THE BRITISH-INUIT TREATY OF 1764-1765
PREFACE

Narratives about historic colonial relations between Inuit and Europeans in Labrador have been largely created by European participants, to serve European/Canadian interests. NunatuKavut Community Council (NCC) has spent decades striving to center these historic encounters in a balanced understanding that presents them accurately, inclusive of our Inuit perspective.

Inuit live in the entire area referred to as coastal Labrador, from Cape Chidley at the northern tip of the Labrador Peninsula to the Strait of Belle Isle. Our Inuit occupation was persistent and followed shifting land use patterns (moving with the seasons). We are, and were, skilled in navigation and possess deep knowledge of the Labrador lands, waters, and ice as we pursue cultural hunting, harvesting and fishing practices, all of which were (and remain) integral to Inuit survival. Inuit, particularly Inuit women, were always active and skilled traders.

An example of this Euro-focus has been the almost complete ignoring of the 1764-1765 Treaty between Inuit and the British Crown. Although the event is well-documented, and cannot be disputed, it gets little attention from government. It is largely ignored or downplayed because that is what best serves the interests of Canada and other actors interested in the resources of the NCC land claim area (lands, ice and waters).

This 1764-1765 Treaty is a fundamental constitutional event in the relationship between the southern Inuit of Labrador and Canada. It is similar to the pre-Confederation Peace and Friendship Treaties entered into between the British and the Mi’kmaq, Malecite and other Indian nations in 1760-61. Those Treaties were upheld by the Supreme Court in Marshall. The British-Inuit Treaty of 1764-1765 is similarly valid and enforceable. The Treaty protects our Inuit right of priority to the resources of our territory to sustain ourselves and to generate surpluses for fair trade with others. This vital Treaty right can no longer be ignored by Canada.

---

1 Stopp 2002, 2015; Martijn 2009
BACKGROUND TO THE TREATY OF 1764-1765

By 1764, the Inuit of southern Labrador had considerable experience with Treaty-making with Europeans. Violence between Europeans and Inuit had plagued the Labrador coast since the 16th century and had disrupted European attempts to exploit the rich fishery and trading opportunities in the region. Treaty-making was a way for both sides to promote peace and to engage, all importantly, in trade.

During the 1700s, the French themselves entered into Treaty with the Inuit in southern Labrador. This occurred in 1713 (Note F26 2) and in 1719 (Note B16), culminating with a Treaty entered into with the French Captain Jean Baptiste Galliot at Chateau Bay in 1756 (Note F15).

Although the French attempted to grant land and trade concessions to French merchants in portions of Labrador in the 17th and early 18th century, few French merchants carried out any trade activities beyond the Bay of Bradore on the Quebec North Shore. In 1742, Inuit still inhabited the entire coast of Labrador from the Belle Isle Strait to Hudson’s Strait. See map which follows:

2 The references to “Notes” use the numbering system in Appendix “A”.

Treaty Report Sept 2022.docx
The French had not complied with their promises in the 1713 and 1719 Treaties. Inuit resistance to French efforts in the Strait of Belle Isle therefore continued, including the burning of the French post at Cape Charles in 1741. By 1756, the French post at Chateau Bay had been abandoned altogether as a result of our continued opposition. Even without European firearms, the Inuit were successfully frustrating French attempts to gain access to resources in Inuit territory. Thus the need for the 1756 Treaty with Captain Galliot, which led to more peaceful and lasting Inuit/French trade relations well into the 1760’s. That said, by 1763, there was still no sustained French presence north of Cape Charles, on what the French described as the “Cote des Esquimeaux”, Inuit territory.
By 1763, the Inuit communities had a multi-year trade relationship with the French, particularly with Captain Galliot. The French had an annual fishing presence in the Strait of Belle Isle, including at Quirpon on the Northern Peninsula of Newfoundland. Inuit from Labrador occupied the Strait of Belle Isle and used that area (known by us as “Ikeramiklua”) as a traditional gathering place to harvest resources including wood for darts. It was natural for the two Nations to meet there every summer. The French subsequently built their trade zone and processes with our communities around this annual land and water use patterns to create a core Inuit/French trade zone (Quirpon-to-Cape Charles).

The Treaty of Paris (1763) ended the Seven Year’s War between the French and the British. That treaty negotiation between those two Nations dealt expressly with Labrador, trade with us, and French continued occupation of the north of the island of Newfoundland (the “French Treaty Shore”). In particular:

- European authority over Labrador was transferred to the British;
- The French negotiated for continued trade with our communities in Labrador. The British refused to concede on this important point; the French could have access to cod but not to Inuit trade;
- The French were given exclusive use of a wide section of northern Newfoundland, including the Northern Peninsula. It was in that core trade zone starting at Quirpon (Ikeraitsak) on the Northern Peninsula that the French had nurtured their trade relations with our people.

The Treaty of Paris (1763) was, of course, an event invisible to the Inuit of Labrador. Nothing Britain and France could do in discussions with each other had any immediate practical effect on our communities, and no impact at all on our use of the land, ice and waters of both Labrador and the island of Newfoundland. We lived our lives as before. There continued to be French merchants operating from fishing vessels and their bases on the Northern Peninsula. For us, post-1763 Treaty was very much “business as usual”.
Britain was determined, however, to change this by offering itself, and its merchants, as the preferred Inuit trading party. The British Crown issued strict instructions to the Governor of Newfoundland to “use your best endeavours to conciliate their [Inuit] Affections, and to induce them to trade with Our Subjects.”

Hugh Palliser, appointed the Governor of Newfoundland in 1764, worked to fulfill those Instructions. Palliser aimed to eliminate competition by discouraging permanent European settlement, preventing the French from trading with our people (from Quirpon and elsewhere), and improving safety for the British by reducing violence with our Inuit communities.

The 1764-1765 Inuit Treaty Conferences were carefully planned by the British authorities and the Moravians who acted as their agents. The Moravians, fresh from success with Inuit in Greenland, had ambitions to expand into Labrador. Jens Haven, a Danish missionary who had learned some Inuktut in Greenland, met with Governor Palliser in London in 1764, and the two agreed their goals for Labrador coincided.

If the Moravians could induce Inuit out of the Strait of Belle Isle and away from the British fishery, then the British colonial goals would be furthered. In a petition to the British Lords of Trade, Moravian officials argued that their missionary work was key to establishing safe conditions for a British fishery. If the “English Nation...ever wish to see the Fishery on that Coast Secure from the Depredations of those barbarous People by their becoming Civilized,” the Moravians wrote, then it should “readily grant us all needful & proper protection & assistance.”

By the summer of 1764, Brother Jens Haven had been authorized by Governor Palliser to go to Labrador to make contact with our community members on their behalf. Haven travelled to Quirpon in August, knowing he would meet Inuit traders there to whom he could issue his

---
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invitation. Encountering our people at Quirpon was not a fortuitous accident. It was known that Inuit went to-and-from there every year, including for trade with the French.

On September 4, 1764, at Quirpon Island (“Ikeraitsak”), Newfoundland, Haven met with, first of all, 18 Qayaks of Inuit men and later he records 26 Qayaks of Inuit men.

The Inuit had come to Ikeraitsak to meet the French captain/trader Galliot with whom they had made Treaty in 1756, and were surprised when Haven spoke to them in their own language. They responded to Haven in broken French. Haven told them he wanted to speak in their language and proceeded to change into his Greenland Inuit clothing.

Haven then conversed with them in Inuktitut and gave them gifts (fish hooks, sewing needles and money: Note MO1). Haven offered to trade, but the Inuit who were there had nothing with them to exchange. Haven took aside six of the Inuit and read to them a letter given to him by Governor Palliser that expressed “the good intent of the Government towards them and wished they would be partakers of such great Benefits.” Haven offered to give them the paper, but they refused, being “afraid to take it” because they believed that the paper had shamanistic powers to cause Haven to speak. This negative reaction would guide future British and Moravian conduct in their Treaty processes with our Nation.

Over the course of that week, Haven developed a relationship with those Inuit families by hosting and visiting them many times. According to his records, they discussed relations with Europeans, including the Governor’s desire to encourage peaceful trade.8

The Inuit and Haven also discussed Moravian plans to return to Labrador the following summer with other missionaries to explore the possibility of establishing a Moravian mission station. On several occasions, the Inuit asked Haven to confirm that he would return. He assured them that
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he would and encouraged them to collect products over the winter for them to trade. Both sides agreed to meet again next year.

Upon returning to St. John’s, Jens Haven reported on his trip to the British authorities. He impressed Governor Palliser, who was convinced the missionary would prove useful to the British Crown. “I think a good use may be made of this man next year,” Palliser wrote to the British Board of Trade.

Over the following winter, Moravian officials and British colonial agents in England and Germany discussed their plans for developing a relationship with the Inuit of Labrador. While the Moravian request for exclusive land grants conflicted with Governor Palliser’s aims, each party recognized the mutual benefit of collaboration. The British needed the missionaries’ Inuktitut translation skills in negotiations with Inuit, and the Moravians needed the British to allocate them land from which they could operate Labrador mission stations.

What the Moravians wanted was a land allocation near what had been long known as Eskimo Bay (now Groswater Bay). As matters transpired, the British reserved trade on the south coast of Labrador to themselves, relegating the Moravians, starting in 1771, to areas further north and outside the core Inuit trade zone developed by the French.

Although the 1763 Treaty of Paris prohibited the French from fishing along the Labrador coast or trading with Inuit, the French continued to trade with us from their sites (like Quirpon) on the Northern Peninsula of Newfoundland. The French captain Galliot even offered to pay an English officer “a considerable sum of money” to allow him to trade in Labrador. When this bribe was refused, he sent his boats anyway and “trafficked with the savages.” Captain Galliot had
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developed a strong relationship with Inuit through his earlier Treaty efforts, who had asked after him by name at the meeting with Haven in Quirpon the previous summer.\footnote{Haven in Taylor 2009: 93}

Four Moravian missionaries travelled to Pitts Harbour in southern Labrador in mid-July 1765. Palliser requested that two of them travel north on an exploratory trip to the Davis Inlet area, so Jens Haven and Schloezer boarded a ship heading north. Governor Palliser joined the remaining two (Drachart and Hill) in Pitts Harbour when he arrived on the HMS Guernsey on August 8\textsuperscript{th}.\footnote{Privy Council documents, No. 419, p. 1301}

On August 10, 1765, concerned that the French were acting to “\textit{prejudice those ignorant barbarous People against the English Nation}” and thus undermine British influence and commerce in the region, Palliser issued an “\textit{Order forbidding the French to have any Traffick with the Esquemeauxs or to Molest or Hurt them}”\footnote{ibid., pp. 1297-98} adding:

\begin{quote}
And Whereas I am endeavouring to establish a friendly communication between His Majesty’s subjects and the said natives on the Coast of Labrador, and to remove these prejudices that have hitherto proved obstacles to it. I have invited Interpreters and Missionaries to go amongst them to instruct them in the principles of religion, to improve their minds, and remove their prejudices against us.\footnote{ibid., p. 1298}
\end{quote}

Governor Palliser instructed all British subjects to refrain from violence against Inuit and instead, “\textit{by all fair, just and gentle means, to encourage and invite them to come with their commodities to trade}.”\footnote{Diaries of the Moravians in \textit{Joseph Banks}, ed. Lysaght, p. 197-8}

On August 18\textsuperscript{th}, Drachart, Hill, and the British met a group of Inuit. Drachart “\textit{invited them to come to Pitts Harbour to see the Governor & introduced Sir Thomas to them as an Officer who was their Friend & would on every occasion while they staid here protect & shew them kindness}.”\footnote{Treaty Report Sept 2022.docx}
Inuit trade opportunities were valuable to the Europeans vying for their attention. The French had developed a core trade zone with the Inuit of Labrador in the Quirpon-to-Chateau Bay area. The British were determined to take over the trade relations that the Inuit had with the French, which meant creating their own relationship with our Inuit communities in the area, and working to prevent the French from continuing theirs.

