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From the time that the first Europeans set foot on North American soil, immigration has fashioned the social and cultural fiber of what is now the United States. While the British heritage of the original thirteen American colonies shaped much of eighteenth-century American culture, colonial America was already a melting pot. On the eve of the American War of Independence, the population of the American colonies numbered about 2.8 million people. Those of English descent represented the largest sub-group; however, peoples of many other racial and ethnic groups resided in the colonies, including almost half a million African-Americans, many of whom were enslaved. The Scots-Irish, Germans, Irish, Swiss, French, Dutch, and Scots comprised some of the larger non-English populations. On-going immigration drove population growth during the course of much of the eighteenth century. At the turn of the century, the colonies contained approximately 262,000 people—on the eve of the Revolution, that number had increased more than ten-fold. By the time of the 1840 census, the population had grown to seventeen million. Immigration continued unabated and growing tensions of nativism influenced the US Census Bureau to begin capturing the nativity of the American populace. The 1850 census introduced a question regarding birthplace, asking each individual to identify the state, territory, or country of birth.

The 1870 US census recorded an aggregate population of 38,115,641. In cold, emotionless language, the census estimated the effect of the recent Civil War on the nation’s population count and arrived at an estimate that the United States had suffered “a direct loss to the male population of not less than 850,000.” The census also calculated an indirect loss to the nation’s population, as nearly 1.5 million men were at war and “withdrawn from domestic life.” The census estimated a population loss due to the disruption in the flow of immigrants. In the four years preceding the war, immigration grew the population by almost 650,000. However, the four years following the war saw immigration soar to almost 1.2 million new arrivals. During the four war years though, the United States welcomed only 553,605 new arrivals; a likely loss of over 350,000 potential new Americans occurred due to the war.

Despite the calamity of war, by the 1870 census foreign-born residents
represented 14.4 percent of the United States population. Immigration remained high through the rest of the nineteenth century and into the early decades of the twentieth century, with the percentage of foreign-born dropping to the single digits during the 1940 census and staying relatively low until it saw a sharp increase in the 2000 census. The count of foreign-born residents surged in the 2010 census, reaching almost thirteen percent. The population influx in recent years has been largely of Hispanic origin; the 2010 census reflects over thirty-nine million foreign-born residents with over fifty-three percent from Latin America and the Caribbean. Mexico alone accounted for almost thirty percent of the foreign-born population.\(^5\)

With the current heated immigration debate in the United States, it is worthwhile to turn to the nineteenth century and study the effects of immigration upon the United States, the immigrant population, and the immigrants’ country of origin. Numerous studies, such as Alison Clark Efford’s *German Immigrants, Race, and Citizenship in the Civil War Era* and Susannah Ural Bruce’s *The Harp and the Eagle: Irish-American Volunteers and the Union Army, 1861-1865* have examined the German and Irish immigration surges of the mid-nineteenth century.\(^6\) Likewise, a great deal of scholarship exists on the impact of the Italian and Eastern European immigration waves of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. “Eastern European Immigrants in the United States,” by Paula E. Hyman provides a lengthy bibliography of both primary and secondary sources.\(^7\) There are far fewer studies on French-Canadian immigration to the United States. Yet a significant influx of French-speakers from Quebec in the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth centuries provided Canada’s southern neighbour with a people already closely tied to the nation—a people who brought their own language and culture to America and provided a substantial boost to Roman Catholicism in the United States. In many ways, the French Canadian immigrant of the nineteenth century was similar to the Hispanic immigrant of the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries. However, unlike immigrants from the Old World and from the Spanish New World, the influx of Canadians to the United States brought a people who had been closely tied to the origin and development of America, and who for over one hundred and fifty years prior to America’s independence from Great Britain, had been considered an archenemy of the English colonists.
New France

Unlike the vast majority of immigrants to the United States in the mid-nineteenth century, the author’s great grandmother, Marie Iantha Paradis was a child of the New World. While the 1870 census reported over 5.5 million foreign-born residents, the vast majority—4.9 million—hailed from Europe. Less than nine percent emigrated from Canada. Before examining the causes and effects of the French-Canadian immigration to the United States, however, it is important to consider the variety of ways in which the founding of Canada related to that of the United States. Rather than relying solely on famed French explorers and settlers, this paper will also provide examples of Paradis’s own ancestors to illustrate the establishment and settlement of New France.

