over its use, including the power of the Chaudière Falls.<sup>36</sup> Their fully capitalist activity took place using the pre-condition of seigneurial privilege, fully exploited by both the Papineaus (in terms of contractual rights and collection of revenue) and Joliette.<sup>37</sup> For Mears and McGill, as for Edouard Scallon, a partner of Joliette whose access to Lavaltrie's productive possibilities always required payment to Joliette or his widow,<sup>38</sup> the use of seigneurial privilege was an essential part of their institution of capitalist production.

Significantly, it was the privilege perhaps more than the activities of the specific seigneurs (since control would often pass from their heirs to others, as from Joliette's widow to Scallon) which continued to influence the development of rural industry after the commutation of seigneurial tenure. The Etchemin Mills, for instance, were one of Lower Canada's largest complexes of saw mills, built in the seigneurie of Lauzon by Henry Caldwell who had used his privileges as seigneur to assemble the land and ensure a steady supply of timber.<sup>39</sup> They were bought at a sheriff's sale in 1856 by the merchant, Henry Atkinson, whose family kept them producing various wood-related products until 1935. They remained of such importance that in 1958 one local wrote "La plupart [des gens de St-Romuald] ont des parents qui y ont travaillé, s'ils n'y ont pas travaillé eux-mêmes..."<sup>40</sup>

The most striking feature of the phenomenon we are analyzing -- albeit through an inevitably incomplete search for evidence -- is its pervasiveness, precisely because it stems not from mentalités (as in Ouellet's psycho-social analysis), nor individual characteristics (as in Robert's entrepreneurial-biographical approach), but from the nature of seigneurial privilege itself. Capitalist production on the basis of seigneurial privilege was introduced by francophones such as Joliette and anglophones such as McTavish, by political reactionaries such as Caldwell and by no less a political figure than the Patriote Dr. Wolfred Nelson, who operated a distillery at St-Denis-sur-Richelieu in partnership with the seigneur Louis Deschambault (burned to the ground by British soldiers during the 1837 Rebellion he helped to lead).<sup>41</sup>

Eustache-Nicolas Lambert-Dumont, the seigneur of Mille-Isles (division du Chêne), was a direct descendant of the original seigneur (he was the fifth generation) and ran six flour mills, five saw mills and a carding and fulling

mill there. His grandson, Godroy Laviolette, inheritor of the Augmentation des Mille-Isles, carried on this capitalist tradition in the period 1850-1881: "Il fut pour les travailleurs de Saint-Jérôme une vraie providence, s'ingéniant sans cesse, de longues années durant, à créer des industries qui employaient quantité d'ouvriers."<sup>43</sup> If any seigneurs belonged to Ouellet's dubious category of Canadian "noblesse" (dubious since being a seigneur carried no privileges not attached to the seigneurie), it would be Dumont and Laviolette yet, this did not make their activity any less capitalist than that of an "enrichi" like Nicolas Montour who built iron forges and furnaces on the seigneurie of Pointe-du-Lac which he bought in his forties, after having made his fortune in the fur trade.<sup>44</sup>

By the same token, this phenomenon occurred in the district of Montreal (Mille-Isles, Terrebonne), of Trois-Rivières (Montour), Quebec (George Allsopp ran a paper mill and a large flour milling and biscuit-baking operation on his Jacques-Cartier seigneurie<sup>45</sup>). It also occurred to a large extent in the Gaspésie, where seigneuries were acquired by fish merchants to complete their control over their fishermen clients, but where they also organized lumber shanties, operated saw mills and used the lumber for shipbuilding.<sup>46</sup>

In addition to existing in every region and under the auspices of seigneurs of varying backgrounds, it should be emphasized that this incipient capitalist production did produce for a local market, distilling, for instance, and, in some cases, woollen and textile manufacturing, as in Montarville in the 1820s where American industrialists rented a seigneurial flour mill and used it for carding and textile manufacturing or, in Beauharnois in the 1850s where Montreal entrepreneurs bought water-power rights from the seigneur and formed the Dominion Woolen Manufacturing

Co. Many kinds of production were of course complementary: a mill receiving grain might easily use it for distilling, which might also require glass production; one producing flour might use it for biscuits and, if it received timber as well, add a cooperage to produce barrels in which to store the flour.

Iron manufacturing took place via seigneurial privilege, both at the St. Maurice Forges, where the lease from the crown carried the privileges of a seigneury<sup>48</sup> and at Ste-Geneviève-de-Batiscan, where the Batiscan was leased from the crown and neighbouring Champlain bought by the group of merchants running them.<sup>49</sup> It involved both the production of bar iron for export and of stoves for local use.<sup>50</sup> The St. Maurice Forges at least (the Batiscan Forges failed after a short time) were of considerable importance in terms of their use of wage labour. In 1843, their lessee, Mathew Bell, called the attention of the government "to the destitute situation of workmen and their families, residents at the works, should the [lease] be discontinued:"

These people, four hundred and twenty-five souls, (Mr. Bell adds,) are nearly all Canadians, born and brought up at the Post, and several of the families are descendants of the workmen found there at the Conquest, who never left the Establishment; and there are besides about three hundred more people fed at the Works at particular seasons of the year; and the farmers in the neighbourhood have always had a ready market for hay and oats, etc., etc., thus showing the vast importance which these Works have hitherto been to the Town and District...<sup>51</sup>

Capitalist production through seigneurial privilege can thus not be easily dismissed: though the cursory evidence assembled here shows a predominance of production for export, it also produced for the domestic market, and while it used a system of production as primitive as the lumber shanty or as limited as a mill with a half-dozen employees, it could be as large and sophisticated as the St. Maurice Forges.

