

“those two insignificant Islands”: Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, and Social and Cultural Continuity in Northeastern North America, 1763-1793

By:

Brandon Morris

A thesis submitted to the College of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in History, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

© Copyright Brandon Robert Morris, August 2012. All rights reserved.

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of History
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 5A5

Abstract

Title: “those two insignificant Islands”: Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, and Social and Cultural Continuity in Northeastern North America, 1763-1793

Author: Brandon Morris

Supervisor: Robert Englebert

Submitted: September 5, 2012

This thesis focuses on Mi'kmaq-French-Acadian relations in Northeastern North America between 1763 and 1793. The Seven Years' War (1754-1763) spelled the end of France's North American Empire and resulted in widespread geopolitical changes across the continent. This thesis argues that while the Seven Years' War led to significant changes for the peoples of the Northeast, they were nevertheless able to maintain a remarkable degree of continuity in their social, economic, and cultural relationships with one another. The return of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to France allowed specific Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadian communities to remain connected through kinship, religion, and commerce, despite the fact that Britain was the dominant imperial power in the region. The continuity in these connections demonstrates that French, Acadian, and Mi'kmaq influence persisted in the post-Conquest period. This thesis seeks to contribute to a growing body of literature, which argues that French cultural and economic structures in North America persisted for many years after the fall of New France.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the input of my supervisor Dr. Robert Englebert. You encouraged me to look at big questions and consider the broader contexts of British history. Your guidance interpreting primary sources, especially religious documents, and careful editing of countless drafts shaped my work in a positive way.

I would also like to thank the Department of History at the University of Saskatchewan and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for providing me with funding, without which my research would not have been possible. Everyone at the University of Saskatchewan was very welcoming and made me feel comfortable as I completed my studies. A special thanks to Nadine Penner for keeping me aware of all the deadlines and requirements and putting up with my requests while I was out of town. None of us in the department could do what we do without you. My committee members, Dr. Jim Miller and Dr. Dale Miquelon, provided constructive criticism that was invaluable to my research and writing. It was an honour to have both of you review my work. I would also like to thank my fellow graduate students. You made the University of Saskatchewan an enjoyable place to be. Adam, Deanna, Mat, Michael, Matt, and Amy – thank you for making Saskatoon feel like home.

Lastly, I would like to thank my friends and family in Ontario. John, thanks for showing me a good time in Ottawa. I could not have spent all those long days in the archives without your support and generosity. Dan, you were there through all the good and bad times and I cannot thank you enough. To my parents and sister Kiera, thank you for all your love and encouragement. You were there whenever I needed you. From driving me to the airport to making time for phone calls, you helped more than you know. I could not have done it without you.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Historiography of the Northeast	6
Reincorporating the French and Acadians into Northeastern History	6
Power and Politics in Mi'kmaq History	8
Mi'kmaq Identity	13
Reinterpreting the Northeast	15
Chapter 1: Transplanting Île Royale Across the Cabot Strait	18
Mi'kmaq Relocation	23
Cape Breton/ Île Royale Before the British Conquest	28
The Relocation of Acadians	30
Godparentage: Linking Mi'kmaq and Acadian Communities Together	34
Conclusion	39
Chapter 2: “leur attachement pour la France”: Mi'kmaq Spirituality and Historical Ties to the French	41
Religious Continuity	42
Trade, Gift Giving, and Historical Relationships	52
Renewing Mi'kmaq-French Relationships	59
Conclusion	62
Chapter 3: Financial Insecurities and Enemy Aliens: A New Political History of the Northeast	64
Illicit Trade	67
Cultural and Kinship Connections	75
Conclusion	86
Conclusion	88
Appendix A: Mi'kmaq Baptisms in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon	91
Appendix B: Classification of Mi'kmaq Godparents	98
Bibliography	100

Introduction

The 1750s and 1760s were a time of tremendous geopolitical change in Northeastern North America.¹ The Seven Years' War (1754-1763) witnessed Britain and France clash for control of the continent and attempt to expand their North American empires. Both sides were supported by Aboriginal allies, who participated in the conflict for their own reasons, and had just as much if not more at stake in the outcome. Ultimately, the war brought about dramatic changes in the Northeast. After capturing Fort Beauséjour in 1755, Britain rounded up and deported the Acadians of Nova Scotia to France and the Thirteen Colonies because they refused to swear an unconditional oath of allegiance to the British Crown. The Acadians were willing to swear a conditional oath to Britain that would grant them freedom to practise Catholicism, but not commit them to take up arms in imperial conflicts.² Acadians in the French colonies of Île Royale (present-day Cape Breton) and Île Saint-Jean (present-day Prince Edward Island) were also deported following the British siege of the French fortress of Louisbourg in 1758.³

¹ The Northeast is defined as the area east of the St. Lawrence River from Gaspésie to the Atlantic Ocean, including present-day Cape Breton Island and Newfoundland, as well as New England to the south.

² Fort Beauséjour was located on the Chignecto Isthmus, which connects the present-day Canadian provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Acadian refers to the French-speaking population of the present-day Canadian Maritime provinces. The Acadians developed a unique identity of themselves as a result of the colony of Acadia/ Nova Scotia constantly changing hands throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Acadians came to believe that both France and Britain viewed them as pawns in an imperial struggle. For investigations into Acadian identity see: Anne Marie Lane Jonah and Elizabeth Tait, "Filles d'Acadie, Femmes de Louisbourg: Acadian Women and French Colonial Society in Eighteenth Century Louisbourg," *French Colonial History*, v. 8 (2007), p. 24-27; N.E.S. Griffiths, *From Migrant to Acadian, 1644-1755: A North American Border People* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005), 238; John Mack Faragher, *A Great and Noble Scheme: The Tragic Story of the Expulsion of the French Acadians from Their American Homeland* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2005), xvii, 141-143; Carl A. Brasseaux, *The Founding of New Acadia: The Beginnings of Acadian Life in Louisiana, 1765-1803* (Louisiana: Louisiana State Press, 1987), 3, 13; Geoffrey Plank, *An Unsettled Conquest: The British Campaign Against the Peoples of Acadia* (Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 164-167.

