The Rose, the Shamrock and the Cabbage: The Battle for Irish Voters in Upper-Town Quebec, 1827-1836

David De Brou*

Employing methods developed by social historians, socio-political history endeavours to widen knowledge of past politics by examining mass political behaviour. The creation of a large data set designed to increase the pool of information for each potential and actual voter resulted in a better understanding of early nineteenth-century Upper-Town Quebec politics. Analysis of linked pollbooks, assessment rolls and census returns suggests several conclusions. First, the response of voters was complex, influenced by national considerations, changing political options and socio-economic factors. Second, politicians' beliefs that success at the polls depended on appealing to the growing Irish populace was based on political realities as Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants constituted large enough blocs of voters to affect the results in Upper-Town Quebec where close elections were the norm from 1827 to 1836. Third, in 1834, the response of the Irish and other British voters was complicated by religion: Church of England or Scotland members plumped for a single candidate, while many Irish and British Catholics and Non-Conformists split their votes between an English-speaking Protestant Bureaucratic-party Scot and a French-speaking Catholic moderate patriote-party canadien, a logical response to their divided national and religious allegiances. Fourth, in the by-election of 1836, Irish Catholics along with other British voters chose Empire over Catholicism.

Adoptant les méthodes développées par l'histoire sociale, l'histoire socio-politique tente d'élargir la connaissance de la vie politique du passé en étudiant les comportements de masse. La création d'un vaste ensemble de données conçu pour accroître les informations sur chaque électeur réel ou potentiel amène une meilleure compréhension de la politique dans la haute-ville de Québec au début du 19e siècle. L'analyse des rapports des bureaux de scrutin, des rôles d'évaluation et des recensements suggère les conclusions suivantes. Premièrement, les réactions des électeurs étaient complexes, influencées par des considérations nationales, des choix politiques changeants et différents facteurs

* David De Brou teaches history at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

A shorter version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association held in Quebec City in June 1989. The research presented here was funded in part by le Centre de recherche en civilisation canadienne-française. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their stimulating comments and to acknowledge the contribution made by my friends and colleagues, including Fernand Ouellet, Chad Gaffield, Mark Olsen, Bill Waiser, Jim Miller and John Bullen.

Histoire sociale — Social History, Vol. XXIV, n° 48 (novembre-November 1991) : 305-334

socio-économiques. Deuxièmement, la croyance des politiciens que leur succès électoral dépendait de l'attrait qu'ils pouvaient exercer sur la population irlandaise croissante était basée sur une réalité politique; de fait, les Irlandais catholiques et protestants constituaient un groupe d'électeurs assez important pour influer sur les résultats dans la haute-ville de Québec où des élections rapprochées étaient la norme entre 1827 et 1836. Troisièmement, la réaction des électeurs irlandais et britanniques en 1834 a été compliquée par le facteur religieux : les membres de l'Église d'Angleterre ou d'Écosse ont fixé leur choix sur un seul candidat, alors que plusieurs Irlandais et Britanniques catholiques et non-conformistes ont divisé leurs votes entre le parti des bureaucrates, écossais, protestant et d'expression anglaise et le parti patriote canadien, catholique, modéré et d'expression française, ce qui constituait une réponse logique à leurs divisions religieuses et nationales. Enfin, à l'élection partielle de 1836, les Irlandais catholiques, de concert avec les autres Britanniques, préférèrent l'Empire au catholicisme.

Andrew Stuart's campaign was in trouble. On the fifth day of the election, he found himself trailing his closest opponent, Amable Berthelot, by 74 votes, not an unsurmountable gap, but one that had persisted from the first day of polling. Since July 1820, Stuart had presented himself before the Upper-Town Quebec electorate four times. Twice he was elected by acclamation and twice he received enough votes to secure a seat in the House of Assembly of Lower Canada. The situation in 1834, however, was grave as Louis-Joseph Papineau's *patriotes* were determined to oust Stuart, a former *parti-canadien* lieutenant who had rejected Papineau's nationalistic message.

During one of the several meetings held to bolster his faltering campaign in the general election of 1834, Stuart thanked "the Irish Electors for the generous support which they had given him." One of his backers exhorted the English, Scottish and Irish to unite against the Canadians and carry Stuart to victory. First, he called upon "the sons of old England, the descendants of those proud nobles and bold yeomen who signed the great charter" to go to the poll. Next, he enjoined the "[c]hildren of the mist and the mountain, sons of the land of field and flood, of the free kilt and waving plume" to support one of their own: "Forward! Tis a Stuart calls." Finally, he implored the "lads of old Erin" to go "[o]nward in the cause of the rose and the shamrock", preventing the French Canadians from dividing the Irish, the Scottish and the English. Did the British voters want to be separated? "No! No!", shouted Stuart supporters. Did the Irish want to side with the French or the English with the cabbage or the rose? "The rose", responded the crowd. The Stuart standard bearer agreed. It would be the rose. And the Irish had nothing to fear from the rose, "not a single thorn of it should ever hurt them."[1]

Did the Irish voters choose the rose or the cabbage? To answer comparable questions, historians of nineteenth-century Canadian politics have

1. *Quebec Gazette*, October 27, 1834; *see* also *Quebec Mercury*, October 28, 1834.

routinely turned to such traditional sources as newspapers, private correspondence and government reports. In short, they have looked to evidence that presents past politics from the perspective of the "political notables", including politicians, colonial administrators, government officials and newspaper editors.[2] This preoccupation with the likes of Papineau, George-Étienne Cartier, John A. Macdonald and Wilfrid Laurier has proved to be very valuable, providing insights into those persons constituting the political leadership, and the impact their decisions had on the events of the period.[3] This way of doing political history is indispensable, but like all elitist history, this way of doing history has been under attack since the late 1960s. The failure to look beyond the elite has cost political history its pre-eminent place in the writing of history in Canada.[4]

In the last two decades, social historians have taken history beyond the boardrooms and the backrooms, and have ably demonstrated the legitimacy of studying groups that society once considered peripheral (women, natives and immigrants, for example) and therefore unworthy of serious scholarly study. This is not to say that the "old-fashioned" history is no longer of value. On the contrary, the social, economic and political power of the elites is undeniable. However, even those who believe that the role of the masses is negligible in history must first demonstrate that assumption through careful examination of mass behaviour. In other words, political leaders and traditional sources may only represent a part of the story. Political history that does not endeavour to study the general populace remains only a partial history until it is demonstrable that the elites alone shaped nineteenth-century political life.

Social historians have shown that one way to awaken the long-dead documentless ordinary people is through analysis of such routinely generated

---

2. American historian Paul Kleppner uses the term "political notables" to describe "that group of prominent contemporary figures who have been regularly quoted and cited by historians as sources of information" for nineteenth-century American politics. P. Kleppner, *The Third Electoral System, 1853-1892. Parties, Voters and Political Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 4).

3. *See*, for example, J.M.S. Careless, *Brown of the Globe: Statesman of Confederation, 1860-1880* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1963); Donald Creighton, *John A. Macdonald: The Old Chieftain* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1955); Andrée Désilets, *Hector-Louis Langevin : Un père de la Confédération canadienne, 1826-1906* (Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1969); Jacques Monet, *The Last Cannon Shot: A Study of French Canadian Nationalism, 1837-1850* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969); Peter B. Waite, *The Life and Times of Confederation, 1864-1867: Politics, Newspapers, and Union of British North America* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962).

4. John English, "The Second Time Around: Political Scientists Writing History", *Canadian Historical Review*, 67 (1986), 1-16; Reg Whitaker, "Writing About Politics", *Writing About Canada: A Handbook for Modern Canadian History*, ed. by John Schultz (Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall, 1990), 1-3.

sources as nominative census returns, assessment rolls and city directories.[5] As the pioneer work of Fernand Ouellet and the more recent scholarship of Gail Campbell demonstrate, historians of nineteenth-century Canadian politics have access to another invaluable source, pollbooks.[6] Pollbooks are written records of how individuals voted in Canadian elections during the first half of the nineteenth century, prior to the advent of the secret ballot in the 1870s. The general practice was for government-appointed returning officers and poll clerks to register the voting preferences of individuals participating in the open poll. In the case of Lower Canada, returning officers were obligated by law to maintain and furnish a written record of the individuals voting and to indicate each voter's choice of candidates. In addition to the names of the voters, the returning officer included such information as occupation, property qualifications (property owner or tenant), place of residence, objections that were made to the voters, if any, and the time in which the poll opened and closed. Thus, the pollbooks reveal the ebb and flow of election activity on the hustings.[7]

Fortunately, a series of seven pollbooks covering all but one of the contested elections from 1814 to 1836 make Andrew Stuart's constituency, Upper-Town Quebec, ideal for examining mass political behaviour. Furthermore, linking the pollbook data to the census returns of 1842 allows us to

5. *See*, for example, Michael T. Doucet and Mark J. Stern, *The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982); Chad Gaffield, *Language, Schooling, and Cultural Conflict: The Origins of the French-Language Controversy in Ontario* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987); David Gagan, *Hopeful Travellers: Families, Land and Social Change in Mid-Victorian Peel County, Canada West* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981); Allan Greer, *Peasant, Lord, and Merchant: Rural Society in Three Parishes, 1740-1840* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985); Michael B. Katz, *The People of Hamilton: Family and Class in a Mid-Nineteenth-Century City* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975); Fernand Ouellet, *Éléments d'histoire sociale du Bas-Canada* (Montréal: Hurtubise HMH ltée, 1972); Fernand Ouellet, *Histoire économique et sociale du Québec, 1760-1850 : Structures et conjonctures*, 2 vols. (Montréal: Fides, 1971).