#### The Phenomenon in comparative perspective

The involvement of landed nobility and gentry in capitalist production in Europe is already well-known to historians.<sup>52</sup> Of particular interest for this study are Guy Richard's articles on nobility's involvement in industry in Normandy after the French Revolution.<sup>53</sup> Even after the revolutionary abolition of feudal tenure, noble families--old and new--were able to use their control of natural power (streams and rivers running through land they still owned) to introduce mass production.

In the eighteenth century in the British colony of New York, the manorial system (left from the Dutch régime) allowed the landlords, many of whom were also merchants, to establish saw mills, grist mills, bolting houses, bake houses and iron manufacturing, using the exclusive milling and mining rights which conveyances (contracts with tenants) gave them, presumably financed through the annual rent and the sale rights paid to them by their tenants.<sup>54</sup> On Prince Edward Island, in the early nineteenth century, the land monopolies used their resources to develop a lumber and shipbuilding industry:

The land being rich with timber, the landlords brought out new settlers from Britain, rented them land, and offered them the "opportunity" of paying their rents by cutting lumber and working in shipyards. The value of this labour was rated so low however that it was insufficient to pay the rents. The landlords demanded additional payments in cash, which the tenants seldom had. Consequently they sank into debt to the landlords.<sup>55</sup>

The most interesting comparisons, however, can be made with other regions of Lower Canada, those settled under the free-hold system. To begin with, however, it should be noted that free-hold tenure (applied to new lands conceded after the conquest) was not necessarily as free as has often been assumed. The seigneurs of Lavaltrie, for instance, controlled a large part of the neighbouring township of Kildare (township land was assigned through a

leader system which granted vast portions of townships to individuals or land companies who were then responsible for further granting lots to settlers). Robert maintains that free and common soccage "impliquait un achat pur et simple de la terre, libre par la suite de tout lien", but writes elsewhere that the contracts of concession Joliette made for land in Kildare included the obligation to have wood sawed at his mills. Thus, the township lands "étaient dans la réalité partie intégrante de la seigneurie de Lavaltrie et étaient considérés comme tels par les seigneurs."<sup>56</sup>

There is reason to believe that this was not an isolated case: the 1851 Reports of the Special Committee Appointed to Inquire into the Causes which Retard the Settlement of the Eastern Townships reproduced in its entirety a contract of concession with an impressive list of obligations, between Charles Turgeon, Esq., "Merchant, residing in the City of Québec, proprietor of certain lands situate in the Township of Maddington" and Jacques Dion, farmer. The sale was made "in consideration of an annual, perpetual and irredeemable ground-rent, rent foncière, non rachetable, of one shilling currency" payable after redemption of a constituted rent of £ 112. 10s; payment of constituted rent could be delayed in return for an annual and perpetual ground rent of 20 shillings during the purchaser's personal occupation which upon any transfer of the property would "be increased by the said change of title, until it be equivalent to the legal interest upon the said capital sum of £ 112." The vendor and his heirs also had the right of pre-emption over the land in whole or in part. He reserved the rivers and brooks, mines, mineral lands, minerals, quarries of stone or slate, and limestone, timber, "as also the proprietorship of a land of six arpents in superficie, fit and proper for the construction and erection of one or more grist or saw mills, or any other mills or manufactories whatsoever; as also

for a road, as a means of communications therewith" subject only to payment of "the value of the clearing or improvement." It was also "expressly agreed, by and between the said parties, that neither the said purchaser, his heirs, nor any of their successors whomsoever...shall ever in any case construct any grist-mill or saw-mill upon the said land."<sup>57</sup> This was a set of servitudes as complete as any seigneurial contract might include.

Not surprisingly, then, there are cases of township land grantees who operated manufactures on their land grants. In his 1815 Topographical Description of Lower Canada, for instance, Joseph Bouchette described Hyat's Mills, "a valuable property" at the foot of the great fall at the forks of the St. Francis, Township of Ascot, belonging to Gilbert Hyat, one of Ascot's original grantees, and its largest landowner.<sup>58</sup> When Ascot came under the domination of the British American Land Company in the mid-nineteenth century, the town of Hyat's Mills was renamed Sherbrooke.