³ Louisbourg was strategically positioned on the tip of present-day Cape Breton Island so that it could bar entry into the Gulf of St. Lawrence and protect Canada and Île Saint-Jean from naval attack. Louisbourg was also intended to serve as a base for the French Atlantic fishery and disrupt New England shipping. W.J. Eccles, *France in America* (Toronto: Fitzhenry & Whiteside Limited, 1972), 109. William C. Wicken,

By the end of 1760 Québec and Montréal were in British hands, which spelled the end of the French Empire in North America. The Treaty of Paris ended the Seven Years' War in 1763, and resulted in France ceding the majority of its North American possessions to Britain.⁴ However, France's empire in the Northeast did not disappear completely. Under the terms of the treaty Britain was required to return two islands, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, located twenty-five kilometres from the south coast of Newfoundland, which France had previously ceded under the Treaty of Utrecht.⁵ The Treaty of Paris also ensured that France retained its exclusive fishing rights on Newfoundland's French Shore, which had been established in 1713.⁶ At the end of 1763, France's official colonial possessions in North America amounted to two tiny islands in the North Atlantic and exclusive fishing rights in northern Newfoundland.⁷

Saint-Pierre and Miquelon were of little concern to the British in 1763, but the colonies allowed France to retain influence in the Northeast. Britain anticipated that a shortage of wood on the islands would prevent France from making Saint-Pierre and Miquelon profitable colonies.⁸ However, the inhabitants of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon

"Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales: Mi'kmaq Society, 1500-1760," (PhD Dissertation, McGill University, 1994), 382-383.

⁴ French territory west of the Mississippi River became British, while territory east of the river was transferred to Spain. For complete terms of the Treaty see: Eccles, 217-218; Colin G. Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 9; Fred Anderson, *The Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 505-506.

⁵ Charles A. Martijn, "Mi'kmaq in the Parish Registers of the Islands of Saint-Pierre et Miquelon, 1764-1848," [<http://www.cbu.ca/mrc/stpierre-miquelon>], September 1996. The Treaty of Utrecht (1713) ended the War of Spanish Succession (1701-1713).

⁶ The French Shore was the area between Cape Bonavista and Pointe Riche. For a discussion of the inclusion of fishing rights in the Treaty of Utrecht and their importance to France see, Dale Miquelon, "Envisioning the French Empire: Utrecht, 1711-1713," *French Historical Studies*, v. 24, no. 4 (Fall 2001), 665-666. Frederick J. Thorpe, "The Debating Talents of the First Governor of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, François-Gabriel d'Angeac, 1764-1769." *Newfoundland Studies* 18, 1 (2002), 61.

⁷ France also maintained its sugar islands in the Caribbean – Guadeloupe, Saint Lucia, and Martinique.

⁸ Thomas Graves to Board of Trade, 20 October 1763, doc. 108, v. 15, Colonial Office Papers (CO) 194, Manuscript Group (MG) 11, Library and Archives Canada (LAC). Thorpe, 70.

overcame this shortage of resources by illegally harvesting timber on the south coast of Newfoundland.⁹ Saint-Pierre and Miquelon were valuable to France for three reasons. First, they ensured that France retained access to the North Atlantic cod fishery.¹⁰ The islands were intended to serve as a supply base and harbour for fishermen operating on the French Shore. Under the terms of the Treaty of Paris French fishermen were not permitted to leave their vessels or supplies in Newfoundland over the winter. Consequently, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon became vital to French fishing operations, both for storing supplies and harbouring fishing vessels.¹¹ By helping to re-establish the French cod fishery, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon were important for a second reason – they provided jobs for Frenchmen in primary and secondary industries related to the fishery. Men and women in French port towns, such as St. Malo and Granville, depended on the Atlantic cod fishery, and therefore had a stake in the success of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon for their livelihood. This meant that the loss of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon could have tangible economic consequences in France.¹² Thirdly, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon allowed France to develop a strong merchant marine, which provided the navy with competent sailors.¹³ The French government was very explicit in its instructions to the Governor of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, François-Gabriel d’Angeac, to prevent any disputes from arising with Britain so that France would not risk losing access to the

⁹ Palliser to d’Angeac, 29 June 1764, doc. 13v, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

¹⁰ After 1713 the French cod fishery was based in Île Royale, which was ceded to Britain in the Treaty of Paris (1763), and the French Shore. For the importance of the Newfoundland fishery to France see: Jean-François Brière, “Pêche et politique à Terre-Neuve au XVIIIe siècle: la France véritable gagnante du traité d’Utrecht?” *Canadian Historical Review*, LXIV, 2 (1983), 168-172.

¹¹ Thorpe, 62-3.

¹² *Ibid.*, 63.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 63; Olaf U. Janzen, “The Royal Navy and the Interdiction of Aboriginal Migration to Newfoundland, 1763-1766,” *International Journal of Naval History*, v. 7, no. 2 (August 2008), 3.

fishery.¹⁴ D'Angeac was instructed to discourage Native peoples from visiting Saint-Pierre and Miquelon because their presence concerned the British. However, the inhabitants of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon were forced to circumvent the Treaty of Paris by cutting wood in southern Newfoundland and trading for building supplies with British colonists. Considering that they were already forced to disregard certain provisions of the Treaty of Paris to simply re-establish Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, the French did not wish to risk further conflict with Britain by encouraging Aboriginal peoples to visit the islands.¹⁵

Despite continued French imperial presence – Saint-Pierre and Miquelon – historians have largely focused on geopolitical change and presumed British supremacy after the Seven Years' War, which has minimized any continuing role for the French. Robert Englebert has argued that the Seven Years' War has characteristically been interpreted as “a fundamental historical fissure.”¹⁶ The British Conquest often serves as an artificial breaking point in Canadian and American history. In Canada the Seven Years' War has been interpreted as initiating a divide between English and French Canadians.¹⁷ In the United States the Seven Years' War is used to explain the growing

¹⁴ Thorpe, 67, 70. There was an international agreement that vessels should not pass within one league of foreign colonies.