THE BRITISH-INUIT TREATY

Beginning on August 21, 1765, members of our Inuit communities in southern Labrador responded to the invitation given to them by Jens Haven the year before and met with the British Governor of Newfoundland, Hugh Palliser, in Chateau Bay. The British picked Chateau Bay for the 1765 Treaty conference because it was in the core Inuit/French trade zone, and would be central for our people of the immediate area, as well as intercept other community members on their way from such places as Sandwich Bay and Hamilton Inlet to visit the French out of Quirpon.

For our community members, they were coming down that coast as usual every summer for trade with the French and to harvest resources. As we shall see, hundreds of our Inuit community members decided to respond to the invitation from Haven to attend the British event, and the constitutional history of Labrador was forever changed by that encounter.

Through the Inuktitut-interpreting skills of Moravian missionary Christian Drachart, the Inuit negotiated a Treaty with the British in August-September of that year. A pictorial of that Treaty Conference follows in Fig.2.
The Treaty guaranteed us, as self-governing Inuit, a right of priority access to the resources of our territory, along with a right to truck/trade with British merchants on fair and advantageous terms.

This Treaty Conference was no minor event. This was an event conducted with great ceremony, over a lengthy period of time:

• There were three British navy vessels, with a total of some 600 British navy personnel:
  
  (1) **HMS Guernsey** – 50 gun ship -compliment of 350 men -Governor, Sir Hugh Palliser, flagship
  (2) **HMS Niger** – 32 gun ship – compliment of 220 men – Sir Thomas Adams, master
  (3) **HMS Hope** –service schooner – 105 tons – compliment of 30 Men
• There were also at least two merchant ships:
  
  (1) Darby’s ship, probably the *Europa* – punched for 30 guns – 12 swivels – about 120 men
  (2) Coghlan’s ship, either the *Swift* or the *Two Sisters*, with about 50 men aboard.

• Taken together, this represented five British ships, with a combined crew of some 770 men.

• On our side, there were initially some 300 of our Inuit in attendance, with a second party that joined later. In a letter from Palliser in 1766, he gave the number of our community members as being 500, each family unit bringing its harvest surpluses for sale.

That means that 1,300 people were in Chateau Bay, Labrador in 1765 in diplomatic conference sessions that ran from August 18th until September 21st, a total of 34 days.

This was an intense and serious diplomatic effort, underscoring the importance of these peace, friendship and trade issues for both sides. It was also incumbent on the British to remain available and open for trade long enough (over a month) to intercept as many of our Inuit as possible, hoping keeping us from trade with the French at Quirpon, who would vacate that area at the end of the summer fishing season (See Note M12). The logbooks for HMS Niger contain numerous references to them going out to look for passing Inuit community members in August 1765.18

**What were the British Treaty Promises?**

Among the British Treaty promises made to the Inuit were (*bold* added):

• From the Articles written by Governor Palliser, and read by Brother Drachart:

  *Our King ... loves you & will not let any Body do you harm.*
  *I make you a present of a good Tent to shelter them from the Weather.*
  *Our People have some things to Truck with you.*

18 ADM51/636, HMS Niger Journal, 26 March 1765- 31 March 1766
If you will let me know what things you want our people shall bring you every thing the next Year to truck for your things.
I will take care that our People take nothing from you but what you choose to exchange for something else.\textsuperscript{19}

\begin{itemize}
  \item On August 26\textsuperscript{th}, Drachart read a letter to our community representatives that said:

  So as you have in your Tents Chief-men, you may also observe in the Ships that we also have Chief-men among us. But in our Land we have also a very great man, George King of Great Brittain his Country is called England, he has also many Countries….He \textit{loves the Inuit}, he is like a \textit{Father} to you, and has given orders to his Subjects, that when they come to your Land they shall \textit{Shew you all kindness} and do you no harm. Do you also act so towards them. Commit no Hostilities, Steal not & they will not Steal from you, do not kill any of them & they will not kill any of you. When you \textit{Trade} with the English & become better acquainted with them you will find that they love you & will \textit{do you all manner of good}; you and your Children will reap the \textit{advantage} of it.\textsuperscript{20}

  \item Drachart met our Inuit leaders and presented them with a picture and memento of the Treaty event:

  \textit{[He] called the Old Men together & shewed them a Picture wherein the Commodor’s Ship with the Yards man’d, the two Barges accompanied by the Indians, just as it appeared on the Day when we made peace with them was represented. He explain’d this to them & told them the Commodor made them a present of it, that they might take it home with them & shew it to their people & tell them of the league of friendship which we have entered into with their Nation. And whenever they look’d upon this picture they should think on their good Friends the English. All this they understood & accepted of the present with great tokens of satisfaction, they even offer’d a large quainty [sic] of Whalebone in return, but we declined it (Diaries of the Moravians in Joseph Banks, ed. Lysaght, p. 205).}

  \item On September 3\textsuperscript{rd}, when Inuit in four kayaks came aboard the British ship, Drachart showed our representatives “his Majesty’s Picture which hung in the cabin.”\textsuperscript{21}

  \textit{Br Drachart shew’d them the Picture, & said here you see the Picture of our King, He it is who has sent the Governor to you; when you made peace with the Governor, it is the same as if you were obedient to the King whose picture you

\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{19} Diaries of the Moravians in \textit{Joseph Banks}, ed. Lysaght, p. 201
\textsuperscript{20} Diaries of the Moravians in \textit{Joseph Banks}, ed. Lysaght, p. 202-203
\textsuperscript{21} Diaries of the Moravians in \textit{Joseph Banks}, ed. Lysaght, p. 206
see here, & when you go to Newfoundland or Northward the King will rejoice when he hears that you behave yourselves well & are obedient orderly Caralit.  

Our Inuit representatives understood what was being said to them and responded in kind. When the British / Moravian group “reminded them of the peace which they made with the Governor,” our representatives “say’d as long as day & night remains, we will continue your good Friends; & when we come next year we will bring all our Whale bone with us.”

Common to all these exchanges are (a) peace, (b) friendship/kindness and (c) trade in a fair process. The importance of trade as a vital aspect of this relationship can be seen in its continuous mention:

- In the 1763 Instructions to the Governor of Newfoundland;
- In the 1764 discussions with Jens Haven, the agent for the Governor;
- In Palliser’s 1764 letter to the Board of Trade;
- In the August 1765 Order issued by Governor Palliser;
- In the Treaty Articles prepared by Governor Palliser and presented to the Inuit by Drachart;
- In the August 26, 1765 letter read to our representatives;
- In the speech to the Inuit when we were presented with the picture commemorating the Event;
- In the September 1765 “whale bone” discussion between the Inuit and Drachart.

Trade was fundamental to this relationship. The British wanted a monopoly on trade with our Inuit communities, because it was very valuable to them. We had other trade options (the French easily available in Quirpon, for example), and those existing relationships were familiar to us. From the British perspective, cornering that trade, and making sure that trade was as large as possible, was a prime interest.

From our Inuit perspective, the inherent right to utilize and harvest resources of the territory to create surpluses to engage in trade was fundamental to this Treaty relationship. We were self-governing going into the Treaty event and continued to be self-governing after the Treaty Event.

22 Diaries of the Moravians in Joseph Banks, ed. Lysaght, p. 206
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(and thereafter). Those rights are now constitutionally guaranteed to our southern Labrador Inuit communities by section 35 of the Constitution Act.

AFTERMATH OF THE 1764-1765 TREATY EVENT

Palliser reported this Treaty to the Earl of Halifax in September 1765, saying that he had “an interview with the wild Savages of that Country, and, in obedience to His Majesty’s commands, to endeavour to conciliate their affections, & establish peace & friendship with them; accordingly I had the luck to meet with a Party of near 500 (Men, Women & Children included) of the Wild Carolit or Esquimaux Savages, from the North Coast of Labrador, & by means of one of the Brethren of the Unitas Fratrum, who speaks their language, & who came from Germany on purpose with a view of sending Missionaries amongst them, I first explained to them His Majesty’s affection & gracious intentions towards them, & in his name offered them protection from all People whatever, & invited them to live in peace & friendship with us, they joyfully accepted the Offer, & promised to live in peace & friendship with us by night & by day, so long as we forbear to do them any harm...” 24.

Palliser asked British subjects “to prevent anything being done to break the Peace which I made with the Carolit or Esquimaux Savages on the 21st instant, who have promised to live in friendship with us by night and by day, so long as we forbear to do them any harm” 25.

Palliser also issued rules about who would have the “exclusive privilege of trafficking with the savages” in each harbour, demonstrating the value and appeal of such trade26.

24 Governor Palliser’s Dispatch to the Earl of Halifax, 11 September 1765, C.O. Records 194/27, Privy Council documents, No. 222, p. 946
26 Privy Council documents, No. 221, p. 945
Palliser later wrote to the Lords of Trade, “I am likewise of opinion that under proper regulations that coast may prove a source of great wealth and naval strength to the nation”.

In 1766, Palliser repeated his argument that “The Carolits or Esquemeauxs...may be easily Civilized, which would be of great advantage to the Trade of His Majs Subjects”.

In 1766, Governor Palliser ordered the construction of Fort Pitt at Chateau Bay. He also directed the establishment of a truckhouse (initially at Henley Harbour and then on “Truck Island”, south of Cape Saint Charles). The British Navy also stationed vessels off Newfoundland in 1766 to keep the French from trading with the Inuit (see Note E17).

Figure #3: Small portion of the Southern Labrador coastline showing, (1) Camp Islands/Cape Charles area where our people were initially encamped during the Treaty Event of 1765, (2) Chateau Bay, the primary location of the treaty negotiations, and (3) the ‘truck house’, set up by the British, midway between the British navy ships and the Inuit camps; to the present day this island is known as Truck Island, on both navigation charts and toponymic maps.