Another interesting case is that of Paul Holland Knowlton, who was appointed agent to dispose of unsold land in Brome Township in 1827 and had purchased much of the land himself in a few years' time. At his first farm, on Brome Lake, settled in 1815, he had operated a store and distillery. In 1834 he moved to a stream flowing into the lake, over which he took up water rights, and set up a saw mill to produce building materials, as well as "a large house with offices attached, a smithy and its shop, a pearlshery and, later, a store and grist mill which became the nucleus of the village of Knowlton ... These facilities enhanced the value of the wild land in the neighbourhood, much of which either belonged to him or passed through his hands."<sup>59</sup>

More important to this analysis than the fact that even township land sometimes included the expropriation of the producer's surplus through legal

coercion (i.e., rent, milling obligations) is the exploitation by grantees of their control over resources such as land, motive power and raw materials to establish manufactures. In nations such as France, where feudal tenure had been almost universal, the control of such resources was historically connected to coercive surplus extortion. In North America, however, once the aboriginal population was eliminated there was an abundance of unsettled, unoccupied land, and these resources could be monopolized by an elite under a variety of legal forms. Thus, the capitalist activity of seigneurs in Lower Canada must be seen as growing out of the institutionalization of the control and exploitation of resources in a land in large part not yet settled (by Europeans) during the transition to capitalism, not merely a capitalistic transformation of the exploitation of feudalistic privilege.<sup>60</sup> Rural manufacture was a transitional phenomenon which no longer required the outright control over land and labour exercised by feudal lords but, merely, the coercive power of the law and market relationships. This coercive power or de facto control could be exercised through bourgeois property (as in post-revolutionary France or in Prince Edward Island) or through a semi-feudal system such as that in Lower Canada.

A final qualification worth making is that, Berthélemy Joliette notwithstanding, the relationship between seigneurial privilege and the development of capitalist production was not necessarily simple nor smooth, the former by no means automatically facilitating the latter. To begin with, a seigneur could very profitably exploit his seigneurie in an essentially rentier fashion: simply using his various privileges (such as the rents, banalités, corvée, right of concession and retrait and, thus, of speculation) to extract the maximum amount of surplus from his censitaires without ever introducing new, capitalist productive relationships.<sup>61</sup> Moreover, the

agitation by the Montreal bourgeoisie for an end to the Sulpician Seminary's privilege over their seigneurie of Montreal as early as the 1820s demonstrates that the existence of those privileges could also conflict with capitalist development.<sup>62</sup>

The "commutation" of seigneurial tenure in 1854 suggests that it eventually did become incompatible with further capitalist development. It was legislated by a liberal-tory coalition in the assembly, under the influence of the lieutenant-governor, suggesting a high degree of consensus on the issue among various elements of the dominant classes. The result was a profoundly non-revolutionary transformation of land tenure, in which seigneurs kept unconceded land as private property and were indemnified by the state for their privileges, while the cens et rentes were paid off to them by the censitaires in either a lump sum or over time.<sup>63</sup> This transformation was necessary, however, for the consolidation of capitalism in Quebec. Rural manufacture under whatever form was, as I have pointed out, inherently transitional. The full development of capitalism required the elimination of urban crafts in favour of factory production. Fully capitalist production in the cities required "la différenciation de la masse paysanne et sa polarisation entre le capital et le travail salarié,"<sup>64</sup> which the "commutation" of the older, pre-capitalist relations of production in the countryside ensured.

#### Conclusions

The most important aspect of nineteenth century Quebec history is its transition from a rural society dominated by agricultural production to an urban one characterized by industrial production. In Marxist terms, this was the transition to capitalism, from a population of petty producers whose

surplus was expropriated under coercive sanction (as well as through exchange), to one of property-less wage earners whose surplus was expropriated by those in control of the means of production to whom they sold their labour-power.

Earlier Marxist and neo-Marxist analyses have emphasized the importance of merchant capital ("penned in the sphere of circulation") and of the burdens imposed on agricultural production by seigneurial tenure and land monopolies in Lower Canada, implying some form of "underdevelopment" in the (capitalist) economy (which eventually resulted). The only such analysis which has examined industrial production which emerged on the basis of seigneurial privilege (and often in connection with merchant capital) rejected such production as essentially mercantile and feudalistic.

In fact, not only was such industrial production capitalist, in the sense of the sale of labour-power by property-less wage earners to persons monopolizing the means of production but, other characteristics of this production matched Marx's description of the transitional phenomenon of manufacture ("not yet the factory"), the form of capital's first appearance. Manufacture transforms the rural subsidiary occupations, requiring a concentration of labour-power, natural power and of the means of production as well as "mass-production, sales to a general market, [and] monetary wealth on the part of the entrepreneur." Moreover, the fact that such production followed the "non-revolutionizing path" of capitalist development ("the merchant becomes an industrialist") did not make it any less capitalist.