Both England and France were latecomers to Europe’s rush to discover and exploit the New World. Locked in a struggle for control of France during the Hundred Years’ War from 1337 until 1453, the two countries exhausted their manpower and resources. During the fifteenth century, Spain and Portugal, ably assisted by some Italian mariners, launched the initial European explorations of North and South America. These two powers relied upon newly improved ships, sailing technology, and weaponry that enabled them to circumnavigate the globe and overwhelm the native populations that attempted to oppose them. According to historian Alan Taylor, “By 1550, Spain dominated the lands and peoples around the Caribbean and deep into both North and South America.” Spanish successes

Figure 1. Marie Paradis, c. 1885-1890. Photo property of author.
spurred competing European powers to claim their own share of the riches, often by attempting to plunder Spanish treasure ships on their return route to Europe. By the late sixteenth century, visions of New World wealth and hope of finding trade routes to the Orient impelled England and France to seek their own colonies. In their race to explore and exploit the Americas, both countries carried with them a lasting hatred for the other, born from the fury of the Hundred Years’ War.¹⁰

France pursued exploration of North America through a series of expeditions, beginning with the French-sponsored Verrazano voyage of 1524. Regular forays of French fishermen to the Grand Banks brought sufficient harvests to supply the needs of Catholic France. Jacques Cartier led several expeditions to what is now Canada, including a voyage that explored the St. Lawrence River as far inland as the rapids by Hochelaga—a site now known as Montreal. An unfortunate series of false starts and missteps, including the Cartier voyages, provided the French with knowledge of the local peoples, their environment and its geography, but little else. However, the underpinnings of European exploration and conquest of the Americas changed by the efforts of Francis I of France; through his negotiations with the papacy, Europeans came to regard “discovery, conquest, and settlement” as the grounds for sovereignty in the New World.¹¹ This set the stage for a new wave of European colonization.

By the early years of the seventeenth century, both England and France launched colonial efforts that came to shape the future of both the United States and Canada. The English settlements at Jamestown in 1607 and at Plymouth in 1620 followed a distinctly different path than that launched by the French along the shores of the St. Lawrence River. The Anglo-American colonies developed rapidly, in comparison to the French, as the English came to settle and exploit the land, rather than to trade. Historian W. J. Eccles, professor of history at the University of Toronto, and specialist on the French era in Canada, characterized the English frontiersman as “a potential settler, the enemy and destroyer of the frontier forestland and its denizens.”¹²

The French, in particular Samuel de Champlain, by contrast, sought to establish alliances with the native peoples to exchange European goods for food and furs to supply the European markets. Champlain, often referred to by historians as the Father of New France, was an extraordinary figure. Soldier, cartographer, navigator, diplomat, humanist, administrator, and governor—for more than thirty years, Champlain was the pivotal figure in the founding of New France, beginning with his establishment of Quebec in 1608. A veteran of the French civil wars of religion that tore France apart between 1562 and 1598, Champlain, like his friend and mentor, France’s Henry IV, came to appreciate the
value of peace. During one of Champlain’s first missions to the New World, he acted as a spy in Spanish America for the French king. He observed first-hand the cruelty perpetuated by the Spanish on the native population. That experience influenced him to approach the tribes in the north in a dramatically different manner.\textsuperscript{13} According to Fischer,

Champlain’s special pattern of relating with the Indians made the history of New France fundamentally different than those of New Spain, New England, New Netherland, and Virginia. The Spanish conquistadors sought to subjugate the Indians. The English pushed the Indians away, built a big “pale” in Virginia, and forbade Indians from crossing it unless they presented a special passport. Only the French established a consistent policy of peaceful cohabitation, and something of its spirit persists in North America to this day.\textsuperscript{14}

Figure 2. “Carte geographique de la nouvelle Franse faictte par le Sieur de Champlain,” Map of New France, c. 1613, by Samuel de Champlain.
For the French, it was imperative to establish and maintain good relations with the Native Americans. As Alan Taylor noted in *American Colonies*, the French and Indians became bound to each other in a “mutuality of dependency.” The natives began to rely on European goods, which in the short term improved their quality of life, but their craving for those goods soon forfeited for them their previous independent way of life. The French, few in number, relied upon their native allies, the Algonquin nations and the Huron to provide them access to valuable furs. However, their allies also expected the French to assist them against their enemies—the Iroquois League. This war-like people was particularly aggressive and brutal; their reputation for cruelty far exceeded that of the Montagnais, Algonquian, and Huron. Unfortunately for the French, providing military aid to their native allies won them the enmity of the Iroquois.