27 Governor Palliser to Lords of Trade, 30 Oct 1765, Privy Council documents, No. 224, p. 948.
28 Palliser to Heads of Enquiry, 19 March 1766, Privy Council documents, No. 229, p. 959
Governor Palliser also called for a second Treaty conference with our Inuit communities in 1766, again in Chateau Bay (Note E12). This time, 4-500 of our Inuit men and women, with their children accompanying them, responded, initially setting up on Camp Island. On August 8, 1766, we met again with the Governor and settled on Grenville Point and Whale Island (Henley Harbour) to engage in trade and treaty renewal. This Treaty renewal was repeated in 1767 (Notes E13, E13c, E33), at which Governor Palliser reported acquiring three tons of whalebone in trade with our people. The annual exchange of ceremonial gifts continued in 1768 (Note E13d), 1769 (Note E17d), 1770 (Note E17c), and until at least 1774 (Note E18).

These British trading posts were the focus of much of the Inuit trade in Labrador. The British took steps to restrict continued French trade in that area. This included:

- Stationing HMS Niger at Great Quirpon Harbour in late August of 1767, the navy vessel endeavoured to keep the Inuit, who were camped at nearby Sacred Bay, away from French traders on the eastern side of the Northern Peninsula, as well as to prevent Inuit from ‘plundering’ French property nearby. On September 2nd, the Niger greeted several hundred Inuit and the following day discouraged them from travelling further east (towards the French). By September 20th, the shallop from the HMS Niger pushed the Inuit as far west as Cook’s Harbour (back towards Labrador) and, in the process of doing this, met resistance from the Inuit, who wounded two British Navy men in the skirmish. By September 28th, the Niger was successful in pushing the Inuit away from the Northern Peninsula and back to the Labrador coast.
- Stationing HMS Otter off Henley Harbour in September 1770 to pick up Inuit who were passing by and take them by ship to Cape Charles for trade with the British;
- On August 6, 1771, on board the Ship Nautilus, ordering the punishment (2 dozen lashes) for a seaman who, while drunken, insulted one of our people; 31

29 ADM 52:1382; ADM 51:36
30 ADM51/663, HMS Otter Journal #3, December 17, 1769 – December 16, 1770
31 ADM52/1387; Logbook #7, January 8, 1771 – January 9, 1772.
• Directing HMS Otter to spend the summer of 1772 near Henley Harbor to intercept our community members (including firing a 6 pound warning shot at an Inuit shallop trying to pass Chateau Bay, ordering her into Henly Harbour) 32.

During this important Treaty-period, there was no competition from Moravian trading missions from 1765 to 1771, the date of the first Moravian mission. Even after the British had been convinced to grant land to the Moravians, that competitor trading post was sent northwards to Nain, safely outside the core Quirpon-to-Chateau Bay Inuit trade zone that the French had developed and the British had inherited. Once opened, the Moravian mission posts were at a key trade disadvantage in comparison to the British trading posts, since the Moravians refused to sell firearms and ammunition to Inuit until 1786. 33

OUR INUIT REPRESENTATIVES

The Inuit who treated with Governor Palliser identified themselves as being from southern Labrador, including our communities around Kikertak (Norman Bay to Spotted Island), Nuneinarmik (North side of Hamilton Inlet), Aviktume (Sandwich Bay area), and Arbaktok (south side of Hamilton Inlet). See Fig 3 below. These communities represent stable and long-term southern Labrador Inuit kinship networks, with interconnections up and down the coast, which survive and flourish into today.

32 ADM51/663, HMS Otter Journal #6, January 19, 1772 – January 18, 1773; ADM52/1387; Logbook #9, January 10, 1772 – January 10, 1773.
33 “So fond of the pleasure to shoot”: The Sale of Firearms to Inuit on Labrador’s North Coast in the Late Eighteenth Century, Hans Rollman, Newfoundland and Labrador Studies, 26, pages 1 and 14 (2011)
Our territory extended inland where there “are plenty of Trees but near the Shore its Barren, the Isles are also Barren. There are many Fresh Water Lakes.”

As the Moravians recorded, we utilized our territory of land, water and ice to harvest “Whales, Seals, small Cod, &c &c The Land – with Deer, Foxes, White & Black Bears, Wolves & doubtless other animals. In the fresh water they find plenty of Salmon.

... In Winter & early in the spring the men are employed in catching Seals, Whales, Birds &c. In summer they hunt Deer, Fish for Cod & Salmon; they also catch Herrings with a small net. The men make the frames or wood-work for the Womens
Boats & their own Kaiaks. They Women sew the skins to cover them with, they also make the Tents & cloaths, & does the Domestic Business.

... The [Inuit] kill the Whales & Seals with Harpoons which stick fast in the fat; to the end is fastened a leather thong with a Seal skin blown full of wind; this tires the Creature to draw thro’ the water, as he comes up they repeat their strokes till the whale is quite spent. They then put on a dress of skins so boiant that they are from the middle upwards above the water; thus they surround him as he floats & cut & take away as much of the Whale as they think proper. Deer they wound with their Arrows and then hunt them down with their dogs. Fish they catch with Hooks & Lines as we do.”

The Inuit expressed an interest in trading “Whalebone &c for such things as they [need].”

In terms of European trade goods, our communities were interested in “Files, Rasps, Adzes, Saws, Chissells, Gouges, Gimlets, Draw-knives, Large Clasp-knives, Large Butcher like knives with sharp points, such half round knives as the shoemakers use to cut their upper leathers with, Augars, spike-nails, & other lesser Nails, needles square & round pointed taylers & womens thimbles scissars, hammers, Iron wire of different thickness Battoes or Shallops, Sail Cloth, Ropes, Cordage, Fish-lines and hooks, blocks, robes & everything thats necessary to rig a large boat with one sail, small sea chests, pewter plates, dishes, spoons, ladies, lead, large Iron or Brass kettles, small potts of Iron saucepans, coarse thick milled White Wollen Cloth with one side well raised. Their women are fond of beads of different colours, rings, combs (especially small teethed) Brass medals & counters.”

THE BRITISH TREATY PROMISES

In this Treaty event, our Inuit community members agreed to “peace”, promised to enter into “friendship” with the British and accept the British King as their “Father”. In turn, the British King took our Nation under his protection and gave our representatives a British flag as a sign of that protection and relationship, which, together with a picture, served to memorialize the agreements reached. This brought our southern Inuit communities into “peace and friendship”
relations with the British Crown (although no effective Euro-Canadian sovereignty would exist in our area for hundreds of years).

**What did the British promise?**

1. That we would not be treated badly because the British King loved us and would not let anyone do us harm.

2. That the British and the Inuit would live together as brethren and not hurt each other.

3. We were assured a right of trade with British subjects, without danger of being hurt or ill-treated.

4. The British made an active promise that trade goods would be brought to Labrador for trade with our communities.

5. The British also promised that nothing would be taken from us that we did not wish to trade voluntarily, and assured us that the trade would do us “all manner of good”, “shew [us] all kindness” and “be to [our] best advantage”. The British wished to maximize the trade goods which our Nation would bring to them, while discouraging our communities from continued trade with the French (who remained interested and readily available on the Northern Peninsula of Newfoundland). As a result, the Crown promised to take steps to ensure that the trade with merchants and truck houses/trading posts would be on basis advantageous for our people.

Of note, the Treaty did not:

- Surrender any territory or rights of the Inuit.
- Discuss British settlements to be made in Labrador.
- Intrude into our Inuit self-governance.
- Interfere with our continuing Inuit life-ways, including continued access by us to those resources required for self-sustenance and the generation of economic surpluses for trade.
The British-Inuit Treaty of 1764-1765 conferred on the Inuit communities of southern Labrador, and the current NunatuKavut members who are their descendants, a constitutionally-protected commercial trade right, which includes a right to access the wildlife and natural resources of the land, ice and waters to sustain them and to generate surpluses for trade. The trade is to be done at prices advantageous to, and in processes fair to, our people. If the interests of non-indigenous users of the resources conflict with our Treaty rights, we are to have priority. This created a mandatory duty on the Crown to act to ensure that its Treaty covenants were met.

An analogous positive duty to act was found in *Manitoba Metis Federation Inc. v. Canada*, [2013] 1 SCR 623, which held that fiduciary duties arise in the Aboriginal context when:

there is (1) an undertaking by the alleged fiduciary to act in the best interests of the alleged beneficiary; (2) a defined person or class of persons vulnerable to a fiduciary’s control; and (3) a legal or substantial practical interest of the beneficiary that stands to be adversely affected by the alleged fiduciary’s exercise of discretion or control.

The Treaty of 1764-65 contained a positive duty on the Crown to act, to benefit the southern Inuit, now the NCC membership.

As also noted in *Manitoba Metis Federation*:

*In the context of the implementation of a constitutional obligation to an Aboriginal people, the honour of the Crown requires that the Crown: (1) take a broad purposive approach to the interpretation of the promise; and (2) act diligently to fulfill it. The question is whether, viewing the Crown’s conduct as a whole in the context of the case, it acted with diligence to pursue the fulfillment of the purposes of the obligation. The duty to act diligently is a narrow and circumscribed duty. Not every mistake or negligent act in implementing a constitutional obligation to an Aboriginal people brings dishonour to the Crown, and there is no guarantee that the purposes of the promise will be achieved. However, a persistent pattern of errors and indifference that substantially frustrates the purposes of a solemn promise may amount to a betrayal of the Crown’s duty to act honourably in fulfilling its promise.*
The promises made to our Inuit communities included a Crown duty to act by giving orders to his British subjects: *King George ... loves the Innuit, he is like a Father to you, and has given orders to his Subjects ...*” (bold added)

In the case of the implementation of the Treaty promises, Canada has failed to take a broad and purposive interpretation of the Treaty covenants (or, rather, has neglected to recognize them at all) and has acted, to use the phraseology from *Manitoba Metis Federation*, with “persistent inattention”, and with “repeated mistakes and inaction that persisted for more than a decade” since the Treaty assertion was made in *Unveiling NunatuKavut* in 2010. 34 This is inconsistent with the behaviour demanded by the honour of the Crown, since “*a government sincerely intent on fulfilling the duty that its honour demanded could and should have done better*”.

The principle adopted by all Courts has been to recognize that the Treaty consists of what the parties said to each other at the Treaty Conference. Whether the British chose to write down anything, or chose to write down only some of what was said, does not affect the covenants verbally exchanged or their enforceability.

That an executed document is not required for a Treaty to exist was endorsed by the New Brunswick Court of Appeal in *R. v. Polchies*, which found that a verbal agreement reached between Superintendent Francklin and the Mi’kmaq at Miramichi on September 24, 1778, constituted a treaty:

*This court finds that the agreement of September 24th, 1778, was and is a treaty ...*

*The treaty in question ended a war with the British and gave notice to the American rebels that war with them was imminent. As one of the considerations for joining the British, the Indians were provided with their own priest. In addition, they were each presented with a gift of one pound of gunpowder. The Indians in turn returned certain other articles seized during the war (including three swivel guns) and entered into an oath of allegiance to the King. It is of vital import that*

this oath was drafted by the British and that they included the phrase “but that I will follow my hunting and fishing in a peaceable and quite manner”.