The ensemble of privileges which constituted seigneurial tenure for the seigneur (and were sometimes found even under free-hold tenure) steadily increased during this period at the expense of the petty producers and included many of the requirements of manufacture, particularly concentration

of natural power and the means of production. Speculative practices in the concession of land increased the available labour power, just as upward pressure on cens et rentes provided a growing source of monetary wealth. Thus, while Barthélemy Joliette and his Village d'Industrie at Lavaltrie is the best-known example in the historical literature, a survey of the secondary and printed primary sources quickly reveals that the institution of capitalist production on the basis of seigneurial privilege was widespread in Lower Canada, occurring in all regions, under seigneurs of varying backgrounds and with a variety of products, including some for domestic consumption as well as export and sometimes using quite sophisticated technology. Manufacture developed similarly (under the direction of landlords or their lessees) in other parts of North America where land tenure allowed a monopolization of motive power and natural resources and sometimes, in addition, the coercive extortion of surplus from producers in the form of rent.

Profitable exploitation of seigneurial privilege did not necessarily result in manufacture, nor did manufacture always develop out of seigneurial privilege and, in the case of Montréal, seigneurial privilege came into conflict with nascent capitalist production early on. Yet, in Louise Dechêne's words:

Loin d'être un repoussoir, les diverses fonctions et contraintes extra-économiques autorisées par la loi des fiefs constituaient une forme idéale de prélèvement sur la petite production. La bourgeoisie de toutes origines trouvait provisoirement son compte à maintenir les rapports sociaux existants, un type de propriété qui n'entre pas en contradiction avec le développement général du pays avant la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle.<sup>65</sup>

This is in sharp contrast to mediterranean France, for instance, where, by 1788, the bourgeoisie had already concluded that seigneurial property--in particular the "moulin banal"--was an obstacle to growth and to progress in production.<sup>66</sup>

This analysis has included only a discussion of the theoretical implications of capitalist production based on seigneurial privilege, as well as its broadest characteristics. A quantitative portrait of the phenomenon over time is needed, though it may prove elusive in view of the available sources. Beyond that, however, the very fact of capitalist development growing out of seigneurial privilege in Lower Canada places the institution of seigneurial tenure and its eventual "commutation", the political and social struggles surrounding it, at the top of the historical agenda if we are to understand Quebec's transition to capitalism.

#### NOTES

- \* The author gratefully acknowledges the help of Professors Richard Rice, Brian Young, and Louise Dechêne, and by Alexander Wright and Vince Masciotra, through their comments and criticism, and most especially Richard Rice's inspired teaching. Responsibility for any errors rests, of course, with me.
1. Rodney Hilton, "Introduction," p.30; "Capitalism--What's in a Name?," p. 148; in Hilton, et al, The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism, London: Verso, 1980.
  2. R.T. Naylor, "The rise and fall of the third commercial empire of the St. Lawrence," in Gary Teeple, ed., Capitalism and the National Question in Canada, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972, p. 35.
  3. Stanley B. Ryerson, Unequal Union: Confederation and the Roots of Conflict in the Canadas, 1815-1873, Toronto: Progress, 1973, p. 30-31, 39-40.
  4. Ernest Mandel, Late Capitalism, London: Verso, 1978, p. 53-54. The historical materialist analysis of Canada's social and economic evolution is in its infancy. What follows is an examination of a single aspect of Quebec's transition to a capitalism still poorly understood.
  5. Serge Courville, "La crise agricole au Bas-Canada, éléments d'une réflexion géographique," (2 parts) Cahiers de géographie du Québec, vol. 24, nos. 62 and 63 (septembre, décembre 1980), p. 391.
  6. C.P. Lucas, ed., Lord Durham's Report on the Affairs of British North America, vol. 2, p. 24; cited in Ryerson, p. 30.

7. Louise Dechêne, "L'évolution du régime seigneurial au Canada: Le cas de Montréal aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles," Recherches sociographiques, vol. 12, no. 2 (mai-août 1971), p. 151-73.
8. Dechêne, p. 181. Seigneurial tenure in Québec was, after all, the creation of the seventeenth century French absolutist state, a state Perry Anderson characterized as "accompanied not by a decrease in the economic security of noble landownership, but by a corresponding increase in the general rights of private property"; Perry Anderson, Lineages of the Absolutist State, London: NLB, 1974, p. 428-29.
9. Courville, p.221.
10. Serge Courville, "Rente déclarée payée sur la censive de 90 arpents au recensement nominatif de 1831: Méthodologie d'une recherche," Cahiers de géographie du Québec, vol. 27, no. 70 (avril 1983), p. 59.
11. Journals of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada, vol. 42, 1832-33, 12th December.
12. Ibid., vol. 34, 1825, 16th March.
13. J.C. Robert, "Un seigneur entrepreneur, Barthélemy Joliette et la fondation du village d'Industrie (Joliette), 1822-1851," Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française, vol. 26, no. 3 (décembre 1972), p. 375-97.
14. For this essay we have used Robert's thesis: "L'activité économique de Barthélemy Joliette et la fondation du village d'Industrie (Joliette), 1822-1850," M.A. these, Université de Montréal, 1971.
15. Fernand Ouellet, "Propriété seigneuriale et groupes sociaux dans la vallée du St-Laurent (1663-1840)," in Mélanges d'histoire du Canada français offerts au professeur Marcel Trudel, Ottawa: Ed. de l'Université d'Ottawa, p. 206, 212.
16. Gérald Bernier and Daniel Salée, "Appropriation foncière et bourgeoisie marchande: Elements pour une analyse de l'économie marchande du Bas-Canada avant 1846," RHAF, vol. 36, no. 2 (septembre 1982), p. 165, 191, 192.
17. Ibid., p. 179-80.
18. Ibidem, p. 180.
19. Robert, p. 80.
20. J.W.M. (sic), "Notes sur les seigneuries du district de Rimouski," Bulletin des recherches historiques, vol. 17 (1911), p. 243.
21. Robert, p. 92-93. In this essay I do not explicitly consider class struggle, either between censitaires and seigneurs (Courville is useful on this point) or seigneur-capitalists and wage-labourers. This is because most of the sources used (local histories, parliamentary papers) refer to it only rarely and even these references would require a separate and complex analysis.