Champlain used many tactics to forge close ties with the allied native nations, investing a great deal of time and energy to learn the people, their customs, their languages, and their land, which he frequently mapped. Additionally, Champlain sent a number of young French men to live with the Indians. Among them was Olivier La Tardif, or Letardif, Marie Paradis’s sixth great grandfather, whom Champlain sent to live with the Algonquin. La Tardif was born in 1604 and had been with Champlain in Quebec from as early as 1621. La Tardif began his career in Quebec as a clerk for the Company de Caën. Champlain was proud of the linguistic talents of his protégé, and wrote that La Tardif had become as “skilled in the languages of the Montagnais and Algonquin as those of the Huron.” Champlain and Jesuit father Le Jeune recognized La Tardif for his integrity and character. La Tardif developed a close relationship with many natives. Living among them and becoming fluent in their languages and customs, La Tardif gained their trust and esteem. He supported Indian missions and encouraged many to convert to Catholicism, personally acting as a godfather to the converts. La Tardif brought three Indian children into his home and raised them, further evidence of his devotion to his adopted people.

Unluckily, for the small, struggling French colony, by 1625 England and France were again at war. England unleashed privateers to attack and raid the French colonies. Jarvis Kirke, one such ambitious privateer, sailed for the St. Lawrence in March 1628 and captured the French supply ships and settlers who had been en route to the colony. Without supplies from France, the small settlement in Quebec was hard pressed. Champlain sent many of the men to winter with the Indian allies. The few who remained “were reduced to grubbing for roots and the charity of the Indians to avert starvation.”

By the spring of 1629, France had regained its territory along the St.
Lawrence via the terms of the Treaty of St.-Germain-en-Laye. However, there was little left of the French settlements. What the English had not stolen, they had destroyed. The French rebuilt. La Tardif returned to Quebec in 1633. He rose in prominence in the colony, eventually becoming a member of the *Compagnie de Beaupré* as its “general and special procurator.” In May 1637, La Tardif, together with Jean Nicollet received a large tract of land on the outskirts of Quebec, called Belleborne. His holdings expanded in April 1646 to include one-eighth of the seigneury of Beaupré. La Tardif eventually became the seigneurial judge of Beaupré. La Tardif married twice and had four children from his two marriages. He died at Château-Richer in January 1665.

Figure 3. Map of Quebec, c. 1641. The land holdings of Olivier La Tardif and Jean Nicollet appear in the left.

**The Peopling of New France**

Champlain’s sponsor, Henry IV, died in 1610. His assassination threw France into turmoil and elevated his wife, Marie de Medici to power as regent for
her son, Louis XIII. Louis came into power in 1616. One of his first acts was to force his mother, and her Italian advisors whom Louis hated, from power. Her French advisor, Armand-Jean du Plessis Richelieu, accompanied the queen regent into exile; however, he did not remain far from the seat of power for long. Richelieu exercised his vast diplomatic skills to effect reconciliation between the queen regent and her son. He soon rose to become the new king’s most trusted advisor. From 1621 until his death in 1642, the man who became Cardinal Richelieu exercised immense influence over France and its colonies.

In 1627, Richelieu organized a new vehicle to increase the population of the French colonies in North America—the Company of New France. By the terms

Figure 4. Cardinal de Richelieu, by Philippe de Champaigne, c 1633-40.
of its charter, the Company’s purpose was to attract hundreds of colonists each year. To further that goal, it granted large tracts of land—seigneuries—to prominent individuals who committed to bring settlers to the New World. One of the first men to obtain such a grant was Robert Giffard. Several of Marie Paradis’s ancestors accompanied Giffard to Quebec, including Marin Boucher and his wife, Perrine Mallet as well as Zacharie Cloutier, a master carpenter, and his wife Xainte Dupont. Another ancestor, Paradis’s sixth great grandfather Jean Guyon Du Buisson, a master mason, accompanied Giffard. Records indicate that Giffard provided Zacharie Cloutier and Jean Guyon Du Buisson grants of land at Beauport. Apparently, all was not well between the two neighbors, as conflicts arose between Cloutier, Guyon, and their seigneur, Giffard. Cloutier sold his property in 1670 to relocate to Château-Richer, where he had already received a grant of land from Governor Jean de Lauson on 15 July 1652. Reflecting the small size of the settlement, Champlain’s will notes a grant to Marin, stating, “I give to Marin, mason, living near the house of the Recollet Fathers, the last suit I had made from material that I got at the store.” Guyon Du Buisson appears as a witness to the marriage of Robert Drouin and Anne Cloutier, sixth great grandparents to Marie Paradis. Their marriage contract is the oldest preserved in the original in Canada. The early settlers to New France were exceptionally fruitful and the population doubled every twenty-five years. It seems that in New France, as in New England, “the only biblical commandment that these Christians consistently obeyed was to increase and multiply.”