The whole transaction can hardly be viewed other than as a treaty entered into to end a war, with both sides giving assurance one to the other, and both sides represented at the transaction by the top echelons of their respective commands. Surely the Indians in making their solemn oath of allegiance also had the subjective belief that their hunting and fishing rights (which had previously been interfered with by the American rebels) would be continued in the same peaceable and quiet manner as was the case before the war. 35

This principle was applied by the Supreme Court in Sioui, [1990 1 SCR 1025 to find that a memorial signed by General Murray, evidencing the basic topics covered in a lengthy treaty conference, sent to his superiors, was sufficient to constitute a treaty.

The courts have been clear that what constitutes a section 35 Treaty is not restricted to formal bilaterally-signed treaty documents. The leading authority on this principle is the British Columbia Court of Appeal in R. v. White and Bob36, cited with approval by the Supreme Court in R. v. Simon 37:

…”Treaty” is not a word of art and in my respectful opinion, it embraces all such engagements made by persons in authority as may be brought within the term “the word of the white man” the sanctity of which was, at the time of British exploration and settlement, the most important means of obtaining the goodwill and co-operation of the native tribes and ensuring that the colonists would be protected from death and destruction. On such assurance the Indians relied.

Having learned from the Haven encounter in 1764 that our Inuit ancestors did not wish to be given a “piece of paper that could speak”, the British approach in 1765 was to give our representatives a flag and a pictorial representation of the event, as commemoration and mnemonic devices, to evidence the commitments each made to the other. In this case, the flag and the picture were Treaty memorial documents.

DOES A RIGHT OF TRADE INCLUDE A RIGHT OF HARVEST?

Implicitly, the right of trade includes the right of harvest. As the Supreme Court said in Marshall:

43 The law has long recognized that parties make assumptions when they enter into agreements about certain things that give their arrangements efficacy. Courts will imply a contractual term on the basis of presumed intentions of the parties where it is necessary to assure the efficacy of the contract, e.g., where it meets the “officious bystander test”… Here, if the ubiquitous officious bystander had said, “This talk about truckhouses is all very well, but if the Mi’kmaq are to make these promises, will they have the right to hunt and fish to catch something to trade at the truckhouses?”, the answer would have to be, having regard to the honour of the Crown, “of course”…

This was also the approach taken by the New Brunswick Court of Appeal in Polchies.

It can therefore not be disputed that the right of trade includes our right to harvest the natural resources of the lands, ice and waters of the territory as a self-governing people.

What are we to make of the promises of “fairness,” “friendship,” “advantage,” etc.?

The British promises of fairness, friendship and advantage must be given independent meaning and importance. Our community representatives were told that the British Crown “loves you & will not let any Body do you harm.” We were also told:

King George … loves the Innuit, he is like a Father to you, and has given orders to his Subjects, that when they come to your Land they shall Shew you all kindness and do you no harm… When you Trade with the English & become better acquainted with them you will find that they love you & will do you all manner of good; you and your Children will reap the advantage of it.

The British promises were not simply “peace and trade”. They included this third vital component, the requirement of “fairness” and “friendship”. To add to this, the trade was to be
to the “advantage” of the Inuit, in that the British merchants were to be ordered by the Crown to “do (us) all manner of good”, and “shew (us) all kindness”.

On the principle of Treaty interpretation of such concepts as “love”, “kindness”, “friendship” and “your advantage”, Cory J., in Badger, [1961] 1 SCR 771, said at para. 52:

... when considering a treaty, a court must take into account the context in which the treaties were negotiated, concluded and committed to writing. The treaties, as written documents, recorded an agreement that had already been reached orally and they did not always record the full extent of the oral agreement... As a result, it is well settled that the words in the treaty must not be interpreted in their strict technical sense nor subjected to rigid modern rules of construction.

This principle was adopted by the Supreme Court in R. v. Marshall, [1999] 3 S.C.R. 456, para 14 (“Marshall”). We know, therefore, that these terms are to be given the modern purposive interpretation intended to accomplish what the Inuit in 1765 would have understood them to mean.

How these concepts are to be understood and enforced today are also matters involving the honour of the Crown. On the topic of “Treaty honour”, the Supreme Court said in Marshall:

49...[T]he honour of the Crown is always at stake in its dealings with aboriginal people. This is one of the principles of interpretation set forth in Badger, supra, by Cory J., at para. 41:

... the honour of the Crown is always at stake in its dealings with Indian people. Interpretations of treaties and statutory provisions which have an impact upon treaty or aboriginal rights must be approached in a manner which maintains the integrity of the Crown. It is always assumed that the Crown intends to fulfil its promises. No appearance of “sharp dealing” will be sanctioned.

50 This principle that the Crown’s honour is at stake when the Crown enters into treaties with first nations dates back at least to this Court’s decision in 1895, Province of Ontario v. Dominion of Canada and Province of Quebec; In re Indian Claims (1895), 25 S.C.R. 434. . . .

51 In more recent times, as mentioned, the principle that the honour of the Crown is always at stake was asserted by the Ontario Court of Appeal in Taylor and
Williams, supra. In that case, as here, the issue was to determine the actual terms of a treaty, whose terms were partly oral and partly written. MacKinnon A.C.J.O. said for the court, at pp. 235-36:

The principles to be applied to the interpretation of Indian treaties have been much canvassed over the years. In approaching the terms of a treaty quite apart from the other considerations already noted, the honour of the Crown is always involved and no appearance of “sharp dealing” should be sanctioned. ...

Further, if there is any ambiguity in the words or phrases used, not only should the words be interpreted as against the framers or drafters of such treaties, but such language should not be interpreted or construed to the prejudice of the Indians if another construction is reasonably possible. ...(bold added)

All of the Treaty ceremonials with our Inuit communities took place in circumstances where very senior officials, on behalf of British Crown, were seeking to secure peace and trade with us, a relationship of tremendous value to the British at the time. It took our respective delegates (one of whom was Governor of Newfoundland) over a month to get to know each other, to reach an agreement on peace and trade, and to engage in trade itself. The parties then returned for a number of years to renew the Treaty promises through discussions and gift exchanges. These were very serious circumstances and the solemnity with which the parties approached these agreements cannot be doubted.

The assurances, ceremonies, and gifts that were exchanged would have impressed upon both parties the consequence of the agreements reached. The Treaty ceremonials constituted Treaties from the perspective of the Inuit, and were reported as such by the British officials. The Treaty rights must be understood and implemented in a modern context in a purposive manner consistent with how the Inuit in 1765 would have understood them. That would include the right to harvest resources to sustain ourselves and our communities, sufficient to accumulate surpluses for trade, which trade was to be on favorable and fair terms. This was not simply a Treaty Right of our Nation; accomplishing that beneficial trade relationship is also an active Treaty obligation of the Crown.
BRITISH (INITIAL) COMPLIANCE WITH THE TREATY

We can see British initial compliance with its Treaty obligations in the subsequent Treaty Conferences and the gift giving and exchanges which occurred for roughly a decade. Governor Pallier returned to renew the Treaty with us in October 1766 (Note E-12) and in July 1767 (Note E33).

Colonial records also confirm that both Governor Palliser and successive governors of Newfoundland continued to provide presents to us to continue the good relations promised in the Treaty. Treaty gifts were provided, for example, in 1766 (Notes E17b and E12), 1767 (Note E13), 1768 (Note E13d), 1769 (Note E17d), 1770 (Note E17c) and in 1774 (Note E18).

Pursuant to the terms of the 1764-1765 Treaty, the British agreed to establish a trucking (trading) place. This Treaty promise was kept by the establishment that became known as Truck Island (roughly halfway between Chateau Bay and Cape Charles in South Labrador), a precursor to the small trading posts established into the nineteenth century. From these British trade establishments, our Inuit community members acquired, among other things, sailboats, metal traps, firearms, gunpowder and lead.

Protecting its own Treaty interests, the British established a Fort at Chateau Bay in 1766 in an attempt to keep French from the “French Treaty Shore” of the Northern Peninsula of Newfoundland, as well as boats from the Americas, away from trade with our communities in south and central Labrador (Note E32).

Following the Treaty of 1765, traders from our communities on the South Coast continued to move in a seasonal round throughout our territory to harvest resources both for subsistence and to produce surpluses for trade with British merchants.
In furtherance of the Treaty promises, by 1800, small European trade posts had been established at Battle Harbour, Venison Island, Square Island and Francis Harbour (Waldergrave). By the 1820’s, these small trade posts had expanded north on the coast to places in the regions of present day Hamilton Inlet and Sandwich Bay, at locations such as Cuff Harbour, Dumplin Harbour, Grady and Tub Harbour (mostly still supplied from England). Their purpose was two-fold: (a) to accommodate the expanding seasonal cod fishery from Newfoundland, and (b) to engage in trade with our southern Inuit population (a trade separate and apart from that at the Moravian missions farther to the north). By the mid-1800’s, a few English Protestant men had become a part of our Inuit kinship networks on the Labrador coast.

Our Inuit communities had always been catchers and preservers of fish. The Treaty meeting with Governor Palliser in 1765 was delayed by us because we were procuring cod fish at Cape Charles for our families. During the 1800’s, our Inuit communities expanded our methods of fishing to enter the commercial trade in codfish and salmon. New ways were adapted to catch fish, alongside visiting fishermen to the Labrador coast, mostly Newfoundlander (Black 1960). Into the 1900s, commercial fishing became a way of life for NunatuKavut Inuit, ultimately leading to the formation of the very successful Labrador Fisherman’s Union Shrimp Company in 1978, with five processing plants in NCC territory from L’Anse au Clair to Cartwright. The majority of vessels landing fish at these plants are owned, crewed and operated by NunatuKavut Inuit.

**BRITISH/CANADIAN TREATY BREACH**

Within a short period of time, the British promises in the Treaty slid into breach. There were trading opportunities for southern Labrador Inuit, but Britain/Canada did nothing to ensure that the terms were fair or favorable. Our Inuit traders became part of an abused system of supply, meant to benefit European/Canadians, rather than intended to be fair to our communities under the Treaty promise. Inuit trade was necessary for British interests to be advanced, and our year round occupancy of south and central Labrador was essential to British trade. However, treating us fairly was not in the interests of the trading companies and the Crown did nothing to oblige
their merchants to comply with its Treaty promises of friendship and advantageous trade.

The end of the 18th century also led to a distinction between how Inuit in northern Labrador (such as at Nain and Hopedale) and those in our south/central areas of Labrador (such as Sandwich Bay and Port Hope Simpson) were treated by colonial authorities. The Treaty of 1765 applied specifically to the area from Chateau Bay through Hamilton Inlet (southern Labrador) where many Inuit continued to live and travel on the coast, trading and intermarrying. However, as Moravian interests grew in northern Labrador, efforts were made to orient some Inuit towards those mission/trading posts for Moravian economic and political gain. To be able to sustain and expand their influence in Labrador, it was vital for the Moravians to “play up” their mission posts as being very successful. Over time, a myth concerning the centrality of Moravian mission trading posts became the preferred “Inuit narrative” for the Moravians and government, even though it ignored our large Inuit population that continued to live in the area from Hamilton Inlet down, south-east, along the Labrador coast.

As outside interests grew in the resources of Labrador, members of our southern Inuit communities began to be pushed out of our places, facing increasing non-indigenous competition, growing more marginalized over time. Instead of Inuit having the benefit of the Treaty promise of a prior and advantageous allocation, we were left out or left behind.