22. Karl Marx, Capital, vol. 3, Moscow: Progress, 1959 ed., Part IV, Chapter XX, p. 325.
23. Karl Marx, Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations, New York: International, 1964, p. 99.
24. Bernier and Salée, p. 192; Naylor also suggests this, p. 3 and p. 34, n. 7.
25. Marx, Capital, vol. 3, p. 335.
26. Ibid., p. 334.
27. Fernand Quellet, "Simon McTavish," Dictionary of Canadian Biography V (1801-1820), Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983, p. 566.
28. L'île des moulins, Quebec City: Ministère des affaires culturelles, Direction général du patrimoine, 1979, p. 15.
29. Felicity L. Leung, Crist and Flour Mills in Ontario, Ottawa: Parks Canada, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, 1981 ("History and Archaeology," no. 53), p. 24-25, 72, 92-101.
30. Marx, Pre-Capitalist..., p. 116, 117.
31. John Merington, "Town and Country in the Transition to Capitalism," in Rodney Hilton, et al, p. 190.
32. Marx, Pre-Capitalist..., p. 107.
33. Ibid., p. 110.
34. In fact, both Bernier and Salée's and Naylor's articles are less the presentation and analysis of historical processes, than of what failed to happen, on the basis of an inexplicit construct of what should have taken place. For a non-Marxist survey of the tradition from which they proceed, see: L.R. MacDonald, "Merchants against Industry: An idea and its origins," Canadian Historical Review, vol. 56, no. 3 (September 1975), p. 263-81.
35. Leung, p. 73.
36. Claude Barbeau, La Seigneurie de la Petite-Nation, 1801-1854, Hull: Ed. Asticou, 1983, p. 101-108.
37. Ibid., p. 66.
38. Roger Barrette, "Edouard Scallon," Dictionary of Canadian Biography IX (1861-1870), Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976, p. 703-704.
39. Marcel Caya, "Henry Caldwell," DCB V, p. 131.
40. Paul de Saurel, "Les Moulins Atkinson," La Seigneurie de Lauzon: Bulletin de la Société d'histoire régionale de Lévis, no. 14 (été 1984), p. 8-14. (Originally published in Le Foyer, St-Romuald, 16, 23, 30 janvier, 13 février 1958).
41. L'abbé Jean-B. Allaire, Histoire de la paroisse de Saint-Denis-sur-Richelieu, St.-Hyacinthe: Impr. du "Courrier de St.-Hyacinthe", 1905, p. 346. Ryerson is clearly mistaken in using this distillery as an example of "indigenous industrial capitalism" opposed to the "imperial-mercantile framework" upheld by merchants, clergy, landowners and seigneurs (p. 40-41). For our part, we are assuming that as manufacture taking place within a seigneurie, the establishment of the distillery necessarily involved seigneurial privilege.
42. McGill University Library Special Collections. Documents of the Lambert-Dumont family. CH 230.S208; Document concerning the demarcation of the Eustache Dumont and J. Brassier properties near St. Eustache.
43. Cited in L'abbé Elie-J. Auclair, Saint-Jérôme de Terrebonne, St-Jérôme: L'Impr.-Photogravure J.-H.-A. Labelle, 1934, p. 297.
44. L'abbé Albert Tessier, "Deux Enrichis: Aaron Hart et Nicolas Montour," Les Cahiers des Dix, vol. 3 (1938), p. 219-21. A Catholic chauvinist, Tessier's presentation of a Jewish and of a Protestant seigneur is marked by anti-protestant and anti-semitic bigotry.
45. David Roberts, "George Allsopp," DCB V p. 20-23; W. Stewart Wallace, The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1978 (4th ed., rev.), p. 13.
46. Jules Bélanger, et al, Histoire de la Gaspésie, Montréal: Boréal Express, 1981, p. 162-65, 186-89, 210-12.
47. Montarville Boucher de la Bruère, "Le 'livre de raison' des seigneurs de Montarville," Les Cahiers des Dix, vol. 4 (1939), p. 257; R.P. Augustin Leduc, Beauharnois: Paroisse Saint-Clément: Histoire religieuse: Histoire civile, Ottawa: Cie. d'Imprimerie d'Ottawa, 1920, p. 193. It is important to note that carding and fulling mills merely performed parts of the process of preparation of wool and could easily be integrated into domestic production, simply making it easier. Woolen and textile manufacture, by contrast, necessarily displaced domestic production.
48. "Copy of a Report of the Honourable the Executive Council on the subject of the Forges of St. Maurice, dated the 15th of September, 1843..." Appendix O, Appendix to the Fourth Volume of the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada, 1844-45, 14th January. The St. Maurice Forges were not the only example of this: shipbuilding began at Sorel on the seigneurial domain (including saw mills), first leased and then sold by the crown, which had retained the seigneurie after the Conquest; l'abbé E. Couillard Despres, Histoire de Sorel: Des origines à nos jours, Sorel: Ed. Beaudry et Frappier, 1980 (reprint of the 1926 edition), p. 309.