¹⁵ Janzen, 11.

¹⁶ Robert Englebert, “Beyond Borders: Mental Mapping and the French River World in North America, 1763-1805,” (PhD Dissertation, University of Ottawa, 2010), 12.

¹⁷ Catherine Desbarats and Allan Greer, “The Seven Years' War in Canadian History and Memory,” in *Cultures in Conflict: The Seven Years' War in North America*, ed. Warren R. Hofstra (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2007), 146. Philip Lawson, “A Perspective on British History and the Treatment of Quebec,” *Journal of Historical Sociology*, v. 3, no. 3 (September 1990), 255. Dale Miquelon, ed., *Society and Conquest: The Debate on the Bourgeoisie and Societal Change in French Canada, 1700-1850* (Vancouver: Copp Clark Publishers, c1977).

friction between the Thirteen Colonies and Britain, which eventually led to the American Revolution.¹⁸

Another reason historians of the Seven Years' War have emphasized change is that they have the benefit of hindsight. Historians know that France did not make an attempt to recapture its North American colonies and have chosen to focus more on the development of English society than the persistence of French economic and cultural relations. Colin Calloway noted that 1763 "initiated a world of upheaval that remade America" and "ensured that America would be English speaking, not French speaking..."¹⁹ However, geopolitical changes did not immediately alter the social and cultural realities in France's former colonies. Furthermore, the fact that France ceded its colonies to Britain in 1763 did not mean that the triumph of English society in North America was inevitable. As Phillip Buckner and John Reid have argued, "Even after the Treaty of Paris of 1763 secured for the British what they had won on the battlefield, it was not inconceivable that France might have returned or assisted the thirteen colonies during the American Revolutionary War in taking from Britain what Britain had taken from France."²⁰ The fact that France never recaptured its colonies does not mean that it was an insignificant actor after 1763. Despite its military defeat in the Seven Years' War, France retained social and cultural influence in North America.²¹

¹⁸ Lawson, 256. Phillip Buckner and John G. Reid, eds., *Remembering 1759: The Conquest of Canada in Historical Memory* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 9. Warren R. Hofstra, ed., *Cultures in Conflict: The Seven Years' War in North America* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2007), vii. One of the best examples of this interpretation can be found on pages 365 and 746 of Anderson's *The Crucible of War*.

¹⁹ Calloway, 18.

²⁰ Buckner and Reid, vii.

²¹ Calloway, 112.

Historiography of the Northeast

The historical literature about the Northeast after the Seven Years' War is no exception to the larger historiographical pattern of emphasizing change over continuity. This pattern has created three historiographical challenges, which this thesis seeks to overcome. The first is a tendency to downplay the role of the French and Acadians after 1763. Most historians minimize the role of the French and presuppose British supremacy because France was no longer a major imperial presence in North America. The second and third problems deal with how historians have approached Mi'kmaq history. The second challenge is that historical narratives have overemphasized questions of politics and power dynamics in British-Mi'kmaq relations. This pattern has largely been driven by contemporary politics, which have seen Mi'kmaq seek recognition of their Aboriginal land and resource rights based on treaties signed with Britain in the eighteenth century. The present-day consequences of these treaties have caused social and cultural issues to take a back seat in Mi'kmaq history. The third historiographical challenge is that rights-driven political studies have tended to frame Mi'kmaq as a homogenous group, and downplay regional differences. This thesis will address all of these issues by focussing on social and cultural continuity in the Northeast after the Seven Years' War.

Reincorporating the French and Acadians into Northeastern History

Historians of the Northeast focus overwhelmingly on Britain rather than France or the Acadians after the fall of New France. One reason for this trend is that hindsight has provided historians with the knowledge that the Northeast became primarily an English-

speaking region.²² Focusing on the rapid Anglicization of *Acadie* and the Northeast presupposes that the French and Acadians had little presence or influence in the region following the deportation of the Acadians in 1755, and the conquest of New France in 1760. The period immediately following the Seven Years' War is commonly referred to as "planter Nova Scotia" in Northeastern history, which emphasizes Britain's plans for settling the region with Protestant English-speaking farmers.²³ In his classic work *Micmacs and Colonists*, Leslie Upton devoted only a single chapter to the years 1763-83. Upton mentions the French, Acadians, and Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, but only to demonstrate how they affected British-Mi'kmaq relations.²⁴ The remainder of the chapter discusses treaties between the British and Mi'kmaq, and the effects of the American Revolution on British policy. The rest of the book is divided into chapters detailing how individual colonies (New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia) dealt with the Mi'kmaq after the migration of United Empire Loyalists to British North America in the 1780s.

Narratives that focus solely on the British after 1763 obscure the fact that the French and Acadians remained influential in the Northeast. Many Acadian families returned to Nova Scotia from the Thirteen Colonies between 1763 and 1767. During this period 900 Acadians returned from New England and settled around St. Mary's Bay in

²² New Brunswick is an exception to this pattern. As of 2006 New Brunswick was home to 235,270 people, comprising 32.5 percent of the provincial population, who had French as their mother tongue. Statistics Canada, "Minorities in Canada – Francophones in New Brunswick," [<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-642-x/2011005/article/conclusion-eng.htm>], accessed 28 June 2012.

²³ John G. Reid, "Pax Britannica or Pax Indigena? Planter Nova Scotia (1760-1782) and Competing Strategies of Pacification," *The Canadian Historical Review* 85, 4 (Dec. 2004), 669-692. Margaret Conrad, *They Planted Well: New England Planters in Maritime Canada* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1988). Margaret Conrad, *Making Adjustments: Change and Continuity in Planter Nova Scotia, 1759-1800* (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1991).