In more modern times, Canada (DFO) has issued numerous fishing licences, quotas and TAC allowances off Labrador shores to non-NCC fishers. Small scraps have been extended to NCC, a weak echo of an extensive Treaty promise.

In recent decades, scholars and our Inuit communities have provided further evidence of our continued Inuit occupation in the NCC land claim area and have highlighted the massive economic profits gained by European and Newfoundland interests in southern Labrador as the main incentive for downplaying our Inuit continued existence in the region 38.

38 Black 1960; Rankin et al. 2012; Rankin 2010; Rollmann 2011; Kennedy 2015; Procter 2020b
What was lost from the Treaty relationship was that the self-governing Inuit of the NunatuKavut claim area were (a) to have a guarantee of access to the resources of our territory to sustain our communities and to accumulate surpluses for trade, and, in the event of conflict, priority for that access over non-indigenous users and (b) be treated fairly by English/Canadian merchants. Instead, our community members were marginalized and victimized in their own Treaty territory.

CONCLUSION

Today’s NunatuKavut Inuit are the current beneficiaries of the British-Inuit Treaty of 1764-1765, which was entered into in Chateau Bay, in NCC territory. The Treaty recognized us, the NunatuKavut Inuit, as rightful holders of our lands, ice and waters. The agreement reflected, and protected, our continued Inuit self-governance and self-determination. The British did not request, and we offered no, extinguishment of our land rights or rights to resources. Our communities at the time had the virtual exclusive use of their territory, with no conception that the British and their government successors would try to displace them.

No limit on the trade right was agreed to by us, with the British seeking to maximize the trade goods we might make available. Our Inuit communities made a commitment to co-exist in peace and friendship and to trade with the British merchants to the exclusion of others.

The Inuit Treaty of 1764-65 was entered into with the King of Britain, through the office of the Governor of Newfoundland. Britain promised us peace and friendship/trade, meaning trade on a fair and even advantaged basis. Those promises included the right to harvest for both community sustenance and to generate surpluses for trade.

Those Treaty promises create a positive fiduciary obligation on the Crown (now the Dominion of Canada) to act to implement those commitments. These rights are held by the current NCC communities and are constitutionally protected under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.
The Treaty obligations are binding on the Dominion of Canada and on the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.
APPENDIX A:  
PARTIAL RECORD OF LABRADOR INUIT INTERACTIONS WITH EUROPEANS

The chart which follows describes a chronology of events in Labrador from 1702 through 1774. It cannot be said to be “complete” as it cannot be known what other source materials may exist. However, it does serve as a firm foundation from which to evaluate the powerful agency of the NunatuKavut Inuit in protecting its territory and its trading rights.

For the most part, the events documented took place south and west of Cape Charles, Labrador; Inuit were preventing Europeans from travelling north on the Atlantic littoral in NunatuKavut in the 16th and 17th centuries.

For those not familiar with the territory in southern Labrador, the highest frequency of recorded Inuit/European events took place at, or around, Fort Pontchartrain (Brador Bay) in the French period (pre-1763) and at Fort York (Pitt’s Harbour/Chateau Bay) in the English period (post-1763). Many contact events also occurred at Carpoon/Quirpont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Summary and/or Quote</th>
<th>Linkages And Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F02</td>
<td>1702, Oct 17th</td>
<td>An experienced French military commander, Augustin LeGardeur de Courtemanche is granted a ten year harvesting and trade concession as far north as Alexis/St Michaels Bay, by the Governor at Quebec, “On the requisition presented to us by the Sieur Augustin le Gardeur, praying that we would be pleased to grant him a concession at the place called Labrador, country of the Esquimaux savages, commencing from the river called Kegaska to that called Kesesaskion,”</td>
<td>“Kesesaskion” is Alexis Bay in this time period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 Prepared by Greg Mitchell, used with permission.
40 For a partial accounting of this Inuit resistance see, Pope P., 2015, Bretons, Basques and Inuit in Labrador and Northern Newfoundland; The control of maritime resources in the 16th and 17th centuries, Études Inuit Studies, Volume 39 (1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F21 1705</td>
<td>Courtemanche reports to the French Minister of Marine on a trip along the coast of Labrador, “the Spaniards formerly had fisheries at this place (Brador) and they would probably still be there but for the ill-usage they suffered at the hands of the Esquimaux.” and, “It is also in this harbour (Chateau Bay) that fisheries for whales were once carried on by the Europeans who, as reported by the Indians [French allies], were compelled by the Esquimaux to withdraw.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F20 1708</td>
<td>The French Minister of Marine, Pontchartrain, writes to Courtemanche, “Your information as to what occurred with the Esquimaux Indians was found to be most interesting and I shall anxiously await further news from you with reference to your being able or not to tame them.... It seems to me of great importance for your establishment that you should manage them, and I therefore recommend you to omit nothing and to reach the decision of declaring war for their destruction only when you cannot do otherwise.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F26 1713</td>
<td>Pierre Constantin, voyageur, is granted a concession in the Strait of Belle Ilse for fishing, sealing and trade with Indigenous people. Over the next several years, he builds posts at Red Bay (a fort of “de pieux” [stakes]) and a cabanne at St Modeste/Pinware. Constantine is claimed, by the Intendant at Quebec, Antoine-Denis Raudot, to have reached a treaty with NunatuKavut Inuit, described as “mille amities”(a thousand friendships).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F22 1714</td>
<td>Courtemanche is appointed Commandant of the Labrador Coast, “His Majesty deeming it necessary that an officer of his troops should be in command on the coast of Labrador, the country of the Esquimaux, and being satisfied with the activities of the Sieur de Courtemanche, Captain of one of his companies maintained in New France”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F23 1714</td>
<td>Courtemanche is granted the concession for Baye de Phelypeau (Brador Bay) for life, “To-day, 12th of November 1714, the King [Louis XV] being at Marly, and being informed of the success of the establishment which the Sieur de Courtemanche has made at the Baye de Phelypeaux on the coast of Labrador, country of the Esquimaux, where, in the year 1702, a concession was granted unto him ..., the same having been confirmed the following year by His Majesty, the said concession extending from the river of Kegasket towards Quebec as far as Kesessaskiou river which is below Belleisle”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1717</td>
<td>Courtemanche and his soldiers attack an Inuit shallop at Isle au Bois (Brador) with 12 Inuit aboard and captures four prisoners, including one woman, Acoutsina, and two girls. Acoutsina resides in the Courtemanche household (Fort Pontchartrain) for two years and is referred, in future correspondence, as ‘the young slave girl’ or the ‘esquimaude’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11th 1718</td>
<td>Since June 29th, 1717, Augustin le Gardeur de Courtemanche has been deceased and on January 11th, 1718, his step-son, Francois Martel de Brouague, is appointed by the King Louis XV as the new Commandant of Fort Pontchartrain at Brador Bay (traditional NunatuKavut territory) with a contingent of French and Amerindian soldiers and sufficient arms. Brouague has also assumed the custody of the two remaining Inuit prisoners/slaves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 9th 1718</td>
<td>The seasonal fishermen from France, “…must bring me [Brouage] around five hundred long boats...so that the Eskimos do not cause them any disorder [during the upcoming winter]“.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 9th 1718</td>
<td>Francois Martel de Brouage, French Commandant to Labrador, identifies the Inuit as enemies, “…As we are in a country [Brador Bay, Strait of Belle Ilse] where we have enemies to fear, the Eskimos on one side, and the pirates on the other,…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 9th 1718</td>
<td>Brouage is constantly aware of the threat of attack,” “…I did not fail... to keep watch and send people from all sides to explore so as not to be surprised by the Eskimo savages...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1719</td>
<td>Brouage writes in the fall of 1719,“I immediately sent word to all the captains [French fishing captains] in all the harbors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 List of places from which French Captains’ boats are protected from Inuit is taken from Trudel, F., 1978, Les Inuits du Labrador méridional face à l’exploitation canadienne et française des pêcheries (1700-1760), Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française, Volume 31/4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>of this said coast to be on their guard. This did not prevent the Eskimos from stealing two rowboats and looting five. ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B05</td>
<td>1719, Sept. 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Brouage reports a rare peaceful encounter, “...on arriving ashore [St Modet] he [French Captain] found a number of Eskimos who on disembarking carried him to their huts and gave him a thousand hugs [caresses] and even helped the sailors to load the said salt into his boat and to deal with him...”</td>
<td>St Modest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F27</td>
<td>1719 September 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Three of Pierre Consantin’s men are killed by Inuit at Red Bay, Brouague writes, “Je fis partir un homme avec celui qui s’est sauvé de l’habitation de Lavalle Constantin pour donner la sépulture aux trois hommes que les Esquimaux avaient tués” et pour examiner” [I sent a man away with the one who had fled from Lavalle Constantin’s dwelling to give the burial to the three men that the Eskimos had killed.]</td>
<td>Red Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>1719 Sept 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Brouage is informed that there are Inuit close by,” I left [the fort] with all my people...my scout had assured me that there was a large number of Eskimos. This made me decide to have the face of everyone painted half red and the other half black, so that they would be more hideous and to give them a more terrifying look. It succeeded very well.</td>
<td>Brador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>1719 Sept 18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; In a meeting with the Inuit, Brouague, King Louis XV’s Commandant in Labrador, is requested by Inuit to return the two prisoners. Following this, a treaty of peace is established,” the [Inuit] father of the little girl drew an arrow from his quiver, which did not resemble the others, and gave it to me as a present while showing me the blessings I had done for his daughter. I received it and also gave him something as a present and [I] further recommended on that account not to burn, break or take any boat and that would all be castia.”</td>
<td>Brador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B07</td>
<td>1721, Sept 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Brouage reports, “...I have the honor to inform the Council that a new post is being re-established [at Red Bay], which was destroyed two years ago by the Eskimos, belonging to a man named Constantine, which is fifteen leagues from my home; the Eskimos are there in large numbers. ...”</td>
<td>Red Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>1721 From Antoine-Denis Raudot, Intendant at New France (1705 – 1710), “... no one in this country has had any trade with these peoples [Eskimos] except the Sieurs Joliet and Constantin, who have each been with them once... . When they see Europeans they are always in awe and distrust.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Raudot, Ibid., “I am convinced that we caused it to these peoples by the fear we had of them, by killing several of them, or by driving them away from our buildings with cannon and rifle; they are also in the same distrust when they see other savages [French allies] who, after having traded with them, try to surprise and kill them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Raudot, Ibid., “...some claim that a [French] surgeon having raped the wife of an Eskimo, tied her to a tree and opened her belly to test to know how a woman conceived; not having died within the hour, several of these Eskimos having come to her cries, she told them what had happened, and that since that time they have always been at war with the people of Europe.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>1724 Jan 11th</td>
<td>The Minister of the Marine Council, Count de Maurepas from Versailles, writes to Brouague, Commander for the King on the Labrador Coast,”… it is appropriate to forbid the captains and crews of ships from trading rags which will be plundered by the Eskimos. I see no other way to stop the plundering by these Savages than to impose a penalty on those who will deal with them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>1724 Jan 11th</td>
<td>Maurepas goes on to say, “It is unfortunate that the French have struck down the Eskimos; it keeps these Savages even further away from us. ...., I intend to discuss with you what must be done to prevent such a thing from happening again in the future.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F19</td>
<td>1724 Jan 11th</td>
<td>Having expressed a desire to reach peace with the Inuit, Maurepas still sends munitions to Brouague, “I grant you the continuation of the gratuity of 30 rifles, 300 pounds of powder and 300 pounds of lead bullets which was granted to you in previous years... This grace from His Majesty must increase your zeal and your attention to making our commerce on this coast more and more considerable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F03</td>
<td>1728 Nov 7th</td>
<td>A four year old Inuit slave child from NunatuKavut is baptized as Joseph at Beauport, Quebec. He is owned by Pierre-Paul Margane de Lavaltrie, brother to Francois Margane de Lavaltrie [military], concessionaire at St Augustine, Labrador. Joseph is reported dead by Dec. 17th, 1732.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F05</td>
<td>1729,</td>
<td>A 10 year old Inuit slave from Labrador enters the hospital (l’Hôtel-Dieu, Quebec), baptised as Charles-Coli. His owner is listed as Marquis Charles Beauharnois de Laboische, Governor General at Quebec. By 1733, Charles-Coli is reported dead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ref.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>Event</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B08</strong></td>
<td>1729, Sept 20th</td>
<td>Brouage reports that in 1728, “Two families of Eskimos, having gone to Mecatina were killed by the French and savages who usually winter there, from whom they took two prisoners, a woman and a young boy, whom they took to Canada.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B09</strong></td>
<td>1729, Sept 20th</td>
<td>Brouage reports, “…the Eskimos appeared on the Isle à Bois, which obliged me to send there a rowboat equipped with twelve well-armed men, to impose [on] the disorder..”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B10</strong></td>
<td>1729, Sept 20th</td>
<td>Brouage reports, “As the longboat approached this island [Isle à Bois], the Eskimos embarked behind the huts, and landed a number of arrows on my people which, in order to defend themselves, obliged them to fire rifles on them, of which they killed several.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B11</strong></td>
<td>1729, Sept 20th</td>
<td>Brouage reports, “the eskimos withdrew the same day in the other harbors where they burned and plundered all the effects of the ships…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F06</strong></td>
<td>1732,</td>
<td>A 13 year old Inuit slave from NunatuKavut enters the hospital (l’Hôtel-Dieu), baptised as Charles-Hilaron. His owner is listed as Marquis Charles Beauharnois de Laboische, Governor General.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B12</strong></td>
<td>1733, Feb 24th</td>
<td>Brouage reports, “The Eskimos came as usual to all the harbors and looted everything they could find for their usefulness but they did not find everything they needed because the captains of the buildings had everything brought to me [Fort Pontchartrain, Brador Bay]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B12a</strong></td>
<td>1733, Mar 15th</td>
<td>An esquimeau slave boy from Labrador, baptised Francois, is pronounced dead at the Hotel-Dieu, Quebec. The owner of the slave is the Commander at Labrador, Francois Martel de Brouague.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F08</strong></td>
<td>1733, April 19th</td>
<td>A 28 year old Inuit slave, (esquimaude), baptised as Marie-Angelique, is reported deceased at Beauport, Quebec. [May be the same woman who was captured at St Augustine in 1728.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F04</strong></td>
<td>1733, Oct.</td>
<td>Ordnance issued by the Marquis Charles Beauharnois de Laboische, Governor General of New France, “Panis and Padoucas ceded to the French as well as enemy Indians such as Foxes, Chicachas and Eskimos should be considered as slaves and therefore aliens; masters who want to give freedom to their slaves should do so by notarial act.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