49. L'abbé Albert Tessier, Les Forges Saint-Maurice (1729-1883), Montréal: Boréal Express, 1974, p. 140; E.-Z. Massicotte, Sainte-Geneviève-de-Batiscan, Trois-Rivières: Ed. du "Bien Public", 1936, p. 79. Interestingly, Thomas Dunn and George Allsopp, with others, first leased the St. Maurice Forges from 1767 to 1782, then lost the lease and set up the forges at Batiscan.
50. Pierre Toussignant and Jean-Pierre Wallot, "Thomas Dunn," DCB IX, p. 289; Massicotte, p. 80-81.
51. "Copy of a Report..."
52. See for example, Guy Richard, Noblesse d'affaires au XVIIIe siècle, Paris: A. Colin, 1974; Jerome Blum, The End of the Old Order in Rural Europe, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978, p. 295-301. From a Marxist perspective, see Witold Kula's, "L'origine de l'alliance entre la bourgeoisie et les propriétaires fonciers dans la première moitié du XIXe siècle," in La Pologne au Xe Congrès International des sciences historiques à Rome, Warsaw: Académie polonaise des sciences/Institut d'histoire, 1955, p. 217-36; and, R.S. Neale presents an argument for the English gentry as the economically revolutionary class, in "The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part," in E. Kamenka and R.S. Neale, eds., Feudalism, Capitalism and Beyond, Canberra: A.N.U. Press, 1975, p. 85-102.
53. I have consulted Richard's "Du moulin banal au tissage mécanique: La noblesse dans l'industrie textile en Haute-Normandie dans la première moitié du XIXe siècle," Revue d'histoire économique et sociale, vol. 46, nos. 3 and 4 (1968), p. 305-38, 506-49. Of related interest are: "Les nobles métallurgistes dans le département de l'Eure de 1789 à 1850," in Actes du 87e Congrès des Sociétés savantes, Poitiers, 1962, and "Les fonderies Romilly-sur-Andelle et les débuts de la métallurgie non ferreuse en Normandie," in Actes du 88e Congrès des Sociétés savantes, Clermont-Ferrand, 1963.
54. Sung Bok Kim, Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York: Manorial Society, 1664-1775, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978, p. 142-61; Irving Mark, Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York, 1711-1775, New York: Columbia University Theses, 1940 (vol. 1), p. 64.
55. Errol Sharpe, A People's History of Prince Edward Island, Toronto: Steel Rail, 1976, p. 63, 65.
56. Robert, p. 33,83,38. Joliette also conceded a number of lots to himself and to his brother-in-law, p. 83.
57. First and Second Reports of the Special Committee Appointed to Inquire into the Causes which Retard the Settlement of the Eastern Townships of Lower Canada, Québec City: Printed by Order of the Legislative Assembly of Canada, 1851, p. 132-38.
58. Joseph Bouchette, A Topographical Description of Lower Canada, St-Lambert: Canada East Reprints, 1973 (reproduction of the 1815 edition), p. 354-55.

59. Marion L. Phelps, "Paul Holland Knowlton," DCB IX, p. 434.
60. For a fascinating testimonial to the possibilities of a new seignury, see John MacNider's description of how he settled Mitis, in Appendix T, Appendices to the Journals of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada, vol. 32, 1823, 17th March. MacNider's establishment of farming, fishing and lumbering was made possible not just by seignorial privilege, but also by his judicious generosity, which left settlers with just enough supplies to have to work for him and that, in turn, just enough money to be able to buy from his store. His considerable expenditures seem to have bankrupted him, however; J.W. M., "Notes..." p. 357.
61. For a clear, albeit urban, example of this, see: Louise Dechêne, "La rente du faubourg Saint-Roch à Québec, 1750-1850," RHAF, vol. 34, no. 4 (mars 1981), p. 569-96.
62. Brian Young, "The Commutation of Property Privilege from Seignorial to Free Tenure on the Seignury of Montréal, 1840-1870," Paper presented at the meetings of the Canadian Historical Association, June 7, 1983, p. 19-20. Note, for example, the Molsons' commutation of valuable land holdings, p. 16.
63. Ryerson, p. 290.
64. Albert Soboul, "La révolution française dans l'histoire du monde contemporain (Etude comparative)," Recherches internationales à la lumière du marxisme, no. 62 (1970), p. 18.
65. L. Dechêne, "La rente du faubourg...", p. 569-70.
66. Antoine Casanova, Techniques, société rurale et idéologie en France à la fine du XVIIIe siècle, Paris: Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, 1977 ("Les belles lettres," vol. 203), p. 39-40.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allaire, l'abbé Jean-B.-A. Histoire de la paroisse de Saint-Denis-sur-Richelieu. St-Hyacinthe: Impr. du "Courrier de Saint-Hyacinth", 1905.
- Anderson, Perry. Lineages of the Absolutist State. London: NLB, 1974.
- Auclair, l'abbé Elie-J. Saint-Jérôme de Terrebonne. St-Jérôme: Impr.-Photogravure J.-H.-A. Labelle, 1934.
- Baribeau, Claude. La Seigneurie de la Petite-Nation, 1801-1854: Le rôle économique et social du seigneur. (Préface de Fernand Ouellet) Hull: Ed. Asticou, 1983.
- Barrette, Roger. "Edouard Scallon." Dictionary of Canadian Biography IX (1861-1870). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976, p. 703-704.