²⁴ L.F.S. Upton, *Micmacs and Colonists: Indian-White Relations in the Maritimes, 1713-1867* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1979), 65-7.

southwestern Nova Scotia.²⁵ In 1764, an additional 1,700 Acadians were working for Britain repairing and maintaining the dikes they constructed around the Bay of Fundy.²⁶ Over 800 Acadians had also settled in the French colonies of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon by 1765.²⁷ Acadians continued to return to the Northeast throughout the eighteenth century.²⁸

One of the reasons the continued influence of French and Acadians in the Northeast has been obscured is that historians have relied heavily on British primary sources. In *Micmacs and Colonists*, Upton relied almost exclusively on the Colonial Office Papers (hereafter CO) Series 217 for his brief discussion of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.²⁹ Likewise, Olaf Janzen's examination of the Royal Navy's campaign to prevent Mi'kmaq migration to southwestern Newfoundland depended largely on British documents found in CO194, resulting in an Anglo-centric interpretation of the Northeast after 1763.³⁰ Because they relied primarily on British sources, Janzen and Upton's analyses minimized the role of the French, and obscured the degree of continuity in French-Mi'kmaq relations in the post-Conquest period.

Power and Politics in Mi'kmaq History

²⁵ Robert G. Leblanc, "The Acadian Migrations," in *French America: Mobility, Identity, and Minority Experience Across the Continent*, eds. Jean R. Louder and Eric Waddell (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993), 176-177.

²⁶ Faragher, 418, 422. Brasseaux, 31.

²⁷ Michel Poirier, *Les Acadiens aux îles Saint-Pierre et Miquelon* (Moncton: Les Éditions d'Acadie, 1984), 22-30.

²⁸ Leblanc, 188. By 1800, 8,400 Acadians (thirty-six percent of the total Acadian population) lived in the present-day Canadian Maritimes, and another 8,000 lived in Québec.

²⁹ The Colonial Office Papers are a collection of documents detailing the correspondence between British colonies and the Board of Trade (the office responsible for the colonies) in London.

³⁰ Janzen, 1-26.

Many historical narratives regarding the Northeast also tend to focus on the relationship between power and politics, rather than social and cultural relations. Examining the Northeast from a political perspective emphasizes geopolitical changes and shifting power dynamics while downplaying the continuity of social and cultural relations across the region. This pattern is particularly common in the historical literature concerning British-Mi'kmaq relations after the Conquest.

The political questions addressed in Mi'kmaq history have largely been driven by contemporary legal cases, which have seen Mi'kmaq seek the recognition of Aboriginal land and resource rights. Mi'kmaq historiography became especially focussed on questions of power and politics during the *Marshall* trial of 1999. In 1993 Donald Marshall, a Mi'kmaq man from Cape Breton, was charged with catching and selling eels without a license. Using evidence from British-Mi'kmaq treaties signed in 1760 and 1761, as well as the testimony of historians, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that the Mi'kmaq had the right to fish commercially for the purpose of “securing ‘necessaries’ (which should be construed in the modern context as equivalent to a moderate livelihood)...”³¹ A number of leading scholars on Mi'kmaq history – John Reid, William Wicken, and Stephen Patterson – served as expert witnesses during the trial, and have since become engaged in a debate about the proper interpretation of the 1760-1 treaties.³²

³¹ *R. v. Marshall*, [1999] 3 S.C.R. 456, p. 5.

³² The 1760-1 treaties included the following provisions: a) the Mi'kmaq recognized British jurisdiction over Acadia and submitted to the King; b) Mi'kmaq would not molest settlers “in their settlements as already made, or that may be hereafter made”; c) retribution would be made if “insult, robbery or outrage” were committed by the Mi'kmaq or Maliseet; d) First Nations would not encourage Englishmen to desert; e) Disputes would be settled by British law; f) British prisoners captured during the Seven Years' War would be released; g) Mi'kmaq would not assist the enemies of Britain and would notify the King of any ill designs; h) Aboriginals would only trade at truckhouses (government trading posts intended to operate at a loss to maintain Mi'kmaq friendship without requiring Britain to engage in the practice of gift-giving); i) Mi'kmaq and British would exchange hostages to ensure that both sides abided by the treaty. “Micmac

The contemporary legal questions surrounding Aboriginal and treaty rights to land and resources that arose in *R v. Marshall* have played a significant role in framing the questions addressed in Mi'kmaq and Northeastern history. The competing interpretations of the 1760-1 treaties expressed during the trial were based in large part on how expert witnesses viewed the balance of power in the Northeast after the fall of Québec.

Historians have interpreted the balance of power in the Northeast after the Conquest in one of two ways. The first stresses that Mi'kmaq were more or less at the mercy of the British after the fall of New France. According to Leslie Upton, the British Conquest placed Mi'kmaq in “a position of having to react to the advances of others.”³³ Upton categorized the 1760-1 treaties as documents of submission. He contextualized their signing by referencing the sieges of Louisbourg and Québec, and suggested that these events left Mi'kmaq alone to endure a harsh winter without access to the European goods upon which they depended for survival.³⁴ Olive Patricia Dickason presented Mi'kmaq as a people with greater agency than previously acknowledged, but adhered to the same basic argument as Upton.³⁵ Dickason argued that Mi'kmaq were able to exploit the British-French imperial rivalry to their own advantage, but also suggested that this

Treaty 1760,” in *Maritime Indian Treaties in Historical Perspective*, W.E. Daugherty (Ottawa: Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, 1983), 86-87.

³³ Upton, xii.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 57.