42 There also appears to be a female ‘esquimaude esclave’ named Francoise who is listed as being dead on the same date (March 15th, 1733) and the owner is also Brouague. This may be a coincidence, but, more likely, an error; requiring further research.
| B12b | 1734 Jan 9th | An Inuit slave, ['esquimaude'], baptised as Bayonna, enters the Hotel-Dieu, Quebec, on November 30th, 20 years old, and is pronounced dead on January 9th, 1734. The owner is Francois-Joseph Bissot, Labrador concessionaire. | Linked to conflicts in B08 and/or B10 |
| B12c | 1734 Sept 22nd | An Inuit slave is baptised as Catherine on August 15th, at 15 years old, and is pronounced dead on September 22nd. The owner is Francois-Joseph Bissot, Labrador concessionaire. | Linked to B08 or B10 |
| B13 | 1735 Jan. 25th | French King Orders a ban on arms sale to Inuit, Broauge reports, “…the Order of the King which I sent you the year in which it was forbidden to deal with arms and ammunition to the Eskimos…” | |
| B14 | 1736 Jan. 10th | Broauge reports, “I am glad that the Eskimos did not come last year, according to their custom, to the harbors. Perhaps the French who went to the north of Belle Isle last year prevented them.” | Linked to slaving events |
| F07 | 1736 Jan 19th | A female Inuit slave, esquimaude, from NunatuKavut, enters the hospital (l'Hôtel-Dieu), baptised as Geneviève and leaves on the 29th. Her master is listed as Marquis Charles Beauharnois de Laboische, Governor General of New France. | Link to B14 |
| F09 | 1739 April 16th | A female Inuit slave, esquimaude, aged 13 years, from NunatuKavut enters the hospital (l'Hôtel-Dieu), baptised as Marie-Angelique in an ‘emergency baptism’ just before her death. Her owner is listed as Louis Parant, engagé at Labrador. | |
| F09b | 1740 Sept 7th | A male Inuit⁴³ slave is pronounced dead at Hote-Dieu, baptised as Jacques-Charles. The owner is Jacques LeFontaine De Belcour, Labrador concessionaire. | |
| F09a | 1741 Jan 19th | A female esquimaude slave, baptised as Marie-Catherine, is pronounced dead at the Hotel-Dieu at 18 years of age. The owner is Pierre Trottier Desauniers, business partner of Francois Brouague, King’s Commander at Labrador. | Brador |
| F09c | 1741 Mar 6th | A female slave [du Labrador], baptised as Marie-Madelaine, is pronounced dead at the Hotel-Dieu, at 10 years of age. The owner is Charles Larchevêque, tanner and butcher at Québec. | Related to conflicts in B08 and B10 |
| B14a | 1741 May | A female Inuit slave, baptised as Marie, is in and out of the Hotel-Dieu [hospital] from 1734 to 1741, at which time she is 18 years old. The owner of this esquimaude slave is the | |