- Belanger, Jules, Marc Desjardins, Jean-Yves Frenette, with Pierre Dansereau. Histoire de la Gaspésie. Montréal: Boréal Express/Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture, 1981.
- Bernier, Gérald, and Daniel Salée. "Appropriation foncière et bourgeoisie marchande: Éléments pour une analyse de l'économie marchande du Bas-Canada avant 1846." Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française, vol. 36, no. 2 (septembre 1982), p. 163-94.
- Casanova, Antoine. Techniques, société rurale et idéologie en France à la fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle: Recherches sur les rapports entre les possibilités technologiques, banalités du moulin à huile en France méditerranéenne et critique de l'Ancien Régime vers 1789: La critique des banalités d'après le "Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire naturelle de l'olivier" de Bernard. Paris: Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon ("Les belles lettres", vol. 203), 1977.
- Caya, Marcel. "Henry Caldwell." DCB V (1801-1820). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983, p. 130-33.
- Cothart, James M. "Edward Ellice." DCB IX, p. 234-39.
- Courville, Serge. "La crise agricole au Bas-Canada, éléments d'une réflexion géographique." Cahiers de géographie du Québec, vol. 24, nos. 62-63 (septembre, décembre 1980), p. 193-223, 386-428.
- "Rente déclarée payée sur la censive de 90 arpents au recensement nominatif de 1831: Methodologie d'une recherche." Cahiers de géographie du Québec, vol. 27, no. 70 (avril 1983), p. 43-61.
- Cyr, Céline, and Pierre Dufour. "Joseph Drapeau." DCB V, p. 269-72.
- Dechêne, Louise. "L'évolution du régime seigneurial au Canada: Le cas de Montréal aux XVII<sup>e</sup> et XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles." Recherches sociographiques, vol. 12, no. 2 (mai-août 1971), p. 143-83.
- "La rente du faubourg Saint-Roch à Québec, 1750-1850." RHAF, vol. 34, no. 4 (mars 1981), p. 569-96.
- Despres, l'abbé E. Couillard. Histoire de Sorel: Des origines à nos jours. Sorel: Ed. Beaudry et Frappier, 1980. (reprint of the 1926 edition).
- Hilton, Rodney, et. al. The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism. London: Verso edition, 1980. (New Left Books, 1976)
- File des moulins. Québec City: Ministère des Affaires culturelles du Québec, Direction générale du patrimoine, 1979.
- J.W. M. (sic) "Notes sur les seigneuries du district de Rimouski." Bulletin des recherches historiques, vol. 17 (1911), p. 237-46, 257-67, 312-20, 331-38, 353-68.
- Kim Sung Bok. Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York: Manorial Society, 1664-1775. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1978.
- de La Bruere, Montarville Boucher. "Le 'livre de raison' des seigneurs de Montarville." Les Cahiers des Dix, vol. 4 (1939), p. 243-70.
- Leduc, R.P. Augustin. Beauharnois: Paroisse Saint-Clément: Histoire religieuse; Histoire civile; Fêtes du Centenaire. Ottawa: Impr. d'Ottawa, 1920.
- Leung, Felicity L. Grist and Flour Mills in Ontario. Ottawa: Parks Canada, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch ("History and Archaeology," no. 53), 1981.
- MacDonald, L.R. "Merchants against Industry: An idea and its origins." Canadian Historical Review, vol. 56, no. 3 (September 1975), p. 263-81.
- Mandel, Ernest. Late Capitalism. London: Verso, 1978. (New Left Books, 1975; German language edition, 1972).
- Mark, Irving. Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York, 1711-1775. New York: Columbia University These, vol. 1, 1940.
- Marx, Karl. Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations. Introduction by Eric J. Hobsbawm. New York: International Publishers, 1965.
- Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Volume I. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954 edition.
- Capital. Volume III. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1959 edition.
- Massicotte, E. Z. Sainte-Geneviève de Batiscan. Trois-Rivières: Ed. du "Bien Public", 1936 (Pages trifluviennes, Série A-No. 18).
- Naylor, R.T. "The rise and fall of the third commercial empire of the St. Lawrence." in Gary Teeple, ed. Capitalism and the National Question in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.
- Ouellet, Fernand. "Propriété seigneuriale et groupes sociaux dans la vallée du Saint-Laurent (1663-1840)." in Mélanges d'histoire du Canada français offerts au professeur Marcel Trudel. Ottawa: Ed. de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1978 (Cahiers du Centre de recherche en civilisation canadienne-française, no. 14), p. 182-213.
- "Simon McTavish." DCB V, p. 559-66.
- Phelps, Marion L. "Paul Holland Knowlton." DCB IX, p. 433-35.
- Richard, Guy. "Du moulin banal au tissage mécanique: La noblesse dans l'industrie textile en Haute-Normandie dans la première moitié du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle." Revue d'histoire économique et sociale, vol. 46, no. 3-4 (1968), p. 305-338, 505-49.
- Robert, Jean-Claude. "L'activité économique de Barthélemy Joliette et la fondation du village d'Industrie (Joliette), 1822-1850." M.A. thesis: Université de Montréal, 1971.