³⁵ For arguments similar to Upton's see: Robert Conkling, “Legitimacy and Conversion in Social Change: The Case of French Missionaries and the Northeastern Algonkian,” *Ethnohistory*, v. 21, no. 1 (Winter 1974), 1-21; David V. Burley, “Proto-Historic Ecological Effects of the Fur Trade on Micmac Culture in Northeastern New Brunswick,” *Ethnohistory*, v. 28, no. 3 (Summer 1981), 203-216. This theory of Aboriginal dependency is part of a larger trend in Aboriginal history. For more information on the development of the field see: Bruce R. Trigger, “The Historians' Indian: Native Americans in Canadian Historical Writing from Charlevoix to the Present,” *Canadian Historical Review*, LVXVII, no. 3 (1986), 315-342; and Olive Patricia Dickason, “The Many Faces of Canada's History as It Relates to Aboriginal People,” in *Walking a Tightrope: Aboriginal People and Their Representations*, eds. David McNab and Ute Lischke (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2005), 117-148.

ability declined after the Conquest.³⁶ The debate regarding Mi'kmaq agency and the balance of power in the post-1763 Northeast intensified when Donald Marshall was charged in 1993. Not surprisingly the principal scholars involved in the academic debate, Patterson, Wicken, and Reid, were the same men who served as expert witnesses during the trial.

Building on the arguments of his predecessors, Stephen Patterson suggested that the 1760-1 treaties should be read as documents of submission because the Mi'kmaq became a “dependent people” after the French defeats at Louisbourg and Québec. In Patterson’s words, “the treaties of 1760 and 1761 were those of a conquering power; they said what the British wanted them to say.”³⁷ According to Patterson, the language the British chose to use in the treaties reflected the shift in the balance of power. In a 1726 treaty, known as Treaty No. 239 or Mascarene’s Treaty, Mi'kmaq submitted to the British Crown “in as ample a manner as we have formerly done to the most Christian King [the King of France].”³⁸ In 1760, however, Mi'kmaq made their submission “in the most perfect ample and solemn manner.”³⁹ According to Patterson, the weakened state of Mi'kmaq and the fact that they were without allies made a “perfect” submission more likely.⁴⁰

³⁶ Dickason, “Amerindians Between French and English,” 46.

³⁷ Stephen E. Patterson, “Indian-White Relations in Nova Scotia, 1749-61: A Study in Political Interaction,” *Acadiensis*, v. 23, no. 1 (Autumn 1993), 58.

³⁸ “Treaty No. 239,” in *Maritime Indian Treaties in Historical Perspective*, W.E. Daugherty (Ottawa: Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, 1983), 78. J.R. Miller, *Compact, Contract, Covenant: Aboriginal Treaty-Making in Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 62. Treaty No. 239 is the Canadian version of the Treaty of Boston, which ended Dummer’s War between New England and the Wabanaki in 1725.

³⁹ Stephen E. Patterson, “Eighteenth Century Treaties: The Mi'kmaq, Maliseet and Passamaquoddy Experience,” *Native Studies Review*, v. 18, no. 1 (2009), 45.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 35.

Wicken and Reid's interpretations of the 1760-1 treaties differed from Patterson. Wicken presented the 1760-1 treaties as renewals of the treaties signed between the British and Mi'kmaq in 1726 and 1752.⁴¹ He argued that the intent of a treaty is not solely contained in the text; it is also reflected in the ceremonies leading up to the official signing. According to Wicken the treaties were intended to be a genuine attempt at coexistence by both parties. Britain desired peace so that they could finally proceed with the settlement of Nova Scotia. Outside of the fortified town of Halifax, British settlers were vulnerable to Mi'kmaq attack, which meant that successful settlement depended on Mi'kmaq goodwill and cooperation. In seeking peace, Mi'kmaq hoped to protect their land and resources, and find a trading partner to replace France. Wicken asked, if the British were in an overwhelming position of power in 1760, why would they have bothered signing treaties at all? His answer was that the British were not dominant, and that the treaties were reinterpreted at a later date when Britain felt less threatened by Mi'kmaq.⁴²

Reid was more explicit than Wicken in his assertion that Mi'kmaq retained significant political power after the French defeat. He argued that prior to the Loyalist migration of the 1780s "colonization was limited to defined areas, and there was no inexorable advance of British power."⁴³ Throughout the 1760s, 1770s, and into the early 1780s, the British expressed fears that Mi'kmaq had the potential to disrupt or even destroy some settlements. Thus, according to Reid, the 1760-1 treaties should not be

⁴¹ William Wicken, *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial: History, Land and Donald Marshall Junior* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 3.

⁴² Wicken, *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial*, 218.

⁴³ Reid, "Pax Britannica," 673.

understood as being representative of Mi'kmaq submission because Britain was not in a position to impose its will through sheer force of arms.

More recently Reid has argued that Mi'kmaq continued to factor significantly into British decision-making until 1815. After the migration of United Empire Loyalists to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, Mi'kmaq retained some of their power because the British viewed them as valuable allies in potential imperial conflicts with France or the United States.⁴⁴ Reid concedes that Mi'kmaq were far from occupying a position of strength, but nevertheless “had enough remaining strength to be able to negotiate.”⁴⁵

Mi'kmaq Identity

While these historians have made a substantial contribution and expanded our knowledge of Mi'kmaq history, their focus is overwhelmingly the relations between power and politics. This political focus has affected the way in which historians have represented Mi'kmaq identity. More often than not Mi'kmaq are presented as a one-dimensional, homogenous group in rights-driven political narratives of the Northeast. Most works discuss Mi'kmaq culture, but few attempt to account for regional differences or diverging interests in Mi'kmaq society.⁴⁶ Mi'kmaq are shown to be the equivalent of a

⁴⁴ John G. Reid, “Empire, the Maritime Colonies, and the Supplanting of Mi'kma'ki/Wulstukwik, 1780-1820,” *Acadiensis*, v. 38, no. 2 (Summer/Autumn 2009), 95.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 92-3.

⁴⁶ For works on Mi'kmaq culture see: Wicken, “Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales”; Upton, *Micmacs and Colonists*; Philip K. Bock, “Micmac,” in *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 15: Northeast*, ed. Bruce G. Trigger (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), p. 109-136; Wilson D. Wallis and Ruth S. Wallis, *The Micmac Indians of Eastern Canada* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955); Harald E.L. Prins, *The Mi'kmaq: Resistance, Accommodation, and Survival* (Fort Worth: Hartcourt Brace, 1996). Charles A. Martijn, “Early Mi'kmaq Presence in Southern Newfoundland: An Ethnohistorical Perspective, c. 1500-1763,” *Newfoundland Studies*, v. 19, no. 1 (2003), 49-57.

unified nation-state interacting with European powers.⁴⁷ The exceptions to this pattern are William Wicken's doctoral dissertation and the works of anthropologist Charles Martijn.