6. Fernand Ouellet, *Le Bas-Canada, 1791-1840 : Changements structuraux et crise* (Ottawa: Éditions de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1976); Fernand Ouellet, *Lower Canada, 1791-1840: Social Change and Nationalism* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1980); Gail Campbell, "The Most Restrictive Franchise in British North America", *Canadian Historical Review*, 71 (1990), 159-188; Gail Campbell, "People, Parties and the Vote: Electoral Behaviour in Southwestern Ontario Townships, 1854-1902" (Ph.D. thesis, history, Clark University, 1983); Gail Campbell, "'Smashers' and 'Rummies': Voters and the Rise of Parties in Charlotte County, New Brunswick, 1846-1857", CHA, *Historical Papers/Communications historiques* (1986), 86-116; Gail Campbell, "Voters and Nonvoters: The Problem of Turnout in the Nineteenth Century: Southwestern Ontario as a Case Study", *Social Science History*, 11 (1987), 187-210.

7. Since 1800, returning officers were authorized to "take the votes and enter them in a Book, which he shall keep or cause to be kept for that purpose, according to form No. 5, in the Schedule hereunto annexed." The annexed form included the following headings: "Name of Elector; Addition, Trade or Profession; Qualification, Where Situated; Names of the Candidates; and If Objected To". *Statutes of Lower Canada*, 1800, 40 George 3, c. 1, s. 10 and Schedule No. 5.

consider how the Irish responded to Stuart's call to the Empire and whether the "lads of old Erin" chose the cabbage or the rose.

Analysis of newspaper election reports suggests that appeals to language or "national" concerns did not begin to dominate the Upper-Town Quebec political scene until the general election of 1827. The mother-tongue of the candidates became a central issue as the newspapers debated whether Upper-Town Quebec should continue the tradition of sending one English-speaking candidate and one French-speaking candidate to the Legislative Assembly.[8] Since the election held in July 1820, Andrew Stuart and Joseph Vallières of St. Réal had represented the Upper-Town constituency. Running again in 1827, their success depended upon retaining the support that they had built up over two elections and seven years as representatives.[9] However, the re-election of Stuart was in doubt as he and the Montreal group, led by Papineau, had parted ways. The admiration that Papineau once had for Andrew Stuart[10] had turned to scorn as he saw him as a "timide esclave" of his brother James Stuart, the Attorney-General of Lower Canada.[11] The strategy of Papineau and his followers was to split the Stuart-Vallières tandem by calling upon the voters of Upper-Town Quebec to elect Amable Berthelot, a Papineau *patriote*.[12]

The proponents of Berthelot's election believed the best way to ensure success was to link him with Vallières and to call upon the voters to elect two of their own, two *patriotes*. One of Berthelot's supporters, "N" made an appeal in *L'Électeur* to his "Compatriotes Canadiens" to join together and unite against Stuart, "un de ceux qui ont eu lâcheté d'abandonner votre défense dont

8. Although there was no official agreement between the two language groups, the "tradition" of electing one anglophone and one francophone member to sit for Upper-Town Quebec in the Legislative Assembly began in 1792 and continued throughout much of the period. Until 1834, the anglophone-francophone representation was in force in 32 of the 42 years. The only exceptions occurred from 1800 to 1804 and from 1814 to 1820.

9. Vallières was first elected in March 1820. He and Stuart were acclaimed in July 1820 and re-elected in 1824.

10. For example, in December 1822, Papineau wrote to John Neilson suggesting that Stuart had "des idées saines et très grandes sur les règles de conduite que devrait se prescrire l'administration provinciale pour assurer la prospérité du Pays...". National Archives of Canada (hereafter NAC), Neilson Papers, MG24, B1, vol. 4, 69, Louis-Joseph Papineau to John Neilson, December 12, 1822.

11. Louis-Joseph Papineau to Julie Papineau, March 20, 1826, *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec*, vols. 34-35 (1953-1954, 1954-1955), 243.

12. Berthelot was a well known political figure who had represented Trois-Rivières in the Assembly from 1814 to 1816 and from 1824 to 1827. Defeated in the July election held in Trois-Rivières, Berthelot ran in the election of Upper-Town Quebec depicted by his opponents as an "itinerant candidate ... unable to hold his ground in the Borough in which he so long resided and is now offered at second hand to the Electors of Quebec." *Quebec Mercury*, July 31, 1827; Berthelot, in fact, had strong links to Quebec with his family owning an important tract of land outside of St. John's gate. Indeed, the Berthelot market and the streets of Sainte-Geneviève, Saint-Michel, Saint-Amable and D'Artigny carry the names of Michel Amable and his children, including Amable. NAC, F. Audet, MG30, D1, vol. 2, 517.

ils étaient chargés, et de vous livrer entre les mains de vos ennemis." "N" concluded that the *canadiens* should cast their votes for Vallières and Berthelot who "vous ont toujours été fidèles, et [qui] ont montré autant de vrai patriotisme et d'attachement à la cause de leur pays...".[13]

According to the newspaper reports, the language issue resurfaced in 1834. On one side, the *patriote* candidates, René-Édouard Caron and Berthelot, urged their compatriots to return two *canadiens* to demonstrate their approval of the 92 Resolutions passed by the Papineau-controlled Assembly in the early part of the year.[14] In his opening speech on the hustings, Caron asked the *canadien* voters to set aside tradition: "À la grande question des 92 résolutions, vous devez mettre de côté tout ce qui n'est que de convenance et de forme, et ne considérer que le bien de la majorité du pays." Caron reasoned that the *canadiens* had no option: "Si vous êtes forcés aujourd'hui de choisir deux *Canadiens* d'origine, vous pouvez donc dire que vous y avez été forcés par la position qu'a prise le parti opposé."[15]

The Stuart camp depicted the attempt to unseat Stuart as an attack on the British population of the city and responded with its own "national" volley. The *Quebec Gazette*, which had not supported Papineau since John Neilson's break with the *patriotes* in 1834, advertised meetings for the "Loyal Supporters of Andrew Stuart", urging "Britons" to "remember [that their] opponents have made the cause a national one, and 'England Expects Every Man to Do His Duty'."[16] Stuart himself went on the attack by equating his defeat with a "Canadian" plot to "deprive the English portion of society of their moderate share of the representation."[17]

The by-election of 1836, occasioned by Caron's split with Papineau and resignation from the Assembly, continued the "national affair". As editor of *Le Canadien*, Étienne Parent deplored Caron's retirement, fearing it would allow "le triomphe des ennemis de la réforme". Parent implored his fellow *canadiens* to put aside their differences: "Il n'est qu'un seul but, un seul désir, c'est le salut de la Patrie. Nous le voulons tous également. Ce désir commun nous fera marcher ensemble."[18] Parent also printed a letter from "un Canadien Réformiste", who urged the Canadians to defend their rights by supporting the *patriote*-party nominee, Joseph Painchaud: "En effet, enfans [sic] du Canada,

---

13. *L'Électeur*, July 30, 1827. We will follow the early nineteenth-century practice of using the term *canadien* to refer exclusively to the French-speaking Canadian-born population.

14. The resolutions outlined the *patriotes*' grievances against the political status quo. The *patriotes* claimed, among other things, an elected Legislative Council and ministerial responsibility. *See* Ouellet, *Lower Canada*, 231; Helen Taft Manning, *The Revolt of French Canada, 1800-1835: A Chapter in the History of the British Commonwealth* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1962), 361-363.

15. *Le Canadien*, October 24, 1834. *See* also *Quebec Gazette*, October 22, 1834.

16. *Quebec Gazette*, October 24 and 27, 1834.

17. *Quebec Gazette*, October 27, 1834. *See* also *Quebec Mercury*, October 28, 1834.