- Robert, Jean-Claude. "Un seigneur entrepreneur, Barthélemy Joliette et la fondation du village d'Industrie (Joliette), 1822-1851." RHAF, vol. 26, no. 3 (décembre 1972), p. 375-97.
- Roberts, David. "George Allsopp." DCB V, p. 19-23.
- Ryerson, Stanley B. Unequal Union: Confederation and the Roots of Conflict in the Canadas, 1815-1873. Toronto: Progress Books, 1973. (2nd ed.)
- de Saurel, Paul. "Les Moulins Atkinson." La Seigneurie de Lauzon: Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire Régionale de Lévis, no. 14 (été 1984), p. 8-14 (originally published in Le Foyer, St. Romuald, 16, 23, 30 janvier, 13 février 1958).
- Sharpe, Errol. A People's History of Prince Edward Island. Toronto: Steel Rail Publishing, 1976.
- Soboul, Albert. "La Révolution française dans l'histoire du monde contemporain (Etude comparative)." Recherche internationale à la lumière du marxisme, no. 62 (1970), p. 3-40.
- Tessier, Mgr. Albert. "Deux enrichis: Aaron Hart et Nicolas Montour." Les Cahiers des Dix, vol. 3 (1938), p. 217-42.
- Les Forges Saint-Maurice (1729-1883). Montréal: Boréal Express, 1974.
- Toussignant, Pierre, and Jean-Pierre Wallot. "Thomas Dunn." DCB IX, p. 2-
- Wallace, W. Stewart, ed. The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography. Revised, etc. by W.A. McKay. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1978. (4th edition)
- Young, Brian. "The Commutation of Property Privilege from Seigniorial to Free Tenure on the Seigneurie of Montréal, 1840-1870." Paper delivered at the Canadian Historical Association meetings, June 7, 1983, Vancouver, B.C.

#### PRIMARY SOURCES

- McGill University Library Special Collections. Documents of the Lambert-Dumont family. CH 230.S208. Legal documents of the Lambert-Dumont family, 1780-1838.
- Bouchette, Joseph. A Topographical Description of Lower Canada... St. Lambert: Canada East Reprints, 1973. (reproduction of the 1815 edition)
- The British Dominions in North America... London: Logman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green and Longman, 1832.
- Appendix T., Appendices to the Journals of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada, 1823, vol. 32. Testimony of John MacNider.

- "A Petition of divers Censitaires possessors of Land en roture in this Province..." Journals..., 1825, vol. 34, 16th March.
- "A Petition of divers Inhabitants Censitaires and resident in the Seigniorie of Lotbiniere..." Journals..., 1832-33, vol. 42, 20th November.
- "A Petition of divers Proprietors Censitaires of the Seigniorie of Beauharnois..." Journals..., 1832-33, vol. 42, 5th December.
- "A Petition of the Freeholders of the Parish of St. Nicholas..." Journals..., 1832-33, vol. 42, 12th December.
- "A Petition of the Inhabitants, Censitaires and Proprietors of the Seigniorie of Lotbiniere..." Journals..., 1834, vol. 43, 24th January.
- "Copy of a Report of the Honourable the Executive Council on the subject of the Forges of St. Maurice, dated the 15th of September, 1843..." Appendix O., Appendix to the Fourth Volume of the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada, 1844-45.
- Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of the laws and other circumstances connected with the Seigniorial Tenure in Lower Canada, and Appendix. Laid before the Legislative Assembly, 4th October, 1843, and ordered to be printed. Kingston: Desbarats and Derbishire, 1844.
- First and Second Reports of the Special Committee appointed to inquire into the causes which retard the Settlement of the Eastern Townships of Lower Canada. Printed by Order of the Legislative Assembly. Quebec City: Rollo Campbell, 1851.