Both Wicken and Martijn emphasized that distinct identities developed in western and eastern Mi'kmaq communities. According to Wicken this was largely due to differences in their relations with Acadians. Mi'kmaq in eastern Acadia and Île Royale were more closely tied to the Acadians because both groups were engaged in the fishery and fur trade.⁴⁸ Involvement in these pursuits facilitated the development of kinship ties between Mi'kmaq and Acadians in the east.⁴⁹ For a number of reasons that will be discussed elsewhere in this thesis, the connections between Acadians and Mi'kmaq were not as strong in western Acadia. Charles Martijn argued that the eastern Mi'kmaq were unique because they were more mobile. According to Martijn they occupied a "domain of islands" which were exploited on a rotational basis according to need and the availability of resources.⁵⁰ Their experience with mobility and close ties to Acadians caused eastern Mi'kmaq to react differently to the British Conquest than other groups of Mi'kmaq further west.

Wicken and Martijn's analyses suggest that historians should not unwittingly prescribe unity to a group of people simply because they belong to the same nation. There were undoubtedly broader regional interests that united Mi'kmaq, but these could diverge quite significantly from local interests. A study of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon supports

⁴⁷ Conkling, 1-21. Dickason, 31-56. Patterson, "Indian-White Relations," 23-59. Patterson, "Eighteenth Century Treaties," 25-52. Reid, "Empire." Reid, "*Pax Britannica*." Upton, *Micmacs and Colonists*.

⁴⁸ Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 252.

⁴⁹ Miller, *Compact, Contract, Covenant*, 15, 33. Miller argues that Native peoples would only trade with groups that they had established relationships with. These relationships needed to be constantly renewed through Aboriginal rituals such as gift giving or the calumet (peace pipe) ceremony.

⁵⁰ According to Martijn the domain of islands consisted of Cape Breton, the Magdalen Islands, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, and southern Newfoundland. Charles Martijn, "An Eastern Micmac Domain of Islands," in *Papers of the Twentieth Algonquian Conference*, ed. William Cowan (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1989), 208-231.

Wicken and Martijn's arguments that there were differences between eastern and western Mi'kmaq communities. These differences led some individuals to migrate to Newfoundland after the Conquest, while others sought refuge in New Brunswick, or chose to remain in the former French colonies of Acadia and Île Royale.⁵¹

Reinterpreting the Northeast

This thesis will depart from the existing historiographical pattern by emphasizing continuity after the Seven Years' War.⁵² This thesis seeks to overcome the three historiographical challenges discussed above by reincorporating the French and Acadians into the history of the Northeast, reorienting Mi'kmaq historiography toward social and cultural questions, and framing Mi'kmaq identity in a way that accounts for regional differences. Through examining the French colony of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, this thesis will present a narrative of French-Mi'kmaq-Acadian relations that favours continuity over rupture and change in Northeastern North America. The commercial, cultural, and kinship ties that bound these groups together adapted to imperial realities and persisted in a period of change. As Colin Calloway has argued, "Imperial politics did

⁵¹ For the sake of historical accuracy the term Île Royale will be used when referring to the territory before 1763, and Cape Breton will be used for any discussions after 1763. Similarly, Acadia will be used for dates before 1713, and Nova Scotia will be used for any references to the colony after 1713.

⁵² This study builds on existing studies that emphasize continuity in other former French territories. Robert Englebert, "Beyond Borders." Englebert discusses the enduring links between merchants in Montreal and the Illinois Country. Jay Gitlin, *The Bourgeois Frontier: French Towns, French Traders, and American Expansion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010). Gitlin argues that French cultural influence in the American Midwest persisted until the 1830s. Reid, "Empire, the Maritime Colonies." Reid argues that Mi'kmaq continued to influence British policy in the Northeast because they were useful as allies in potential imperial conflicts until after the War of 1812. Calloway, 130-132. Calloway argues that in the Mississippi valley fur trade Britain and Spain continued to rely on French individuals who had connections with Native communities.

not always or immediately alter existing social realities. On the peripheries of empire, many of the same people continued business as usual.”⁵³

This study begins with the return of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to France in 1763 and concludes with their capture by Britain in 1793 during the French Revolutionary Wars.⁵⁴ Chapter one focuses on the establishment of Mi’kmaq communities in southern Newfoundland, and French-Acadian communities in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. More specifically, it looks at how both of these communities were linked to the former French colony of Île Royale. These communities continued to be tied together through kinship despite the distances between them. Chapter two examines the continuity of Mi’kmaq religious practice after the Seven Years’ War. When Mi’kmaq could not travel to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to access the services of Catholic priests, they practised Catholicism on their own using religious materials provided to them by French priests before 1763. This chapter also looks at the nature of the French-Mi’kmaq relationship after the Seven Years’ War. Although the relationship no longer included a military alliance, it was renewed through ceremonial gift exchanges at various points after 1763. This suggests that both groups continued to see each other as friends and trading partners.

Chapter three marks a slight departure from the social and cultural focus of chapters one and two. Chapter three seeks to reincorporate the political history of the Northeast into a narrative that includes the continuity of Mi’kmaq-French-Acadian relations. By examining the fears expressed in British colonial correspondence, this chapter argues not only that Britain tacitly acknowledged the continuity of commercial,

⁵³ Calloway, 131.

⁵⁴ Britain returned Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to France in the First Treaty of Paris in 1814.

cultural, and kinship networks, but also that these networks had an influence on British policy after 1763.

Continuity in the post-1763 Northeast lay hidden beneath a mask of widespread geopolitical change. The Treaty of Paris shifted imperial boundaries, but did not drastically alter the existing social and cultural realities for the peoples of the Northeast. Following the Seven Years' War, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon played a crucial role in maintaining continuity in the commercial, cultural, and kinship relations between Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadian populations of the region.