⁴³ This record contains some confusion as to whether this boy is Inuit, panis, or Montagnais.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1742 Jan 5th</td>
<td>A female Inuit slave, baptised as Marie, esquimaude, is pronounced dead at the Hotel-Dieu, Quebec, on January 5th, 1742, at 15 years of age. The owner is Pierre Trottier Desauniers, business partner of Francois Brouague, King’s Commander at Labrador.</td>
<td>Linked to B08 Brador and/or B10 Brador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742 Jan 6th</td>
<td>A ‘female Eskimo savage’, baptised as Marie, is pronounced dead at the Hotel-Dieu at the age of 15 years. The record shows her to be associated with Pierre Mangien and several others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743 Feb 17th</td>
<td>Maurepas, Minister of Marine, writes to Brouague, King’s Commander at Labrador, from Versailles, “…I was very sorry to learn of the advent of the French who were to winter at Sr. Bazil’s post [Chateau Bay, 1742] and two of whom were killed by the Eskimo savages…”</td>
<td>Chateau Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743 Mar 27th</td>
<td>An esquimaude female slave, baptised as Marguerite, is pronounced dead at the Hotel-Dieu at the age of 35 years. Her owner is Gilles Rageot dit Beaurivage, ‘navigateur’ and businessman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743 July 4th</td>
<td>Louis Fornel trades under armed guard with Inuit at St Michael’s Bay, Hawke Bay, and Norman Bay [NunatuKavut]. During the first encounter with Inuit, Fornel writes, “…we put our artillery in readiness and prepared our arms in order to always be on the defensive..”</td>
<td>St Michael’s Bay Hawke Bay Norman Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743 July 16th</td>
<td>Fornel again refers to armed encounters during trading events,“The Eskimaux, having re-embarked in their canoes came on board. As we saw them approaching, we armed ourselves.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Between August of 1752 and September of 1753, Inuit kill 26 Frenchmen in the region (Chateau Bay, Carpoon, Straits of Belle Isle) from the various French fishing ships; Jacques Genevieve, Nymph, Holy Spirit, Phèlpeaux, Assumption, Young Emelia, Medea and Aimable Marie.</td>
<td>Chateau Bay Carpoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Jean Baptiste Galliot, Tavignon, negotiates a Peace Treaty with Inuit at Chateau Bay [NunatuKavut]. Inuit swear to the treaty with Galliot and all the French King’s subjects. French</td>
<td>Chateau Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treaty Report Sept 2022.docx
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>witnesses to the event are Antoine Thevenard, <em>Le Comète</em>, and Toulin La Galantra, .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F16</strong></td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>French order to prevent the trade in arms and ammunition to Inuit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E03</strong></td>
<td>1760 Sept 12th</td>
<td>On August 11(^{th}), Governor Webb aboard the <em>HMS Antelope</em> with two other warships, seized the French ship, <em>Tavignon</em>, Captain Jean Baptiste Galliot, near Carpoon, with a cargo of salted fish. Galliot and crew are taken as prisoners of war. Also aboard were English prisoners and Galliot’s intent was to, “destroy <em>English ships on that shore</em>”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E04</strong></td>
<td>1760 Sept 12th</td>
<td>On August 19(^{th}), one of the English warships, command by a Captain Shirley, on approaching Chateau Bay, encountered 13 Inuit shallops. The ship’s crew fired and killed two Inuit and wounded two others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E05</strong></td>
<td>1760 Sept 12th</td>
<td>Three Inuit prisoners were brought to Webb and the next day, “<em>The King’s son [Inuit] came, I entertained him as before and he made me understand that they would always be Friends</em>”. Web proceeds to give the ‘Inuit King’s son’ gifts of sails from the ship and a fitted out a French shallop as a gift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E06</strong></td>
<td>1760 Sept 12th</td>
<td>Webb sends the Inuit away in fear that they will communicate further with French ships and “<em>interrupt our Friendship with the Indians [Inuit]</em>.” He also indicates fear of a future, “<em>...trade [by the French] carried on with the Indians [Inuit] for whale bone.</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E07</strong></td>
<td>1761 Dec. 31st</td>
<td>In August, 1761, the Inuit purposefully attack a crew of fifty Englishmen belonging to John Noble of Bristol, at Carpoon; killing eleven and wounding seventeen. This is a well-planned attack on the enemies of the French, occurring at one of the normal rendezvous places (Chateau and Carpoon) with the French Captains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E09</strong></td>
<td>1762 Aug 10th</td>
<td>British Governor Graves to Newfoundland writes the Lords of Trade “…<em>the enemy [French] have the North end of the island already [Newfoundland] and they would, in that case, command both passages to the Guelph of St Lawrence</em>…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E09a</strong></td>
<td>1762 Aug 10th</td>
<td>Graves sets up British defenses against the French and Inuit at <em>Isle a Bois</em> (Blanc Sablon/L’Anse au Clair) with 16 cannon and 60 men. English shipping in the area is brought to a halt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E11</strong></td>
<td>1763 Or 1762?</td>
<td>Haven writes,”<em>...[in] a fleet of 18 boats, with which they [Inuit] cruised in the Strait of Belle Isle in the year 1763, so that no single vessel durst appear in the Strait of Belle Isle,...</em>”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E10</strong></td>
<td>1762 Aug 10th</td>
<td>Governor Graves sees the Inuit as allies of the French, “…our [English] Northern Colonies would fall from the French being able, from hence, to support the Indians [Inuit] in renewing their horrible incursions…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E19</strong></td>
<td>1762 Nov 29th</td>
<td>Richard Farr, Merchants Hall of Bristol, writes to the British Lords of Trade requesting that a fort is built at Carpoon to encourage trade with the Inuit. Many members of the Merchants Hall, Bristol, such as Michael Miller and Isaac Elton (later to become investors in adventurers to Labrador), are deeply involved in the triangular slave trade to Africa/Caribbean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E19a</strong></td>
<td>Ibid. 1762 Nov 29th</td>
<td>Farr writes, “…from whence [Labrador] they [Inuit] come in Batteaus, with their canoes in summer season, with whalebone, seal skins, etc., to exchange for European commodities with which the French ships used to supply them and which may in time prove very beneficial to this nation, …, but the French ships that were employed in this trade were mostly Ships of Force from sixteen to twenty-four guns which were capable of protecting themselves from the savages.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E19b</strong></td>
<td>Ibid. 1762 Nov 29th</td>
<td>Farr encourages the construction of a fort and, “…a garrison to awe the Indians [Inuit] from using violence (of which there has been of late a melancholy instance).” Farr is referring to the attack by Inuit on John Noble’s crew the previous year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E08</strong></td>
<td>1763 Mar 15th</td>
<td>35 days after the Treaty of Paris, the British Lords write to the King regarding treaty administration, &quot;Upon the Coast of Labrador, it will be impossible to prevent the French continuing to have the full benefit of their former commerce with the Indians [Inuit] of that coast, unless some British settlement should be made there, or sufficient cruizers stationed with Instructions to the Commanders to seize all French ships coming within a certain distance of that coast.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E08a</strong></td>
<td>Ibid. 1763 Mar 15th</td>
<td>The Lords go on to inform the King, George III, &quot;The same observation [keeping the French away/no commerce with Inuit] is equally applicable to all the coast from the Streights of Belle isle to the River St Lawrence, from thence along the coast of Canada and Acadia, and all these coasts which lye within …&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E08b</strong></td>
<td>1763 June 21st</td>
<td>Leeds Intelligencer writes, “they [Inuit] have… burnt and plundered those settlements (John Noble/ Carpoon, 1761). They are set on no doubt by the French, to prevent our fishing in those parts,…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>1764 July 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Sir Hugh Palliser, Governor of Newfoundland, outlines previous killings and robberies of NunatuKavut Inuit by English subjects, and, “hereby strictly forbid such wicked practices for the future and declare all such as are offending herein shall be punished to the utmost severity of the Law.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>Ibid. 1764 July 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Palliser indicates a way forward with the Inuit and issues a certificate (written passport for Inuit), “I hereby strictly enjoin and require all his majesty’s subjects who meet with any of the said Indians [Inuit] to treat them in the most Civil and Friendly manner and in all their dealings with them to act with the Utmost Probity and good Faith, particularly with such of them as may produce this Certificate of their having entered into Treaty with me...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>Ibid. 1764 July 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>In his Order, Palliser goes on to say, “...I have in his Majesty’s Name assured them [Inuit] that they may, by virtue thereof, safely Trade with His Majesty’s Subjects without danger of being hurt or ill-treated; And I hereby require and enjoin all His Majesty’s subjects to conform and pay the strictest regard thereto,...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01</td>
<td>1764 Sept 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Palliser advises, in response to the King’s instructions and has issued passports to the Inuit, “...conciliate the affections of the Esquimeaux savages.”, that he has appointed an interpreter/negotiator to the Inuit, “I have furnished him (Jens Haven) with a writing to be explained and distributed amongst them [Esquimaux savages] to serve as an Introduction, to encourage them to trade with us...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M01</td>
<td>1764 Sept 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Jens Haven, emissary/interpreter for Palliser, meets Inuit at Carpoon and approaches them in his ‘Greenland habit’ (qullittaq). When he speaks to them in Inuktitut they reply that,”...our friend has come” and Haven greets their families,”...I gave to every boy two fish hooks, and to every woman two or three sewing needles, and a piece of money which Captain Thompson [HMS Lark] had given me, I gave to Seculia’s wife; in return she presented me with a purse made of bird skin which I have to return to Captain Thompson.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M02</td>
<td>1764 Sept 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Haven then proceeds to the requested British formalities,”...and I did read to them the authority your excellency gave me and told them the good intent of the government towards them and wished they would be partakers of such great benefits at which they were very attentive...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M03</td>
<td>1764 Sept 5th</td>
<td>Haven continues, “...at the same time I offered to give them that writing given me by your Excellency, they was [sic] afraid to take it, they thought it was alive because of my reading it, and I was not able to persuade them to take it from me.” Haven leaves the Inuit with a warning about behaviour and the promise from him that he will return the next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E02</td>
<td>1765 April</td>
<td>Following these reports from Haven, Palliser recommends,“...an advanced post as far to the northward as possible for a Trucking Place where these savages may be stopt from coming further southward...” This eventually happens at Truck Island, Labrador.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23</td>
<td>1765 April 8th</td>
<td>By April 7, 1765, Count Claude Régnier de Guercy, French Ambassador to England, writes to the Earl of Halifax, Secretary of State with a complaint that the British Navy has been directed, “to arrest the Sieur Galliot, captain of the ship La Valeur de Saint-Malo, with all the other Frenchmen who, like him, had communication with the Savages called Eskimos, and he added that the captain of the English frigate L'Arc [HMS Lark, Samuel Thompson] had asked him to put him in contact with these Savages in order to make peace with them, which is equally important for both nations...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>1765 April 8th</td>
<td>Count de Guerchy continues, “he is authorized to declare to the British Minister, that the King, his Master, will on his part give orders to forbid French shipowners all trade with the Savages [Inuit], and that His Majesty reserves the right to punish, when he is informed, those of his subjects who would contravene; the governor not having and not being able to arrogate to himself jurisdiction over them [French subjects].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25</td>
<td>1765 April 8th</td>
<td>The trade was lucrative for the French; Palliser writes,“This Frenchman, Galliot, had the insolence to offer a bribe to one of His Majesty’s Officers [Thompson] to let him go to the Coast of Labrador [from Carpoon] and although he was deny’d and strictly forbid from going, he did send his boats over and traffick’d with the Savages[Inuit].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E28</td>
<td>1765 April 8th</td>
<td>Governor Palliser issues another order to British subjects, similar to his order of July 1, the previous year, “by all fair and gentle means to encourage and invite them [Inuit] to come with their commodities to Trade with His Majesty’s Subjects and be particularly kind to such of them as may produce a Copy of this [Order] which is to serve as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>1765 Aug 10th</td>
<td>In August Palliser writes, &quot;...the subjects of France [Captain Galliot], fishing at Quirpont the last year, invited the savages, named Carolit or Esquimauxs, over the Newfoundland and had a considerable trade with them, and used many infamous, wicked and savage acts to prejudice those ignorant Barbarous people against the English Nation.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>1765 Aug 10th</td>
<td>Palliser further states, &quot;the French Ambassador, having declared at the Court of London that his most Christian Majesty [French King] would give the most positive Orders to all Armateurs Francoise not to have any communication, or Trade, with the said Carolit, or Esquimaux Savages.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>1765 Aug 10th</td>
<td>Palliser gives notice, &quot;that in case any of the said Carolits or Esquimaux savages should go over to Newfoundland, they are not to be molested... being under His [English King] protection...I am...taking proper measures for civilizing those people...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M04</td>
<td>1765 Aug 17–20</td>
<td>The HMS Guernsey with Governor Palliser aboard is anchored at Pitts Arm (Chateau Bay) and a group of 300 Inuit are camped at Cape Charles (38kms north of Pitt’s Arm). The Inuit inform the Moravian interpreter (Drachardt) that they are reticent about going to Pitt’s Arm for fear of being murdered by the English. Palliser suggests a hostage exchange so that he can talk to three of the Inuit; this suggestion is rejected by the Moravian interpreter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M05</td>
<td>1765 Aug 21st</td>
<td>Drachardt greets the Inuit at Pitt’s Arm, &quot;He [Drachardt] went on shore and called them [Inuit] to him, he formed them in a circle around the Governor and then read to them the following articles which the Governor had drawn up for the purpose.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M06</td>
<td>1765 Aug 21st</td>
<td>Palliser then asks questions, “Will you now enter into Friendship with us? Will you Trade with us? Will you keep away from our ships and houses in the night? Will no more than five of you come to our ships in the day?...[etc.]... to every one of these questions they answered in the Affirmative...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M07</td>
<td>1765 Aug 21st</td>
<td>Drachardt continues, “Upon this, the Present was distributed with which they were entirely pleased and upon His Excellency repeating the question, ‘if they would remain our good friends?’ Segullia the Angikok gave him [Palliser] his hands, called him Captain Chateau, struck him on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
breast, kissed him and said we will remain your good friends. Thus, to us, this rather weighty affair was happily concluded…”

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M08</strong></td>
<td>1765 Aug 21st</td>
<td>Palliser orders a barrier as a Trucking place for trade, “…when the Indians come again, to erect a barrier between them and the Europeans to prevent the latter from taking undue libertys with them under the pretense of trade, one of his officers should always be present to keep order…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M08a</strong></td>
<td>1765 Aug 23rd</td>
<td>Inuit and Europeans trade at appointed place, “The merchants were there with their goods on their side of the Barrier. Brother Drachardt told the Indians (Inuit) why the Barrier was set up, and showed them their side where they could be in perfect security without anyone coming to disturb them. Now said he (Drachardt) go and trade at the Barrier and behave yourselves like good Caralit, which they did to the surprize of everyone for 3 hours together.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M08b</strong></td>
<td>1765 Aug 23rd</td>
<td>“The Governor desired Brother Drachardt to tell them that they should not trade with the French, but to this they would not assent.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M09</strong></td>
<td>1765 Aug 22nd.</td>
<td>Several of the Inuit return to Pitt’s Arm for trade, “The Governor desired Brother Drachardt to tell them that they should not trade with the French, but to this they would not assent.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M10</strong></td>
<td>1765 Aug 26th</td>
<td>“Brother Drachardt asked them: shall we come and live with you? They answered yes! Where shall we build our house? They say’d in Kikkertet.” Spotted Island/Black Tickle area]…” Area includes, Kikerkania, Puktusoaq, Ectrashick, Webatuk, and Ikenuluke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M10a</strong></td>
<td>1765 Aug 27th</td>
<td>When these Inuit are asked if they trade with the French,”they tell us a ship (we suppose French) frequently comes to Esquimaux Bay and trades with them”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M10b</strong></td>
<td>1765 Aug 29th</td>
<td>Drachardt, with English merchants, returns towards the Inuit at Cape Charles, “This was scarce resolved when we saw several Kaiaks, with Indians [Inuit]; they landed on Truck Island, behaved very friendly, and traded freely with us; when they were about to go, we told them we should stay there all night [Truck Island] and if they chose it, they might come early in the morning and have further trade.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M10c</strong></td>
<td>1765 Aug 30th</td>
<td>The mutual trading place is established, “they accordingly came early in the morning and by sunrise the little Island was like a Fair; they also brought their Women’s boats or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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skin battoes [from Cape Charles] with near twenty women with their children in it. They behaved extremly [sic] friendly and orderly and both they and the merchants were pleased; they were very much pleased with this place and method of trade and promised whenever we let them know they would come here and trade with us.”