18. *Le Canadien*, March 14, 1836.

appartenant au même sol, pourrions-nous ne pas défendre les droits de notre mère chérie, le pays qui nous a vu naître !"[19]

Stuart's defenders agreed that the focus once again was "national" differences. Under John Neilson's editorship, the *Quebec Gazette* reminded its readers that Painchaud's supporters were reviving the 1834 campaign strategy of making "the distinctions of 'French origin' and 'British or foreign origin'".[20] Stuart also returned to the question of "the system of exclusion of all persons of British origin who would not yield implicit obedience to the mandate of the majority of the Assembly ...."[21] This policy of exclusion, according to Stuart, had resulted in "the inhabitants of the Upper Town of Quebec, of British and Irish origin [having] no opportunity of expressing their opinions on those deeply important matters in the Provincial Parliament." Stuart asked: "Was it fitting, was it right, was it proper or just that on such a vital question [the House refusing to pay the public officers], in which the good of the country was so deeply involved, that the men of British and Irish origin should find themselves deprived of all means of taking part in the deliberations thereon?"[22]

Finally, the call for "national distinctions" manifested itself in the form of roving bands of anglophone and francophone supporters attempting to intimidate each other. Stuart's followers blamed the *canadiens* for the disturbances. The *Quebec Gazette* attributed the riots to the French, with the result "that more than twenty harmless and peaceable citizens of 'British origin' have been attacked, when walking alone on the public streets, and put in danger of losing life ...."[23] Painchaud's partisans protested strongly that they were not at fault and pointed to "des processions bruyantes des partisans de M. STUART par toute le ville...".[24]

Thus, the "traditional" sources suggest that language or "national" concerns emerged as an issue in 1827 and continued to dominate the hustings after 1830, constituting the central focus in the elections of 1834 and 1836. Is it possible to ascertain if the voters responded to the "national" fervour evident in the newspapers and espoused by the political leadership? If "national considerations" were predominant, then, voters should have ignored all other ethno-cultural and socio-economic factors and considered only whether a candidate represented their "national" interests. By this standard, one simple measure of a candidate's worthiness was whether he was of "French origin" or "British origin". Did "French origin" voters only support "French origin"

19. *Ibid.*
20. *Quebec Gazette*, March 16, 1836.
21. *Quebec Mercury*, March 22, 1836.
22. *Quebec Gazette*, March 23, 1836.
23. *Quebec Gazette*, March 25, 1836. *See* also *Quebec Mercury*, March 24, 1836; *Quebec Gazette*, March 28, 1836.
24. *Le Canadien*, March 23, 1836.

candidates, and "British origin" voters only cast votes for "British origin" candidates?

The extant pollbooks provide an opportunity to consider when linguistic considerations became a significant factor to voters and if the voters responded mechanically to the candidates' appeals of nationalism. The polling results of the seven elections suggest that language affiliation indeed was a key factor in the way in which the inhabitants of Upper-Town Quebec cast their votes.[25] In the six elections in which there were anglophone candidates, the mean percentage of anglophone voters for anglophone candidates is 92.6 percent.[26] Specifically, in the election of 1814, 91.0 percent of the anglophone voters chose one or both of the anglophone candidates, George Brown and John Fletcher (*see* table 1).[27] This very high percentage of anglophone support for anglophone candidates is also evident in the other five elections. In 1816, the percentage of anglophone voters casting at least one vote for an anglophone candidate was 88.2 percent. In 1824, the percentage increased substantially to 98.3 percent, but fell off slightly to 88.0 percent in 1827. In the two elections in the 1830s, the percentage of anglophone support was extremely high: 93.4 percent in 1834 and 97.0 percent in 1836.

The francophone voters also displayed a similarly close attachment to francophone candidates. The mean percentage of francophone voters casting at least one vote for a francophone candidate is 91.8 percent (*see* table 2). Except for the election of 1829, in which less than 75.0 percent of the francophone voters voted for François-Joseph Duval, the only francophone candidate, the percentage of francophone support for francophone candidates was quite high. In the election of 1814, the percentage was 97.4 percent. In 1816, the percentage decreased to 86.6 percent, but jumped to 98.1 percent in 1824. In the election of 1827 and the two elections in the 1830s, the percentage of francophone support for francophone candidates remained over 90.0 percent.

In all of the elections, the relatively high support given by each linguistic group to candidates sharing its respective mother tongue suggests a strong

---

25. From 1814 to 1836, eleven elections took place. Three of the elections did not require polls since the candidates ran unopposed (1815, June 1820 and 1830). The only contested election for which a pollbook has not been found was held in March 1820.

26. The pollbooks do not classify individuals according to mother tongue, but linking pollbooks to the censuses of 1831 and 1842 reveals that the name of the voter is a highly accurate indication of language affiliation, at least for early nineteenth-century Lower Canada. For example, of the 1,091 "francophone" voters found in the pollbooks and in the census returns, only 4 (0.37 percent) were classified as of British origin. Similarly, of the 579 "anglophone" voters found in the pollbooks and the census returns, only 11 (1.9 percent) came under the heading "French Canada".

27. As was the case for 23 of 27 constituencies, Upper-Town Quebec was represented in the House of Assembly of Lower Canada by two members. Consequently, Upper-Town Quebec voters had two votes in each general election. Each voter had the option of voting for two different candidates or plumping, using only one vote.

relationship between language affiliation and voting behaviour. An inverse relationship also existed between voters and candidates. The percentage of francophone voters casting votes for anglophone candidates was relatively low in all of the elections but one (*see* table 1). The mean percentage of francophone voters voting at least once for an anglophone candidate is 21.1 percent for the elections of 1814 (26.3 percent), 1816 (14.9 percent) and 1827 (22.2 percent). In the two elections held in the 1830s, the percentage of francophone voters supporting an anglophone candidate dropped dramatically to 6.1 percent in 1834 and 8.2 percent in 1836. Thus, in the elections of 1814, 1816, 1827, 1834 and 1836, the percentage of francophones voting for at least one anglophone candidate was much lower than the percentage voting for francophone candidates. This supports the contention that mother tongue of the candidates was an important consideration for francophone voters. Only in the election of 1824 is it clear that the francophone voters disregarded the language affiliation of the candidates with 86.4 percent casting at least one vote for an anglophone candidate.

Anglophone voters exhibited the same general tendency with a lower percentage casting votes for francophone than for anglophone candidates. For the four elections occurring in 1814, 1824, 1827 and 1834, the mean percentage of anglophone support for francophone candidates is 51.2 percent (*see* table 2). Comparatively low percentages are evident for 1816 (19.6 percent) and 1829 (19.3 percent). In the election of 1836, a mere 3.0 percent of the anglophone voters cast a vote for Joseph Painchaud, the only francophone candidate. In summary, the analysis of language affiliation suggests that "national" considerations were important to the voters of Upper-Town Quebec. But it is also clear that the "national" factor did not have the same weight in every election. Is there quantitative evidence to corroborate the impression left by newspapers that "national" considerations grew in importance after 1830?

A simple measure of the relative importance of language affiliation is to examine the percentage of votes received by Stuart, a candidate for seven of the eight elections held in Upper-Town Quebec from 1820 to 1836.[28] A comparison of Stuart's vote-getting abilities in the elections of 1824, 1827, 1834 and 1836 reveals that Stuart's strength in attracting anglophone voters was greatest in the 1830s: 93.4 percent in 1834 and 97.0 percent in 1836.[29] Conversely, his francophone support was at its lowest in 1834 (6.1 percent) and 1836 (8.2 percent). Stuart generally received a high percentage of support from the anglophone electors and a low percentage from the francophone electors, with the differences of degree becoming more acute in the elections of 1834 and 1836.

28. The by-election of 1829 did not involve Andrew Stuart, the sitting member.

29. *See* David De Brou, "Mass Political Behaviour in 'Upper-Town Quebec', 1792-1836" (Ph.D. thesis, history, University of Ottawa, 1989), 219.

The only election which did not conform to this model took place in 1824. In this instance, Stuart received a low percentage of support from the anglophone voters (27.5 percent) and a high percentage from the francophone voters (79.6 percent). This was an important exception, however, underlining the power of party politics. A *parti-canadien* candidate in 1824, Stuart received votes from four out of five francophone electors. Without the party's approval in 1827, Stuart saw only one out of five francophones stepping forward to support him. The results of the four Stuart elections therefore confirmed the election story found in the newspapers: "national considerations" were important to the voters, particularly after 1830.

But the newspapers did not tell the complete story. Clearly, the voters' reaction in 1824 was not conditioned by language; rather, they were responding to Stuart's political affiliation. This does not necessarily weaken the "national" explanation — in 1824, *canadiens* saw Stuart as representing their "national" interests because he was campaigning under the banner of the *parti canadien*. Conversely, those of "British origin" were reluctant to support Stuart because of his political inclinations. This conclusion, however, was one that could also be gleaned from the election summaries of contemporary observers.

Less evident in the newspapers was the impact of the changing political options faced by the electorate. The number and language affiliation of the candidates seeking election and the number of votes per voter varied in the elections. The voting options presented to the voters in 1814, for example, were much different than those in 1836. In the first election, there were two votes per voter and two anglophone and two francophone candidates. In the by-election of 1836, each voter had only one vote and the vote was between one francophone and one anglophone candidate. In order to measure the relative importance of language affiliation as a voting determinant, it is therefore necessary to compare those elections in which the voters had the same electoral option.