Despite Richelieu’s best efforts to attract colonists—and the colonists best efforts to procreate—New France grew much slower than the English colonies to the south. By the second half of the seventeenth century, the population of New France was approximately twenty-five hundred, however, at 1660, the combined population of the English colonies of North America stood at over seventy-five thousand. Changes in Europe significantly affected the future of New France, for by 1663, “France was at peace and in a dominant position in Europe.” Louis XIV’s minister, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, an extraordinary diplomat responsible for not only France’s internal affairs but also for New France, aimed to “strengthen the French economy . . . [by utilizing the overseas colonies] to provide France with raw materials . . . and a market for French manufactured goods.” These goals required that New France’s population expand, that the colonies become secure and capable of providing for their basic sustenance. To that end, Colbert set about to reorganize the structure of the colony.

Colbert revoked the charter of the Company of New France, and in its place established a crown corporation—Canada became a royal province.
To enhance the security of the colony, Colbert sent companies of troops, including “the Carignan Salières regiment of nearly eleven hundred men under veteran officers.” These troops quickly became proficient at guerrilla warfare and held their own against the Mohawk. The French campaigns against the Mohawk and Onondaga branches of the Iroquois caused the Five Nations to “agree to end their hostilities with the French and their Algonquian allies.” With the Iroquois threat removed from the scene, Colbert was able to focus on expanding the colony’s population. The new governor general, Daniel de Remy, Sieur de Courcelle, encouraged the men of the Carignan Salières regiment to remain in New France. Colbert arrived at a unique solution to address the shortage of marriageable women in New France. He established a program to entice orphaned girls of good character to immigrate to the New World. The generous terms included a substantial dowry to young women willing to cross the Atlantic to marry one of New France’s many eligible males. Known as the filles du Roi, hundreds of girls made the daunting trip. The Ursuline and Hospital nuns cared for the girls until they found husbands, though typically, the girls married soon after arriving in the

Figure 5. Jean-Baptiste Colbert, by Claude LeFebvre, c. 1666
Marie Paradis’s fifth great grandmother, Perrette Hallier was a *filles du Roi*. She, like many of these girls, married a soldier of the Carignan Salières regiment, in her case, Antoine Bordeleau Laforest. Records indicate that,

[T]he thirty-five year old Antoine Bordeleau appeared at the home of the notary Pierre Duquet to sign his marriage contract with the eighteen-year old Perrette Hallier. The terms of the agreement conformed to the coutume de Paris. The bride brought to the marriage some personal property valued at 350 livres, not counting the gift of 50 livres from the king, given to all the young women under his protection. Antoine offered Perrette a prefixed dowry of 300 livres. Besides Anne Gasnier, chaperone of the king’s daughters, and the seigneur Bourdon Dombourg, François Noël, habitant of the Île d’Orléans, and the travel companions of Perrette Hallier, Nicole Legrand, Marie-Clair Lahogue and Marie Petit, signed the document. The marriage banns were published at the church of Notre-Dame de Québec. On Tuesday, 15 October 1669, Antoine Bordeleau dit Laforest, led his fiancée Perrette Hallier to the foot of the altar of the Virgin to receive the nuptial blessing. Witnesses present were Jean-François Bourdon, René Hubert, who had arrived here as a soldier about 1667 . . . Françoise de Lacroix, and Léonard Faucher dit Saint-Maurice.33

Life among the young couples of the colony was not always peaceful. Court records indicate that Perrette was involved in a fight with another woman and that “the matter was so serious that the civil lieutenant of Québec ordered an arrest issued . . . against Agathe Merlin . . . to the benefit of Perrette Hallier wife of Antoine Bordelot.”34