|M11| 1765 Aug 30th| “Brother Drachardt called the old [Inuit] men together and showed them a picture, wherein the Commodore’s ship with the yards manned and the two barges accompanied by the Indians, just as it appears on the day when we made peace with them was represented. He explained this to them and told them the Commodore made them a present of it, that they might take it home with them and show it to their people and tell them of the league of friendship which we have entered into with their Nation.”| Truck Island, Chateau Bay and Hamilton Inlet [Esquimaux Bay] Nueingame |

|M11a| 1765 September 3rd| “…while we sent the merchants to bring their goods to the trading place [Truck Island]. …we then told them [Inuit] to go to the trading place where the merchants waited for them.”| Truck Island |

|M11b| 1765 Sept 4th| “In the afternoon we set out for the Indians [Inuit] and came by duckish to Truck Island where we anchored.”| Truck Island |

|M11c| 1765 Sept 5th| “Twelve Kaiaks came with whalebone [whale baleen] to truck with the merchants. About 11 O’clock there came in a battoe near 50 women and children…”| Truck Island |

|M11d| 1765 Sept. 7th| “The merchants went to Truck Island to trade with the Indians [Inuit] and we in the tender accompanied them. We immediately bore into the land and actually found the Indians with their tents on the Island. We found there 15 teants, 4 European battoes which they had bought or stole from the French, 3 Indian ones [Umiaks] covered over with skins and about 100 Kaiaks” | Truck Island |

|M11e| 1765 Sept 7th| Inuit still express a desire to trade with the French, “They enquired very earnest about Captain Galliot [French] if he was in Quirpon? We answered we did not know.”| Carpoon |

|M11f| Sept. 13th| The Moravian interpreters, some ship’s crew, the merchants and Inuit are still on Truck Island. This meeting has been for nine days of discussions and trading. However, the Inuit still want to trade with the French, “The Indians [Inuit] inquired about Quirpon and the people there [French], if we knew them? Answered no!”| Truck Island |

|M12| Ibid. 1765 Sept 20th| The British don’t want the Inuit to do any further trading with the French, “Brother Haven, who went with Sir Thomas [Master, HMS Niger] to the Indians, whom they found in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M12a</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Sept. 24th</td>
<td>Some Inuit have moved on to Red Bay, “The officer who had been at Red Bay ... told us the Indians [Inuit] had come to Red Bay, pitched their tents on an island near where he was, some of them came to him, but behaved as they had promised [sic] us very friendly.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E26</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Oct 30th</td>
<td>Palliser reports to the Lords of Trade, “For enabling me to make proper reports...I went there [Labrador] myself and met with a party of between four and five hundred of those savages...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E27</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>Oct 30th</td>
<td>Palliser continues, “…those people [Inuit] who have hitherto been dreaded, may in very short time, by kind and fair dealing, be made exceeding useful People to His Majesty's Subjects, they all are expert whale catchers, and Naturally fishers...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16a</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Oct 31</td>
<td>Palliser has his order for the French to stay away from the Inuit, published in the Québec Gazette, “…in order to prevent that nothing happens which could break the peace which I just made with the savages Carolites, or Eskimos, on the 21st of the Month [August]...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Feb 18th</td>
<td>Leeds Intelligencer, “It is said two separate fleets are, this summer, to be stationed at Newfoundland, one at the east and another at the west end of the island; the latter to prevent the French from any communication with the Labrador Indians [Inuit], or other natives [of] the continent.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17a</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Mar 25th</td>
<td>Leeds Intelligencer, “It is said that Otho Hamilton, Efq; Governor of Placentia, has requested a body of troops from New-York, to reinforce that infant garrison, being apprehensive of surprize from the Labrador Indians [Inuit] in the French interest.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E29 | 1766 | Mar 31st | Palliser outlines many killings and robberies of Inuit in Labrador by British subjects; a Mr George Milner has objected to the Lords of Trade about Palliser’s new regulations. Palliser’s response is terse, “For what is called by Mr. Milner, partial, arbitrary, offensive Orders, suspecting and controlling acts of Parliament, intending the lawful commerce of the subjects of this Kingdom and denying them the Rights and Privileges belonging to British subjects, but they are unworthy of that name [British
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E31</td>
<td>1766 April 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Leeds Intelligencer, “According to letters from Nova Scotia, several French vessels had actually touched, the beginning of last winter, at different islands near the Straits of Belle Isle, particularly Carpoon, which is out of the track of our Newfoundland cruisers, on a trade with the Esquimaux Indians, where they promised to return in the fishing season, and take off all the fish, fur, deer-skins and whalebone they might have ready, in exchange for European goods.”</td>
<td>Carpoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17b</td>
<td>1766 April 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Salisbury and Winchester Journal, “We hear from Portsmouth, that several presents intended to be distributed among the Indian Chiefs [Inuit] on the coast of Labrador, have been shipped on board the transports outward bound for Newfoundland.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30</td>
<td>1766 Aug 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Palliser issues orders to his officers for the apprehension of British offenders at Labrador who are, “Hunting for and Plundering, taking away or muttering, the poor Indian [Inuit] natives of the country, by their Violences, Barbarities and other Notorious crimes and Enormities… and with respect to the Indians [Inuit][at that place] is kept in a constant state of War.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30a</td>
<td>1766 Sept. 28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Journal of HMS Zephyr noting the establishment of the Fort at Pitt’s Harbour to enforce treaty terms, “… the colors were hoisted at Fort York for the first time”</td>
<td>Pitt’s Arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>1766 Oct 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Bath Chronicle, “They write from Newfoundland, that Admiral Palliser had, since his Arrival, gone on Shore several times to visit the Indians [Inuit] on the Coast of Labrador, particularly the Esquimaux Tribe and…they were highly pleased with the Presents sent them from England.”</td>
<td>Chateau Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E37</td>
<td>Exact date unknown</td>
<td>Palliser provides the Board of Trade with a ground plan for Fort York at Pitt’s Arm and a number of comments relevant to the 1765 treaty, “The Block House with this double security is capable of being defended against a great number of men, except cannon should be brought against it, and is too formidable to be ever attacked by the Savages of the country [Inuit].”</td>
<td>Pitt’s Arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>1767 Feb 26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Bath Chronicle, “Orders are given for a quantity of goods to be got ready, to be sent out with Admiral Palliser to Newfoundland, intended for presents among the chiefs of the Labrador Indians [Inuit], in friendship with the English.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767 July 21st</td>
<td>Governor Palliser previously ordered a fort to be built to aid in the enforcement of the British-Inuit treaty terms established in 1765. Palliser’s log aboard his flagship Guernsey reads, “Moored in Pitt’s Harbour, Zephyr in harbour. Hope ordered to bring [more]building supplies for Fort York.”</td>
<td>Pitt’s Harbour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767 July 26th</td>
<td>Palliser reinforces the 1765 treaty, ”This day, 19 of the Esquemaux Savages came to this place in the same number of skin canoes, I went to meet them, and received them with all marks of friendship, they behaved in like manner, and signified their desire to continue the Peace and Friendship they agreed to with me in the year 1765.”</td>
<td>Pitt’s Arm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767 July 26th</td>
<td>Palliser again established trade with them similar to events in 1765 with a manned trade barrier, ”I distributed a few presents amongst them upon Whale Island [Chateau Bay], I sent for our merchants to come and traffic with them, and ordered proper officers constantly to attend, after trucking their whalebone for sundry articles such as tools, woolen jackets, canvas, etc. they went away to a place 6 leagues to the northward named Camp Island where their tribe of men, women and children are arrived.”</td>
<td>Whale Island Camp Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767 July 29th</td>
<td>Palliser records further trading, “This day 31 of the Esquemeaux Savages came in their canoes, and after trafficking with our people as before, went away again.”</td>
<td>Chateau Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767 Aug 12th</td>
<td>“This day the tribe of Esquemeaux Savages came here in 16 Batteauxs and about 50 skin canoes consisting of between four and five hundred men, women and children.”</td>
<td>Pitts Harbour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767 Aug 16th</td>
<td>Palliser keeps a close eye on the Inuit, ”This day the Esquemeaux broke up their camp, embarked in their Batteauxs and proceeded to the westward. ...I compute they trucked above three tuns of whalebone with our people for trifles.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767 Oct 26th</td>
<td>Salisbury and Winchester Journal, “The last letters from Newfoundland mention that Admiral Palliser on his arrival had been on shore several times to visit the Indians on the Labrador coast [Inuit], in alliance with the English, and that they were highly pleased with the presents brought them from England.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767 Nov 12th</td>
<td>Stamford Mercury,” They [write] from St. John’s, Newfoundland, that several French vessels have this season been privately trading with the Indians on the Labrador coast, had landed a quantity of ammunition, arms, and presents to the Chiefs, and promised to return with more.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>News Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768 Mar 11th</td>
<td>Derby Mercury</td>
<td>“Orders are given for a Quantity of Goods of different Sorts to be got ready, to be sent out with Commodore Palliser to Newfoundland, intended as Presents to the Chiefs of the Labrador Indians [Inuit]. “</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769 June 13th</td>
<td>Leeds Intelligencer</td>
<td>“Commodore Byron, who sailed yesterday from for his station, Newfoundland, has carried over several valuable presents for the Indian Chiefs in the neighbourhood of St. John’s, and the country Labrador [Inuit], to attach them more firmly to the interests [of England].”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770 May 11th</td>
<td>Darby Mercury</td>
<td>“Yesterday Orders were sent to Portsmouth, to expedite the Sailing of the Newfoundland Fleet, under the Command of Commodore Byron, with the first fair wind. The Commodore carries out some valuable Presents for the Chief of the Labrador and Esquimeaax Indians.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774 May 30th</td>
<td>Saunders Newsletters</td>
<td>“Orders are given for a 36 Gun Frigate to be fitted out immediately, on board of which a considerable Quantity of goods are to be shipped, which are intended to be given to the Chiefs of the Mickmack and Labrador [Inuit], and to the Chiefs of other Indian Tribes, in Alliance with Great Britain.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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