An examination of the election results judged according to the options available to the different language groups reveals a relationship between a high percentage of support and the voting options available. This suggests that the kind of options open to francophone voters determined in part the degree to which they favoured francophone candidates. Thus, while the overall francophone support for francophone candidates was high (the mean percentage of the seven elections is 91.0 percent), francophone candidates received their highest percentage of support from francophone voters in three of the four elections where the voters had two votes and where there were two francophone candidates. This set of circumstances occurred in 1814, 1824, 1827 and 1834 (*see* table 3). The mean percentage of francophone voters voting for a francophone candidate in the three elections is 98.1 percent. A comparison of these elections with the election of 1827, wich had a lower rate

of support of (91.1 percent), suggests that language affiliation was important, but relatively less important in 1827.

However, an examination of the six elections in which the francophone voters could cast all their votes for francophone candidates suggests that language affiliation was less of a concern in 1824, not 1827. In 1824, 86.4 percent of the francophone voters cast at least one vote for an anglophone candidate, about four times the percentage of francophones doing so in 1814 (26.3 percent) and 1827 (22.2 percent). Similar analysis of the six elections supports the contention that language affiliation was an even stronger consideration after 1830, with a very low percentage of francophone electors casting votes for anglophone candidates (6.1 percent in 1834 and 8.2 percent in 1836).

Anglophones, like francophones, voted overwhelmingly for candidates belonging to their own linguistic group; the mean percentage of anglophone voters for the six elections in which there was at least one anglophone candidate is 92.7 percent (*see* table 4). As was the case with their francophone counterparts, the percentage of support tended to be even higher in those elections where anglophone voters could cast all of their votes for anglophone candidates: this was true in the election of 1824 (98.3 percent) and the election of 1836 (97.0 percent). The one exception was the election of 1814 (91.0 percent): an election which saw one of the two anglophone candidates resign on the first day of a three-day election when only 195 of the 581 (33.6 percent) of the voters had cast their votes.

In elections where there was only one anglophone candidate, the percentage of anglophone support was lower: 88.2 percent in 1816 and 88.0 percent in 1827. The one exception was the election of 1834 in which 93.4 percent of the anglophone supporters cast a vote for Stuart, the only anglophone candidate. This, however, strengthens the argument that the mother tongue of the candidates grew in importance as a voting consideration after 1830. It is also clear that the anglophone voters more readily used the voting strategy of plumping. In the five elections in which each voter had two votes, generally less than one-tenth of francophone voters plumped (the mean percentage is 6.6 percent; *see* table 3). In contrast, about four-tenths of the anglophone voters did not use their second vote (mean percentage is 41.3 percent; *see* table 4). Indeed, in the election of 1834, 253 of the 439 anglophone voters (57.6 percent) plumped for Stuart, following Stuart's advice not to split the "English" vote between himself and René-Édouard Caron, the more moderate of the two *patriote* candidates.[30]

An examination of the electoral options facing the voters in this period supports several conclusions. Firstly, the electoral choices determined, in part, the degree to which each linguistic group responded to the language affiliation

30. *Quebec Gazette*, October 24, 1834. *See* also *Quebec Mercury*, October 25, 1834.

of the candidates. Secondly, when there was no opportunity to vote for a candidate of their language affiliation, the percentage of francophone voters choosing anglophone candidates increased, while anglophone voters opted not to use their second vote. Finally, comparison of those elections in which the voters had the same electoral choices provide further evidence that language (that is, national considerations), while influential throughout the period, became more important after 1830.[31]

Stuart's call for British solidarity among the English-speaking population indicates that other ethno-cultural factors were at work on the hustings. Newspaper accounts of the elections in the 1820s and the 1830s suggest that ethnic divisions based upon country of origin and religion existed among anglophone voters. One group in particular became the centre of political attention: the Irish Catholics. The competing political forces believed that the support of the Irish-Catholic bloc was essential to a successful campaign. As recent studies of Lower-Canadian politics demonstrate, the *patriote* leadership played on the common experiences of the *canadien* Catholics and the Irish Catholics, their religion marking them as "outcasts" in an English-Protestant world. The desire to attract Irish votes translated into the party's adoption of a policy of "moderate nationalism", naming Irish Catholics as *parti-patriote* candidates and likening Papineau to Daniel O'Connell, the protector of Irish Catholicism in Ireland.[32] The Bureaucratic party also saw Irish support as essential if it hoped to maintain "an English-speaking presence in the Assembly".[33] It emphasized language, religious and political tolerance, loyalty to the Crown and Papineau's increasing radicalism and extremism.[34]

Quebec City newspapers began to battle for Irish-Catholic voters in the election of 1827. The pro-Papineau *Quebec Gazette* argued that the interests of all Irish voters were best served by Vallières and Berthelot.[35] Supporting Andrew Stuart and George Vanfelson, the *Quebec Mercury* accused their opponents of using religion by insisting on the "natural attachment which ought to subsist between Irish and Canadian Catholics in opposition to Hereticks."[36]

---

31. A multivariate analysis also underscores the importance of language, while demonstrating the influence of socio-economic factors before 1830 and that the voters' response to francophone candidates was not conditioned exclusively by language in 1834. *See* De Brou, "Mass Political Behaviour", 391-397.

32. Robert C. Daley, "The Irish of Lower Canada and the Rise of French Canadian Nationalism". Unpublished paper presented at Annual Meeting of Canadian Historical Association, Guelph, 1984, 1-6, 10-11; William C. Nolte, "The Irish in Canada, 1815-1867" (Ph.D. thesis, history, University of Maryland, 1975), 185-189, 197-202, 216; Ouellet, *Lower Canada*, 210, 225-226, 233, 236.

33. Mary Finnigan, "The Irish-French Alliance in Lower Canada" (Master's thesis, history, Concordia University, 1982), 7.

34. Daley, "The Irish of Lower Canada", 1, 5-9, 11; Nolte, "The Irish in Canada", 186, 190-196, 204-205, 216; Ouellet, *Lower Canada*, 233-4, 248.

35. *Quebec Gazette*, August 2 and 6, 1827. *See* also *Canadian Spectator*, August 28, 1827.

36. *Quebec Mercury*, August 18, 1827.

The attack on Papineau supporters continued with the *Mercury* printing a letter from "An Elector of the Upper-Town" who blamed Samuel Neilson, the editor of the *Quebec Gazette*, of promoting religious animosities: "Your party — and the whole course of your conduct during the late Election — these have gone too far to [alienate] from each other, the people of English and French origin, who inhabit this Colony — and to excite national, and religious prejudices...."[37] Upper-Town Quebec politicians continued to believe that Irish-Catholic voters were important. Along with John Neilson, Vallières joined the Friends of Ireland Society, an organization dedicated to aiding O'Connell's struggle for Catholic emancipation in Ireland.[38] Vallières became vice-president of the Society and called upon *canadiens* to help their Catholic brethren, for the Irish cause was a *canadien* cause: "So long as the Irish Catholics are persecuted on account of their religion, there will be no security for Catholics in any part of the Empire." He reminded the *canadiens* that if they lost their majority and came to be represented, like the Irish, "by a parliament, strangers to [their] faith, or worse still by venal and corrupt souls", then, they would soon be "as unfortunate, as despoiled and as wretched" as the Irish.[39]

Control of the Irish votes continued to be an important consideration after 1830. Stuart and his followers endeavoured to attract Irish electors by emphasizing the "natural" union of the British people and by belittling the *patriotes*' concern for the Irish. The interests of the "lads of old Erin" would best be served by uniting with the "the sons of old England" and the "sons of the land...of the free kilt and waving plume."[40] In the by-election of 1836, the battle for Irish voters continued. An important part of the *patriote* campaign was to present their candidate, Dr. Joseph Painchaud, as the self-sacrificing hero of the cholera epidemics who risked his life in ministering to his fellow Catholics. He reminded the "[e]migrants of Ireland" that he had worked among their unfortunate countrymen "during the past summer of distress (1832), desolation, and death...exhausting every means in [his] power to procure them food, medicine, shelter, at least, a bed to expire on." He called upon the Irish Catholics to meet his followers on the hustings, as he had met them "in [their] hour of anguish and in the temple consecrated in the god of Patrick and of [their] forefathers." He concluded by linking his name with the "saviour" of Ireland: "Irishmen of every class and denomination! [G]ive me your votes! Let me have the honour of maintaining your civil and religious rights in the Provincial Assembly, and responding there in your defence to the motto which the all persuasive voice of O'Connell has as often proclaimed on

37. *Quebec Mercury*, August 28, 1827.
38. Finnegan, "The Irish-French Alliance", 12.
39. Cited in Finnegan, "The Irish-French Alliance", 29-30.
40. *Quebec Gazette*, October 27, 1834. *See* also *Quebec Mercury*, October 28, 1834 and *Quebec Gazette*, October 31, 1834.