The waves of French immigrants to the New World slowed by 1672, however, during the time of Colbert’s intense focus on populating the colony, approximately six thousand men and women made the crossing. From this point forward, the colony grew through procreation, not immigration.35 However, over the next seventy years, the population of New France grew to only fifty-five thousand colonists, while the English colonies to the south expanded to a population of close to 1.25 million. The French loss to the Anglo-Americans during the French and Indian War seemed pre-ordained, though the French and their allies defeated the English at every turn during the early years of the war. It was not until the great British minister, William Pitt, took the helm and
commanded Britain’s war effort that the inevitable occurred.36

**Conquest and British North America**

Following its victory in the Seven Years’ War, the challenge of how to incorporate Francophone Quebec into the British Empire faced George III and his ministers. Guy Carleton, later Lord Dorchester, was among a small minority who successfully argued that the newest British acquisition—Canada—and its majority French Canadian Roman Catholic population be accommodated by allowing their “language, religion, and legal and political institutions” to continue under British rule.37 Carleton, together with several other key British leaders—the majority of whom were Anglo-Irish or Scottish—overcame the British desire to wipe out the culture of their newest subjects. While Canada’s population was quite small compared to the American mainland colonies, Carleton’s stance for the rights of the French Canadian majority against the small English Canadian minority made an impression and helped garner him the support he needed to resist the American invasion, when it occurred in 1775.

Despite multiple attempts to both cajole and force their neighbors to the north to join the American rebellion, the Canadians remained loyal to the British Crown. In a rather surprising turn of events, the American rebellion succeeded in large measure due to the efforts of France to wreak its vengeance on Britain.38 According to Eccles, however, as soon as America gained its independence, “the Americans displayed a singular lack of gratitude to the French. . . . [W]hen the [Treaty of Alliance] was put to the test in 1793, the Americans, without a qualm abrogated it.”39

The War of 1812 re-introduced the American desire to add Canada to its boundaries. Henry Clay harangued his fellow citizens that “The conquest of Canada is in your power” and Thomas Jefferson stated, “[T]he acquisition of Canada . . . will be a mere matter of marching.”40 While the end of the war brought little change to either the United States or Great Britain, it did establish that the borders of the United States would not expand to include the Canadian north.

**Exodus**

Over the ensuing half century, events in both the United States and Canada triggered a mass departure of Canadians to the United States. According to Claude Belanger of the Department of History at Marianopolis College, “[B]
between 1840 and 1930 roughly 900,000 French Canadians left Canada to [immigrate] to the United States. Historian Bruno Ramirez estimates that by the end of the nineteenth century, Canadian émigrés—both French and English speaking—to the United States equalled over twenty percent of the population of Canada. He further noted that so many Canadians immigrated to America that “angry politicians and community leaders used the term ‘exodus’ to denounce what they say as a quasi-apocalyptic loss of population.” Since the continued enmity of American Protestants greeted the arrival of the Catholic and French-speaking population from Quebec with fear and suspicion, the factors impelling the French-Canadians to depart Quebec were significant enough to outweigh the cultural ostracism that awaited the initial immigrants upon their arrival in America.

In his analysis of the dynamics that influenced French Canadians to emigrate from Quebec, Bélanger noted an “interplay of push and pull factors;” he attributed the poor economic situation in Quebec combined with the expanding economy of the United States as the primary factors that precipitated the exodus. He noted that, Quebec’s agriculture underwent tremendous strains during the 19th century. In part, these difficulties were demographic. Indeed, throughout the century, Quebec experienced very rapid population growth. However, by the 1830s and 1840s, Quebec’s most fertile farm land had been systematically occupied, leaving mostly peripheral regions open to agricultural colonisation, and thousands of landless farmers searching either for affordable, accessible and fertile land, or gainful employment. Between 1784 and 1844, Quebec’s population increased by about 400 percent, while its total area of agricultural acreage rose only by 275 percent, creating an important deficit of available farmland. While not as dramatic, this trend continued between 1851 and 1901. Since Quebec was largely a rural society in the 19th century, agricultural problems were truly national problems.

The economic and demographic turmoil noted by Bélanger caught Marie Paradis’s parents, Celestin Paradis and his wife Marie Adele Bertrand Paradis in its trap. Though the Paradis, a founding family, had resided on the Ile D’Orleans near Montreal since the mid-seventeenth century and farmed on the island for over two hundred years, Celestin Paradis and his family were asked to move from the
island—it could no longer support the number of families who wished to reside there and work its farms. By 1870, Paradis and his family, including his three young children, had moved to Detroit, Michigan where he found work as a ship’s carpenter. They lived in the Tenth Ward, a short distance from the Detroit River. At that time, Detroit’s population was less than eighty thousand people, of whom forty-five percent were foreign born. During the next decade, Felix Paradis—also a ship’s carpenter—and his family joined his younger brother Celestin in Detroit.