Chapter 1: Transplanting Île Royale Across the Cabot Strait

In October 1766, Hugh Palliser, the Governor of Newfoundland, wrote to Nova Scotia's Governor, Michael Francklin, regarding the increased presence of Cape Breton Mi'kmaq in his colony. Palliser complained about the "several Passports that have been granted in your government [Nova Scotia] to the Indian Chiefs to come to this Country [Newfoundland], which I must say was very Inconsiderate in those who granted them..."¹ Palliser also stated that he had written to the Commander of Louisbourg in 1764, asking him to "recant these passes...and to Issue no more, notwithstanding which this last year [1765]...Chief, Jean Pegidawa Oulaut, with a Tribe of over Two Hundred return'd with fresh Passes to come to this Country..."² While Palliser's complaints highlight the mobility of the Mi'kmaq people, they also indicate the development of a unique migration pattern after 1763.

Following the British Conquest of New France a number of Mi'kmaq began relocating from Cape Breton Island to southern Newfoundland. Normally this process might be referred to as cultural mobility, which denotes transplanting a culture from one location to another.³ However, this term implies a degree of change that does not accurately capture the nuances of Mi'kmaq relocation to southern Newfoundland. For Mi'kmaq, cultural mobility did not entail *transplanting* their culture to a new location, but rather *shifting* their primary location of settlement within a familiar territory.

¹ Palliser to Francklin, 16 October 1766, doc. 308v. v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC. Nova Scotia included Cape Breton Island until 1784 and present-day Prince Edward Island, which until 1799 was known as St. John's Island, until 1769.

² Ibid.

³ Stephen Greenblatt, "Cultural mobility: an introduction," in *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 1-23.

Migration had long been a strategy that Mi'kmaq used to take advantage of the resources available in their vast traditional territory, which stretched from the Gaspé Peninsula to the Atlantic Ocean, and included the Magdalen Islands, eastern New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Cape Breton Island, and southern Newfoundland.⁴ Mi'kmaq were primarily fishermen, hunters, and gatherers, who did not practise large-scale agriculture because of the short growing season in their traditional territory.⁵ Mi'kmaq identity was more strongly associated with the extended family, which moved around to fish and hunt, rather than a permanent settlement.⁶ In the summer, Mi'kmaq families congregated in large villages near the Atlantic coast where they could harvest the region's bountiful maritime resources.⁷ In the fall, Mi'kmaq organized themselves into small groups of twelve to fifteen individuals based on kinship ties and dispersed for the winter hunting season.⁸ Mi'kmaq returned to the coast in pursuit of seal, tomcod, smelt, and walrus in early January.⁹ February and March were spent inland hunting beaver, otter, moose, and caribou.¹⁰ Families congregated around

⁴ Historians debate whether Newfoundland was part of the traditional territory of the Mi'kmaq people. Charles Martijn makes a very convincing case that the Mi'kmaq gathered resources in Newfoundland well before the eighteenth century. His opinion is shared by William Wicken. Martijn, "An Eastern Micmac Domain of Islands." Martijn, "Mi'kmaq in the Parish Registers." Martijn, "Early Mi'kmaq Presence." Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 2. For accounts expressing scepticism that Newfoundland is part of the traditional Mi'kmaq territory see, Ingeborg Marshall, "Beothuk and Micmac: Re-examining Relationships," *Acadiensis*, v. 17, no. 2 (1988), 52-82. Upton, 64. Bartels and Janzen, 71, 86. Bartels and Janzen contend that "the transition from seasonal to permanent occupation [of Newfoundland] occurred during the 1760s."

⁵ Prins, 27. Upton, 1.

⁶ Wicken, *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial*, 30. Charles Martijn, "Early Mi'kmaq Presence," 51.

⁷ Upton, 2. Wicken, *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial*, 35. Prins, 27.

⁸ Upton, 2. Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 69-70. Prins, 27. Wicken, *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial*, 35.

⁹ Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 73.

¹⁰ Upton, 2.

rivers in large numbers to take advantage of fish spawning season in the spring, before once again returning to the coast to form summer villages.¹¹

Mi'kmaq continually made adjustments to their seasonal cycles to account for environmental and social changes. These could include natural fluctuations in animal populations, human overpopulation, or even drought. In these situations Mi'kmaq extended their subsistence activities into nearby territories for varying periods of time depending on what type of change they were responding to.¹² According to John Reid, “migration over shorter or longer distances could enable a semblance of the traditional economy to survive...”¹³

While mobility was an inherent part of Mi'kmaq identity, it was especially important to those in eastern Acadia and Île Royale. Charles Martijn has convincingly argued that eastern Mi'kmaq exploited a series of islands that included present-day Cape Breton, the Magdalen Islands, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, and southern Newfoundland. According to Martijn, “the Mi'kmaq once had a unified vision of this traditional homeland, whose eastern sector constituted a domain of islands linked, not separated, by stretches of water, like the Cabot Strait, which served as connecting highways for canoe travel.”¹⁴ Eastern Mi'kmaq accessed different parts of their territory depending on the availability of resources.¹⁵ According to Mi'kmaq oral history, Newfoundland was

¹¹ Wicken, “Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales,” 64. Prins, 27. Prins suggests that spring bands usually included upwards of 200 individuals.

¹² Martijn, “Early Mi'kmaq Presence,” 52.

¹³ Reid, “Empire,” 87.

¹⁴ According to Mi'kmaq oral tradition their traditional territory was divided into seven districts. Newfoundland was considered part of this territory, but was not accorded separate status, and fell within the sphere of Cape Breton. Martijn, “Early Mi'kmaq Presence,” 49. This thesis does not rely on Mi'kmaq oral history. However, a careful reading of the documents available in the parish registers of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon allows one to trace the actions and movements of Mi'kmaq individuals, and give voice and agency to Aboriginal actors.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 53.

always considered part of their traditional territory, but fell under the authority of the Cape Breton district.¹⁶ This suggests a historical connection between Cape Breton – the former French colony Île Royale – and Newfoundland that was not shared by Mi'kmaq in other areas.