the bank of the Shannon and of the Liffey — Ireland, as it ought to be, Great glorious, and free!"[41]

Painchaud's opponents countered by attempting to use his role in the epidemic of 1832 against the *patriote* candidate, claiming he charged the poor cholera-struck Irish "eight dollars...for [his] generous and disinterested assistance...in advance."[42] Using a letter from "Saint Patrick", Stuart's supporters called upon the "Irish boys" to reject Painchaud's promises: "When no election is going on, those Frenchmen look upon you as dogs..., but now that they want your votes, they flatter and try to come Blarney over you to make you desert your King and Country, by saying that they want to get hold of Crown Lands just for the pleasure of sharing them with you. — How many of you do you think would be getting lots of land and a piece if PAPINEAU and the Clique had the giving of them?"[43]

The response of both political parties — the *canadien-patriote* party and the Bureaucratic party — suggests that the politicians and their advisors viewed the Irish and, more specifically, the Irish Catholics, as constituting a key segment of the eligible electorate, whose support was required to ensure success at the polls. It is clear from the newspapers of this period that this perception helped to shape campaign strategies, including what issues would dominate the hustings. Whether the Irish Catholics were essential for victory and how they responded to the cajoling and the pleading is more difficult to ascertain. Pollbooks do not categorize voters according to religion and country of origin. However, by linking the pollbook data to the religious and birthplace information provided in the census of 1842, it is possible to identify Irish-Catholic voters, estimate their importance as a voting bloc and determine whether they heeded the call of religion or Empire.[44]

Unlike their counterparts of 1831, the census takers of 1842 were required to differentiate the Irish from the other British groups.[45] Cross-tabulating this information with religious designations allows us to pinpoint

41. *Quebec Mercury*, March 15, 1836. *See* also *Le Canadien*, March 14 and 29, April 6, 1836.

42. *Quebec Mercury*, March 19, 1836.

43. *Ibid. See* also *Quebec Gazette*, March 23 and April 11, 1836; *Quebec Mercury*, March 26 and 29, 1836.

44. For a discussion of the automated linkage process used to link the individuals found in the pollbooks and the census of 1842, *see* David De Brou and Mark Olsen, "The Guth Algorithm and the Nominal Record Linkage of Multi-Ethnic Populations", *Historical Methods*, 19, (1986), 20-24.

45. The census of 1831 does not include country of origin. Its creators were more interested in knowing how many individuals had arrived since 1 May 1825, whether they were from the United Kingdom or a "foreign country", and whether they came by sea or not. The census of 1842 uses seven categories: England; Ireland; Scotland; Canada, of French origin; Canada, of British origin; Continent of Europe, or otherwise; and United States of America.

Irish Catholics.[46] Unfortunately, the realities of historical research make it impossible to uncover all the Irish-Catholic voters. A first problem is that death and migration out of the constituency meant that only about half the individuals recorded in the pollbooks appeared in the census returns of 1842.[47] With respect to the records of anglophone voters with information regarding religion and country of origin, the recovery ratio is less — closer to one out of three.[48] Secondly, the census of 1842 employed the category of "Canada, of British origin". This distinguishes the *canadiens* from the British Canadians, but groups second- and third-generation Irish, Scots and English under the same heading.[49] Thirdly, rather than indicating the religion and birth place of each individual, the census of 1842 supplied a total for each household. For households containing natives of Ireland, as well as natives of Scotland, England or British Canada, or for households including both Catholics and Protestants, it was necessary to classify the origins of some Irish as British and the religion of some Catholics as unclear. All of these factors combined to worked against identifying all of the Irish Catholic voters. The linking process, on the other hand, does allow for the recovery of a sufficient number of Irish Protestants and Irish Catholics to consider the impact of religion and nationality on the anglophone voters.

Did the appeals to Irish-Catholic voters which began in the second half of the 1820s rest solely on perception or was there a demographic or political basis to the belief that Irish-Catholic votes could make a difference? From 1827 to 1836, Upper-Town Quebec had its share of close elections as three groups — moderate *patriotes*, Papineau adherents and Stuart-led Bureaucratic followers — fought one another for control of the constituency. In 1827, Stuart's margin of victory over Berthelot was only 11, out of 2,213 votes cast.[50]

In these four elections, every vote counted and even a small bloc of voters could not be ignored. This was particularly true in an ethnically-mixed

---

46. The census of 1842 contains 16 religious categories: Church of England; Church of Scotland; Church of Rome; British Wesleyan Methodists; Canadian Wesleyan Methodists; Episcopal Methodists; other Methodists; Presbyterians not in connexion [sic] with the Church of Scotland; Congregationalists or Independents; Baptists and Anabaptists; Lutherans; Quakers; Moravians and Tunkers; Dutch Reform Church; Jews; and all other Religious denominations.

47. The census of 1842 includes 452 (44.3 percent) of the 1021 voters found in the pollbook of 1834 and 365 (53.4 percent) of the 684 voters in the pollbook of 1836.

48. The census of 1842 provides religion and country of origin for 160 (36.9 percent) of the 434 anglophone voters in the pollbook of 1834 and 149 (44.5 percent) of the anglophone voters in the pollbook of 1836.

49. For a discussion of the census underrepresentation of the Irish in Upper Canada, *see* Donald Harman Akenson, *The Irish in Ontario. A Study in Rural History* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984), 15-16.

50. *See* De Brou, "Mass Political Behaviour", 128. Indeed, if 6 voters had voted differently, Berthelot would have defeated Stuart. In the subsequent elections, the difference between victory and defeat ranged from 58 to 85 votes.

constituency like Upper-Town Quebec, which had contained a significant anglophone population since the creation of the Lower-Canadian political system of representation in 1792.[51] In that year, the parish *dénombrement* set the percentage of anglophone heads of household at about 25.0 percent).[52] This had not increased by 1818, but by 1831, the impact of the post-Napoleonic immigration was evident as the percentage of anglophone heads reached about 40 percent.[53]

---

51. The Constitutional Act of 1792 authorized "the governor or Lieutenant governor...or the person administrating the government...to issue a Proclamation dividing such Province into Districts, or counties, or Circles and Towns or Townships, and appointing the limits thereof...." (*Constitutional Act of 1791*, 1791, 31 Geo. 3, c. 17, sec. 14, *Documents Relating to the Constitutional History of Canada, 1759-1791*, Adam Shortt and Arthur G. Doherty, eds. (Ottawa: S.E. Dawson, 1907), 698. Accordingly, Lieutenant-Governor Alured Clarke issued a proclamation on May 7, 1792, dividing Lower Canada into 27 constituencies, including Upper-Town Quebec. *Quebec Gazette*, May 24, 1792, *Documents Relating to the Constitutional History of Canada, 1791-1818*, Arthur G. Doherty and D.A. McArthur, eds. (Canada: C.H. Pamelee, 1914), 75-76.

52. *See* De Brou, "Mass Political Behaviour...", p. 30. Work by Ouellet, and by Marc Lafrance and David-Thierry Ruddell suggests that the *dénombrements* underestimate the proportion of the anglophone population. Ouellet, "Structure des occupations et ethnicité dans les villes de Québec et de Montréal (1819-1844)" in Éléments d'histoire sociale du Bas-Canada, 179; Marc Lafrance and David-Thierry Ruddel, "Physical Expansion and Social-Cultural Segregation in Quebec City, 1765-1840" in *Shaping the Urban Landscape: Aspects of the Canadian City-Building Process*, ed. by Gilbert A. Stelter and Alan F.J. Artibise (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1982), 151; David-Thierry Ruddel and Marc Lafrance, "Quebec, 1785-1840 : problème de croissance d'une ville coloniale", *Histoire sociale — Social History*, 18, (1985), 319-320.

53. This mirrored the kind of changes that Quebec City underwent in the 1820s. The thousands and thousands of British immigrants after 1815 changed Quebec from a predominantly francophone populace in 1805 to a city in which the number of English-speaking inhabitants almost equalled the number of *canadiens* in 1831. Historians analyzing the *dénombrements* of the parish of Quebec place the percentage of anglophone heads of household between 25.0 and 30.0 percent in 1795, 1798, 1805 and 1818. Ouellet, *Le Bas-Canada*, 62-63; Ouellet, *Lower Canada*, 161, 345; Ouellet, "Structure des occupations", 182, 188; David-Thierry Ruddel, "Quebec City, 1765-1831: The Evolution of a Colonial Town" (Ph.D. thesis, history, Laval University, 1981), 664; Louise Dechêne, "Quelques aspects de la ville de Québec au XVIII^{e} siècle d'après les dénombrements paroissiaux", *Cahiers de géographie du Québec*, 28, (1984), 486. By 1831, the effect of British immigration was clear; the census reveals that about 45.0 percent of the heads of household were anglophone. Ouellet, "Structure des occupations", 181. At times, during the 1820s and 1830s, Quebec became an "English" city. In the summer months, British soldiers, sailors, lumbermen and transient immigrants swelled the ranks of the English-speaking population to the point of actually outnumbering the French-speaking permanent residents. Ruddel estimates the percentage of anglophone "inhabitants" to be over 50.0 percent in the summer of 1831. Ruddel, "Quebec City", 663; Ruddell and Lafrance, "Quebec, 1785-1840", 319-321. In the next decade, as the number of Quebec immigrants landing and remaining in Quebec fell and with the general movement of immigrants to Montreal and points further west, the trend toward Quebec becoming an "English-speaking" city reversed. The census of 1842 records about 40.0 percent of the heads of household as anglophone. Ouellet, *Le Bas-Canada*, 161.