While a number of Canadians immigrated to Michigan, many French Canadians migrated to New England and Northern New York. Bélanger attributed the choice of New England to two key factors: financial cost and cultural impact. He noted that the initial migration of one member of a family would soon attract other relatives. This created a support system, which minimized the immigrants’
sense of dislocation. Bélanger noted that “Little Canadas” arose in many New England towns, where life was “predominately French and Catholic.” He described these French ghettos, where,

[a]round their local church and school, life appeared much the same as it was in some parts of Quebec. In these “Little Canadas,” Franco-Americans could often speak French to their priest, grocer, or doctor. This was especially the case as the number of French priests, most of them sent from Quebec, rose substantially as time passed. Father Hamon, in his 1891 study, had found that 175 French-speaking priests ministered to the French parishes of New England.

The family of Celestin Paradis lived in a mixed ethnic working-class neighbourhood during their early years in Detroit. Though many of their closest neighbors were Canadian, the neighbourhood was not exclusively so. Other nearby neighbors hailed from England, France, Bavaria, Ireland, Scotland, as well as other American states, including New York, Vermont, Wisconsin, Ohio, and New Jersey. The occupations of the local men included, among other things, house carpenter, cooper, cigar maker, sailor, caulker, blacksmith, bank clerk, saloonkeeper, shoemaker, ship carpenter, and railroad engineer. Detroit’s Tenth Ward was a melting pot in 1870, unlike the French-Canadian ghettos described by Bélanger in New England.

Once settled in their new home, the French-Canadians would often paint glowing pictures of life in America for their relatives back in Quebec. Amusingly, Belanger related that,

Figure 7. Celestin Paradis (1833-1905), c. 1900.
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In visits home, the emigrant often spent lavish sums of money to impress his family and neighbours and to prove to them that he had become successful. In many rural parishes, the gleam of a gilded pocket watch, a store bought suit or dress and a few American trinkets clashed with the relative material poverty of the local inhabitants. Indeed, the expressions "l’oncle des États" [uncle from the States] or "la tante des États" [aunt from the States] developed in Quebec to describe any relative that was rich, whether that relative was from the United States or not! The emigrant often became the symbol of success, stimulating others to follow his path to industrial New England.52

This phenomenon was displayed in a visit that émigré Marie Paradis Sullivan paid to Montreal years after she had married a second-generation Irish-American, John Emmet Sullivan. Accompanied by her daughter and son-in-law, she toured the land of her birth. Their visit was such an event that their picture appeared on the
front page of the Montreal paper, *La Press*; a tribute that likely occurred because a Bertrand cousin was the editor of the paper at that time.

Like many other new arrivals to the United States, the French-Canadian émigrés sought to blend into their new home. As Bélanger noted, “French is no longer a functional language in New England.”\(^{53}\) He also claimed that the close ties that once existed between Quebec and the French communities in New England are no longer evident. While the French-Canadian immigration may not have established French as a living language in America, it has had an effect upon the lives of the communities that eventually embraced the émigrés: the Roman Catholic faith has remained strong in many of those areas. Today, Catholicism is the largest denomination in Massachusetts, at over forty-six percent of the population, in Rhode Island at over forty-four percent of the population, in Connecticut with almost thirty-six percent of the population, in Vermont, at over twenty-five percent of the population, and in New Hampshire with twenty-four percent of the population. Likewise, Catholicism is the largest denomination in Maine, though the proportion is low at fourteen percent.\(^{54}\)

In “The Three Pillars of Survival,” Bélanger terms, “*Notre foi, notre langue, nos institutions* (our faith, our language, our institutions) . . . [as] the three pillars of survival of French Canadians.”\(^{55}\) Like the descendants of many French-Canadians, most of Marie Paradis Sullivan’s descendants are not fluent in French but remain Roman Catholic. As Bélanger observed, in Quebec, the opposite is true. The French language has remained strong but the Catholic faith has faded with the secularism prevalent in Canada. It is unfortunate that much of the French-Canadian heritage has faded in America; however, in the opinion of this author, the pillar of faith is perhaps the best legacy.
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