How immigration altered the composition of the anglophone community itself is more difficult to determine because of the failure of the census of 1831 to differentiate between the three main British nationalities. The census of 1842, however, revealed that at least one out of three (371 of 1,022) identifiable British heads of household was Irish (*see* table 5). This represented the lowest possible estimate; assuming that one-third of those falling under the general category of British (which included natives of Ireland, England, Scotland or British Canada) also were Irish would mean that one out of two British heads of household was Irish in 1842.[54] The same census indicated that religion split the Irish populace in two, with 50.9 percent of the identifiable Irish heads as Catholic and 41.0 percent as Protestants. These results suggest that the phenomenon of Irish immigration in pre-Famine (1846-1849) Lower Canada was neither exclusively Protestant nor Catholic. Both Protestant and Catholic natives of Ireland made their way to Upper-Town Quebec in the third and fourth decades until the later half of the 1830s when it appears that more of the newly-arrived Irish immigrants were Catholic (*see* table 6).[55]

What is herein of relevance is the indication that by 1842, the Irish constituted 35.0 to 50.0 percent of head of household and, therefore, 15.0 to 20.0 percent of all such heads. This would mean that the Irish Catholics represented 5.0 to 10.0 percent of all heads of household in the constituency in 1842. Was this also true from 1827 to 1836? Even more importantly, how many were eligible to vote?

Establishing how many Irish Catholics were eligible to vote and, therefore, how large the potential bloc of Irish-Catholic voters was requires determining who had the legal and social right to vote. The relevant sections of the Constitutional Act set the legal requirements of enfranchisement: any British subject, 21 years of age or older, who either owned property with an

54. According to the figures provided by John Hare, Lafrance and Ruddel, over 40.0 percent of the Quebec City British population in 1844 was Irish. John Hare, Marc Lafrance and David-Thierry Ruddel, *Histoire de la ville de Québec, 1608-1871* (Montréal: Boréal Express/Musée canadien des civilisations, 1987), 329.

55. This runs counter to John Cooper's suggestions that the pre-Famine influx was a Protestant movement. John Irwin Cooper, "Irish Immigration and the Canadian Church Before the Middle of the 19th Century", *The Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society*, 2 (1955), 2. Helen Manning argues that the "majority of emigrants [to Lower Canada] were Irish Catholics". H.T. Manning, *The Revolt of French Canada, 1800-1835: A Chapter in the History of the British Commonwealth* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1962), 196. Donald Akenson rejects the simple description of pre-Famine Ontario Irish as Protestant. He raises substantial questions regarding the Irish sources and concludes that "before the Famine, the Irish population in Upper Canada was mostly Protestant, but the Irish-Catholic minority was formidable — indeed much larger than was supposed by contemporaries and by later historians. The Protestant-Catholic split is best described as roughly 2:1." Akenson, *The Irish in Ontario*, 26. This may have been true in Upper-Town Quebec in the 1820s. Our evidence suggests that by the 1830s, the ratio was 1:1.

annual value of £5 or rented a house at £10 annually.[56] With the exception of traitors and felons,[57] everyone who met the conditions of nationality, age and property ownership or tenancy could vote legally; the Constitutional Act listed no other restrictions regarding race, religion or gender. In practice, however, women of Upper-Town Quebec, including those who owned property, did not take part in the voting process.[58] As such, this study excludes women as part of the eligible electorate since their inclusion would only serve to inflate the number of eligible voters.[59]

The data set created by linking the pollbooks to the census returns and the assessment rolls allowed us to identify those male British subjects, 21 years or older, who owned property.[60] The censuses of 1831 and 1842 provided age, while the latter permitted us to pinpoint nationality with a reasonable amount of certainty.[61] The assessment rolls covering the 5 elections from 1824 to 1836 revealed that all property owners in Upper-Town Quebec were eligible to vote since the lowest assessed annual value of property was £5, 9 shillings, a figure above the minimum property qualifications. The sources, however, did not indicate which of the heads of household paid the necessary £10 per year for rent. Some tenants clearly met the property requirement — the pollbooks indicated that about 40.0 percent of the voters were tenants.[62] As a basis for calculating the number of eligible Irish electors, this study used the

56. Constitutional Act, 1791, 31 George 3, c. 31, s. 20, 22, *Documents Relating, 1759-1791*, 699-700. Generally, laws governing elections in Lower Canada changed little. The criteria established in the Constitutional Act remained in effect from 1792 to 1836. *See* David De Brou, "Mass Political Behaviour", 111-119.

57. Constitutional Act, 1791, 31, George 3, c. 31, s. 23, *Documents Relating, 1759-1791*, 700.

58. Of the 671 Upper-Town females listed as property owners in the assessment rolls covering the five elections from 1824 to 1836, not one cast a vote. Non-legal barriers, clearly were at work; when they had the legal right to do so, social restrictions and political strategy prevented women from taking part in the elections. For a discussion of this issue, *see* De Brou, "Mass Political Behaviour", 93-99.

59. Women constituted 5.0 percent of the heads of household found in the assessment rolls (mean for 1824, 1827, 1829, 1834 and 1836 is 5.4 percent, with a range of 4.1 percent to 6.9 percent) and 10.0 percent of those in the census returns (mean for 1831 and 1842 is 10.5 percent, with a range of 8.6 percent to 11.6 percent).

60. The data set links 12,262 Upper-Town Quebec heads of household from a total of 27,017 individual cases found in 8 pollbooks (1792, 1814, 1816, 1824, 1829, 1834 and 1836), 3 parish *dénombrements* (1792, 1795 and 1818), 2 nominal census returns (1831 and 1842) and 5 assessment rolls (1824, 1827, 1829, 1834 and 1836).

61. Both censuses use 6 age categories for males: 0-13; 14-17; 18-20; 21-29; 30-59; and 60 and older. The vast majority of non-francophone heads of household were British. Of the 248 non-francophone heads of household listed in the assessment roll of 1834 and linked to the census of 1842, for instance, 96.0 percent were British.

62. The mean of the 7 elections is 40.4 percent, with a range of 35.8 percent to 44.3 percent.

pollbooks and the corresponding assessment rolls. The latter source underenumerated tenants, but census returns do not exist for the election years under consideration.[63]

The key to estimating the minimum size of the Irish eligible electorate is the linking process of the data available in the census of 1842 and that found in the assessment rolls. The limitations of the sources posed restrictions on analysis. Only the elections of 1834 and 1836 will be considered; the percentage of male anglophone heads which could be linked to country of origin information derived from the census of 1842 is relatively small for the elections of 1824 (10.2 percent of 744), 1827 (8.4 percent of 931) and 1829 (13.8 percent of 931). Furthermore, only a handful of Irish are identifiable as potential voters in the 3 elections taking place in the 1820s, (7 in 1824; 10 in 1827; and 21 in 1829), and fewer still are identifiable as actual voters (0 in 1824, 5 in 1827, and 8 in 1829). These low figures are products of an inability to recover the birthplace of those voters and potential voters and of the relatively small proportion, in the early part of the 1820s, of the anglophone eligible voting population who were native of Ireland. The data, despite its limitations, suggest that the percentage of Irish eligible voters increased, constituting less than one tenth of the British eligible electorate in 1824 and rising to one-sixth in 1829.

Linkage of the assessment rolls and the pollbooks of 1834 and 1836 to the census of 1842 provides both the country of origin and religion of 227 (21.7 percent) of the 1,046 anglophone eligible voters in 1834 and 283 (26.4 percent) of the 1,074 anglophone eligible voters in 1836. Even using a process which minimizes their strength underscores the potential voting power of an Irish-Catholic bloc — power that could not, and was not, ignored by the political leadership in a constituency where close elections were the norm. Irish Catholics accounted for at least 6.2 percent of the anglophone eligible voters in 1834 and 8.5 percent in 1836 (*see* table 7). This translated into a possible bloc of 65 (6.2 percent of 1,046) voters in 1834 and 91 (8.5 percent of 1,074) voters in 1836, representing a large enough number of potential votes to have affected the results at the polls. *Patriote*-party appeals to Catholicism also had a price — over half of the Irish were Protestant, with members of the Church of England or Scotland forming 9.3 percent of anglophone eligible voters in 1834 and 9.5 percent in 1836 (*see* table 7). The battle for Irish voters clearly had a demographic and political base. In 1834, the Irish accounted for at least 20.2 percent of the identifiable anglophone eligible electors, representing a potential bloc of 211 (20.2 percent of 1,046)

63. A comparison of the census return of 1831 and the assessment roll of 1827 suggests that the latter source underrepresents the number of tenants, listing only 59.4 percent of the tenants found in the census returns. Part of the difference may be attributable to an increase of population, but this cannot be the major explanation since the same proportion of underrepresentation is not sustained among the property owners (81.9 percent). For a discussion of this problem, *see* De Brou, "Mass Political Behaviour", 101-105.

voters and 422 votes (*see* table 9). By 1836, the possible number of Irish voters increased to 250 (23.3 percent of 1,074).[64]

Potential voters — yes — but did Irish Catholics vote and did they entwine themselves with the rose or the cabbage? In the by-election of 1836, despite the *patriote* invocation of Saint Patrick and Daniel O'Connell, Irish Catholics, like other Irish, voted *en masse* for Andrew Stuart. Of the 335 anglophone voters, 325 (97.0 percent) allied themselves with the Bureaucratic-party candidate; only 10 (3.0 percent) supported Joseph Painchaud (*see* tables 1 and 2). Linking the pollbook of 1836 to the census of 1842 identifies 30 Irish voters, 19 Protestant and 11 Catholics. Only 1 Irish Catholic did not cast his vote for Stuart and British solidarity.

With respect to the general election of 1834, the census of 1842 allows us to identify both country of origin and religion of 164 anglophone voters, 33 (20.1 percent) of whom were Irish. Applying this same percentage to the total anglophone voting population of 439 yields 88 (20.1 percent of 439) Irish voters — a sizeable bloc of voters. Of the 33 identified Irish voters, 8 (24.2 percent) were Catholic and 20 (60.6 percent) were Protestant; this translates into 21 (24.2 percent of 88) Irish-Catholic and 53 (60.6 percent of 88) Irish-Protestant voters.[65]

Analysis of voters according to religion and birthplace indicates that in contrast to the simple "national" response in 1836, religion complicated the electoral decisions of the anglophone voters in the general election of 1834. Francophone voters had the option of using both their votes to support francophone candidates, so they did; 98.9 percent of them voted for at least one francophone candidate, while only 6.1 percent cast a vote for Andrew Stuart, the sole anglophone candidate (*see* tables 1 and 2). Anglophone voters, on the other hand, had two votes each, but only one anglophone candidate facing them. Their response to that situation was determined in part by their religious affiliation, although "national considerations" also were at work. A very high percentage of all British groups — regardless of religion — gave one of their two votes to Stuart. Of the identifiable British voters, only a handful did not join the Stuart camp (*see* table 10). How British voters employed their second vote suggests that the *patriote* emphasis on religion and minority status, as well as Stuart's call to the Empire, fractured the British community along religious lines. Stuart had attempted to avoid this by imploring the British not to split their votes between himself and Caron, the moderate

64. These estimates are on the low side, based on the assessment rolls, sources that underrepresent the number of tenants. The census of 1842 suggests that within six years, the Irish constituted at least a third (36.1 percent) of the male anglophone heads of household, of which one half were Catholic (49.1 percent). Certainly not all of them would have been able to overcome the property restrictions, but this represents a bloc of 160 Irish Catholic voters (17.7 percent of 903), potentially controlling 320 votes in a general election.

65. The remaining 14 Irish voters (15.2 percent of 88) were linked to households that contained Protestants and Catholics.

patriote candidate: "He [Stuart] could not understand why, when the Canadians were endeavouring to turn him out, the English should endeavour to turn Mr. Caron in. There was no half course."[66] Two thirds of the members of the Church of England or Scotland answered this plea by plumping for Stuart (*see* table 11). Less responsive were the Catholics and the Non-Conformists — only one third of them followed Stuart's counsel, while about one-half opted to divide their votes between Stuart and Caron. In this sense, the response of the Irish Catholics, along with the British Catholics and British Non-Conformists, was more complex than that of the Irish and British who belonged to the Anglican or Scottish Church. Many Irish and British Catholics and Non-Conformists split their votes between an English-speaking Protestant Bureaucratic-party Scot and a French-speaking Catholic moderate *patriote*-party *canadien*: a logical response to their divided national and religious allegiances.

By shifting the spotlight away from the political leadership and by going beyond the traditional sources and methods, political history need not be out-dated. This blend of political and social history, or socio-political history, can only serve to widen our knowledge of past politics. With respect to the politics of early nineteenth-century Upper-Town Quebec, the creation of a large data set designed to increase the information on each potential and actual voter allowed us to better understand the political process. Newspaper reports of election activity suggest that national considerations appeared on the hustings in 1827 and dominated the campaigns of 1834 and 1836. Analysis of the linked pollbooks, assessment rolls and census returns confirms the impressionistic views found in the newspapers, but analysis of these non-traditional political sources also suggests a more complex explanation of voter response. The changing political options affected electoral decisions, with support greatest when voters had the choice of casting all their votes for candidates sharing the same linguistic background as themselves. Yet voters always had the option of not using their second votes and the "plumping" alternative differentiated anglophone from francophone voters, particularly in 1827 and 1834.

Newspaper reports indicate that this is what the Upper-Town Quebec politicians believed in the above circumstances. The contending political forces did not doubt that success at the polls depended upon an appeal to the growing British populace and particularly to the Irish segment. By underlining the common experience of religion, *canadien*- and *patriote*-party candidates hoped to capture the Irish-Catholic voters. Countering with a campaign founded upon language, the Crown, religious toleration and the increasing threat of French Canadianism, Bureaucratic-party standard bearers sought to convince the Irish electorate that its interests were best served by those of

66. *Quebec Gazette*, October 24, 1834. *See* also *Quebec Mercury*, October 25, 1834.

"British origin". The key in determining whether the politicians' beliefs were founded on political realities was the linking of the pollbooks and the assessment rolls to the census returns of 1842. Through the identification of religion and country of origin of a sufficient number of eligible electors and actual voters, it was concluded that Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants constituted large enough blocs of voters to affect the results in Upper-Town Quebec where close elections were the norm from 1827 to 1836.

Analysis of religion and nationality also indicated that in 1834, the response of the Irish and other British voters was complicated by religion. All British voters strongly supported the one anglophone candidate, but religious affiliation influenced the use of their second votes. In the by-election of 1836, a second vote was not available, forcing the anglophone voters to choose between religion and language. The *patriote* religious appeals, in the end, fell on barren ground, leaving the Canadian cabbage alone in a field of fervent nationalism.

Table 1 **Number and Percentage of Voters, According to Language Affiliation, Voting for at Least One Anglophone Candidate, Elections, Upper-Town Quebec, 1814-1836**

Language	1814		1816		1824		1827		1834		1836*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Anglophone	131	91.0	90	88.2	229	98.3	403	88.0	410	93.4	325	97.0
Francophone	102	26.3	39	14.9	317	86.4	159	22.2	33	6.1	27	8.2
Other	30	61.2	13	59.1	23	100.0	31	75.6	27	65.9	19	90.5
Total	263	45.3	142	26.8	569	91.3	593	48.8	470	46.0	371	54.2

Sources: Archives nationales du Québec (hereafter ANQ), Pollbooks, Upper-Town Quebec, 1814, 1824, 1827, 1829, 1834, 1836; Archives du Séminaire de Québec (hereafter ASQ), Pollbook, Upper-Town Quebec, 1816; Archives de la ville de Québec (hereafter AVQ), Quebec City, Assessment Rolls, 1824-1836; NAC, Lower Canada, Census Returns, 1831, C-720, C-721 (microfilm); NAC, Lower Canada, Census Returns, 1842, C-725, C-726 (microfilm); Joseph Signäy, *Recensement de la ville de Québec en 1818,* (Québec : La Société historique de Québec, 1976).
* = by election.

Table 2 **Number and Percentage of Voters, According to Language Affiliation, Voting for at Least One Francophone Candidate, Elections, Upper-Town Quebec, 1814-1836**

Language	1814		1816		1824		1827		1829*		1834		1836*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Anglophone	85	59.0	20	19.6	144	61.8	191	41.7	61	19.3	186	42.4	10	3.0
Francophone	378	97.4	227	86.6	360	98.1	653	91.1	413	73.2	535	98.9	301	91.8
Other	42	87.8	11	50.0	18	78.3	26	63.4	11	36.7	30	73.2	2	9.5
Total	506	87.1	258	66.8	522	83.8	870	71.5	485	53.3	751	73.6	313	45.8

Sources: *see* table 1.
Other: other or not known
* = by election.

Table 3 **Percentage of Francophone Voters, Voting for a Candidate, According to Language Affiliation, and the Number of Candidates, According to Language Affiliation, Elections, Upper-Town Quebec, 1814**

Year	Franc. %	Anglo. %	Other %	Plumped %	Franc. N	Anglo. N	Other N
1814	97.4	26.3	—	5.7	2	2	—
1816	88.6	14.9	93.9	4.6	1	1	1
1824	98.1	86.4	—	9.0	2	2	—
1827	91.1	22.2	16.6	11.2	2	1	1
1829*	73.2	—	26.8	—	*1	—	1
1834	98.9	6.1	—	2.4	2	1	—
1836*	92.8	8.2	—	—	*1	1	—

Sources: *see* table 1.
* = by-election; Franc. = Francophone; Anglo. = Anglophone; Other = Vanfelson; Plumped = not use second vote.

Table 4 **Percentage of Anglophone Voters, Voting for a Candidate, According to Language Affiliation, and the Number of Candidates, According to Language Affiliation, Elections, Upper-Town Quebec, 1814-1836**

Year	Anglo. %	Franc. %	Other %	Plumped %	Anglo. N	Franc. N	Other N
1814	91.0	59.0	—	36.8	2	2	—
1816	88.2	19.2	49.0	43.1	1	1	1
1824	98.3	61.8	—	38.7	2	2	—
1827	88.0	41.7	36.5	28.8	1	2	1
1829*	—	19.3	80.7	—	—	*1	1
1834	93.4	42.4	—	59.0	1	2	—
1836*	97.0	3.0	—	—	*1	1	—

Sources: *see* table 1.
* = by-election; Franc. = Francophone; Anglo. = Anglophone; Other = Vanfelson; Plumped = not use second vote.

Table 5 **Catholic and Protestant British* Heads of Household, Upper-Town Quebec, 1842**

Religion	Nationality					
	Irish		British-Not Irish		British	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Catholic	189	50.9	10	7.4	74	14.4
Protestant	152	41.0	116	85.2	328	63.7
Unclear	30	8.1	10	7.4	113	21.9
Total	371	100.0	136	100.0	515	100.0

Source: NAC, Lower Canada, Census Returns, 1842.
*British = natives of England, Ireland, Scotland or Canada (of British origin).
Unclear = household contained Catholics and Protestants.

Table 6 **Number of Years Residency in Lower Canada for Catholic and Protestant Irish Heads of Household, Upper-Town Quebec, 1842**

Religion	Number of Years					
	1-5		6-10		> 10	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Catholic	64	54.7	48	49.5	61	48.0
Protestant	45	38.5	42	43.3	55	43.3
Unclear	8	6.8	7	7.2	2	8.7
Total	117	100.0	97	100.0	127	100.0

Source: *see* table 5.
Unclear = household contained Catholics and Protestants.

Table 7 **Anglophone Eligible Voters, According to Religion and Nationality, Upper-Town Quebec, 1834-1836**

Ethnic Group	1834 Number	1834 %	1836 Number	1836 %
A. Catholic				
Irish	14	6.2	24	8.5
English			1	0.4
Scottish				
British Canadian	2	0.9	3	1.1
British	15	6.6	19	6.7
Other	8	3.5	14	4.9
Total	**(39**	**17.2)**	**(61**	**21.6)**
B. Protestant				
1. Church of England/Scotland				
Irish	21	9.3	27	9.5
English	8	3.5	9	3.2
Scottish	7	3.1	9	3.2
British Canadian	4	1.8	7	2.5
British	72	31.7	76	26.9
Other				
Total	**(112**	**49.4)**	**(128**	**45.2)**
2. Non-Conformist*				
Irish	5	2.2	8	2.8
English	2	0.9	2	0.7
Scottish				
British Canadian	1	0.4	1	0.4
British	12	5.3	15	5.3
Other				
Total	**(20**	**8.8)**	**(26**	**9.2)**
3. Protestant				
Irish	1	0.4	1	0.4
English				
Scottish				
British Canadian	1	0.4	1	0.4
British	10	4.4	11	3.9
Other	1	0.4	1	0.4
Total	**(13**	**5.7)**	**(14**	**5.0)**
C. Unclear (Catholic or Protestant)				
Irish	5	2.2	6	2.1
English				
Scottish	2	0.9	2	0.7
British Canadian	3	1.3	3	1.1
British	33	14.6	40	14.1
Other			3	1.1
Total	**(43**	**18.9)**	**(54**	**19.1)**
Summary				
Catholic	39	17.2	61	21.6
Protestant	145	63.9	168	59.3
Unclear	43	18.9	54	19.1
Total	**227**	**100.0**	**283**	**100.0**

Sources: ANQ, Pollbook, Upper-Town Quebec, 1834; AVQ, Quebec City, Assessment Roll, 1834.
Unclear = household contained Catholics and Protestants.
Other = household contained British and/or Europeans and/or Americans.
Non-Conformist*: includes Wesleyan, Methodist, Baptists, etc.

Table 8 **Male Irish Heads of Household, According to Religion, Upper-Town Quebec, 1834-1842**

Religion	1834 Number	1834 %	1836 Number	1836 %	1842 Number	1842 %
Catholic	14	30.4	24	36.4	160	49.1
Protestant	27	58.7	36	54.5	137	42.0
Unclear	5	10.9	6	9.1	29	8.9
Total	46	100.0	66	100.0	326	100.0

Sources: AVQ, Quebec City, Assessment Rolls, 1834, 1836; NAC, Lower Canada, Census Returns, 1842.
Unclear = household contained Catholics and Protestants.

Table 9 **Male Anglophone Heads of Household, According to Nationality, Upper-Town Quebec, 1834-1842**

Nationality	1834 Number	1834 %	1836 Number	1836 %	1842 Number	1842 %
Irish	46	20.2	66	23.3	326	36.1
English or Scottish	19	8.4	23	8.1	112	12.4
British*	153	67.4	176	62.2	429	47.5
Other/Unclear	9	4.0	18	6.4	36	4.0
Total	227	100.0	283	100.0	903	100.0

Sources: AVQ, Quebec City, Assessment Rolls, 1834, 1836; NAC, Lower Canada, Census Returns, 1842.
British* = natives of England, Ireland, Scotland or Canada (of British origin).
Other/Unclear = household contained Irish and/ or British and/ or Europeans and/ or Americans.

Table 10

Voters Casting Votes* for Candidates, According to Nationality and Religion, Elections, Upper-Town Quebec, 1834

	Candidates						
	Stuart		Berthelot		Caron		Total
Ethnic Group	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Canadien Catholic	15	5.4	262	94.6	270	97.5	277
Irish Catholic	7	87.5	2	25.0	4	50.0	8
British Catholic	10	76.9	7	53.9	5	38.5	13
British Non-Conformist	15	100.0	0	0.0	10	66.7	15
Irish Ch. of Engl./Scot.	13	86.7	2	13.3	3	20.0	15
British Ch. of Engl./Scot.	69	100.0	2	2.9	26	37.7	69
British Protestant	8	80.0	2	20.0	7	70.0	10
British Unclear	32	94.1	2	5.9	19	55.9	34
Other Unclear	4	100.0			3	75.0	4

Sources: ANQ, Pollbook, Upper-Town Quebec, 1834; NAC, Lower Canada, Census Returns, 1842.
Unclear = household contained Catholics and Protestants.
Ch. of Engl./Scot. = Church of England or Church of Scotland.
Non-Conformist: includes Wesleyan, Methodist, Baptists,etc.
Other = houshold contained British, Canadiens, Europeans or Americans.
British = natives of England, Ireland, Scotland or Canada (of British origin).
* Each elector has the right to vote for two candidates.

Table 11

Voting Record of Voters*, According to Religion and Nationality, Elections, Upper-Town Quebec, 1834

Ethnic Group	Voting Options: Berthelot only N	%	Stuart only N	%	Caron & Berthelot N	%	Stuart & Berthelot N	%	Stuart & Caron N	%	Total N
Canadien Catholic	3	1.1	4	1.4	259	93.5			11	4.0	277
Irish Catholic	1	12.5	2	25.0			1	12.5	4	50.0	8
British Catholic	1	7.7	4	30.8	2	15.4			6	46.2	13
Other Catholic					4	80.0			1	20.0	5
British Non-Conformist			5	33.3					10	66.7	15
Irish Ch. of Engl./Scot.	2	13.3	10	66.7					3	20.0	15
British Ch. of Engl./Scot.			41	59.4			2	2.9	26	37.7	69
British Protestant			3	30.0	2	20.0			5	50.0	10
British Unclear			15	44.1	2	5.9			17	50.0	34
Other Unclear			1	25.0					3	75.0	4

Sources: *see* table 10.

Unclear = household contained Catholics and Protestants.
Ch. of Engl./Scot. = Church of England or Church of Scotland.
Non-Conformist: includes Wesleyan, Methodist, Baptists, etc.
Other = household contained British, Canadiens, Europeans or Americans.
British = natives of England, Ireland, Scotland or Canada (of British origin).