Thus, relocation to southern Newfoundland following the British Conquest was nothing new for Mi'kmaq on Cape Breton Island. They were employing a time-honoured strategy of adapting to change, this time geopolitical, by taking advantage of the resources available in a different location within their traditional territory. The difference after the Conquest was that Newfoundland, in addition to being an area for seasonal resource harvesting, became the site of permanent Mi'kmaq settlements.¹⁷ Eastern Mi'kmaq continued to view both Newfoundland and Cape Breton as part of their domain. Those who relocated did not cease visiting Cape Breton to see relatives and attend religious festivals.¹⁸ Mi'kmaq of Cape Breton did not uproot and transplant their culture to a new location, but rather shifted their primary location of settlement in order to adjust to imperial realities.

The British conquest of New France was a crucial factor in the Mi'kmaq decision to relocate to southern Newfoundland. From 1759 to 1761, Mi'kmaq negotiated and signed treaties with Britain on a band-by-band basis. Some bands, including the Merligueche band of Île Royale, were dissatisfied with the treaties because they failed to meet Mi'kmaq needs. One concern was that the British eliminated the practice of gift giving that Mi'kmaq had grown accustomed to under the French administration. The

¹⁶ Martijn, “An Eastern Micmac Domain,” 210.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 211. Mi'kmaq oral tradition states that there was a permanent Mi'kmaq presence in Newfoundland before the eighteenth century. Most historians are only willing to accept that Mi'kmaq seasonally inhabited Newfoundland during periods of resource harvesting.

¹⁸ Martijn, “Early Mi'kmaq Presence,” 81.

French presented Mi'kmaq with annual gifts to reaffirm their trade agreements and alliances.¹⁹ British officials in Nova Scotia preferred treaties, which represented a binding one-time agreement that did not have to be renewed through annual gift exchange.²⁰ Mi'kmaq were also dissatisfied with the British refusal to provide them with Catholic priests after Pierre Maillard, the last Catholic priest operating in Nova Scotia, passed away in 1762.²¹ The 1760-1 treaties promised Mi'kmaq religious freedom, but without priests Mi'kmaq could not fully take advantage of their right.²² In addition to religious concerns, Mi'kmaq faced incoming British settlers who encroached on Native territory.²³ By 1768, 10,000 British settlers had established themselves in Cape Breton. Although European settlement did not become a widespread problem until the Loyalist migrations of the 1780s, it was still a concern for Mi'kmaq around Cape Breton during the 1760s. Mi'kmaq in Cape Breton asked for the termination of settlement in certain areas of the island in 1768, but the British ignored their request.²⁴

The return of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to France presented Mi'kmaq on Cape Breton Island with an opportunity to adapt to these imperial changes by relocating to southern Newfoundland. Newfoundland was a British colony, but it had far fewer settlers than Cape Breton, especially west of Fortune Bay.²⁵ The southern portions of Newfoundland were geographically closer to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon than Nova Scotia

¹⁹ Janzen, "The Royal Navy," 6. Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 396.

²⁰ Olive Patricia Dickason, *Louisbourg and the Indians: A Study in Imperial Race Relations, 1713-1760* (Ottawa: Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, 1976), 88-89. Upton, 37, 63. Britain replaced the practice of gift giving with a system of government-operated trading posts (truckhouses) that were intended to operate at a loss. The purpose of truckhouses was to encourage Mi'kmaq friendship, but to discourage the practice of gift giving, which the British believed to be too costly.

²¹ Upton, 66.

²² "Micmac Treaty 1760," 86-87.

²³ Martijn, "Early Mi'kmaq Presence," 80.

²⁴ Dennis A. Bartels and Olaf Janzen, "Micmac Migration to Western Newfoundland," *Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, v. 10, no. 1 (1990), 76,

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 78.

or Cape Breton.²⁶ Mi'kmaq hoped that relocation would allow them to more easily acquire French manufactured goods, and gain access to the Catholic priests stationed at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.²⁷ Another important factor in Mi'kmaq relocation, which has not typically been discussed by historians, was the presence of French and Acadian kin at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.

Mi'kmaq Relocation

Historians suggest that Mi'kmaq who relocated to Newfoundland had a strong association with the Catholic mission of Merligueche at Lake Bras d'Or on Cape Breton Island.²⁸ The Merligueche mission was established in 1724, and became the responsibility of Abbé Pierre Maillard in 1738.²⁹ The Merligueche band, led by Jeannot Peguidalouet, signed a treaty with the British in 1759 or 1760. However, upon realizing that the treaty did not meet his band's needs, Jeannot sought to contact the French at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.³⁰ Jeannot and his band were first spotted in southwestern Newfoundland when a British ship, the HMS Lark, noticed them hunting and fishing on Codroy Island in 1763.³¹ In October of that same year, a group of Mi'kmaq from Louisbourg was also spotted hunting around Cape Ray in western Newfoundland.³² In 1764, Governor Hugh Palliser, learned that Jeannot and his followers had wintered in the

²⁶ Martijn, "Mi'kmaq in the Parish Registers." Saint-Pierre and Miquelon are located twenty-five kilometres from the Burin Peninsula, and sixty kilometres from the mouth of the Baie d'Espoir.

²⁷ Upton, 64.

²⁸ There are various spellings for this mission. Others include Mirligueche, Merligüeche, and the Anglicized Malagawatch. Janzen, "The Royal Navy." Bartels and Janzen, "Micmac Migration." Martijn, "An Eastern Micmac Domain." B.A. Balcom and A.J.B. Johnston, "Missions to the Mi'kmaq: Malagawatch and Chapel Island in the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society*, v. 9 (2006), 135.

²⁹ Upton, 38.

³⁰ Janzen, "The Royal Navy," 7.

³¹ Bartels and Janzen, 80.

³² Graves to Board of Trade, 20 October 1763, doc. 108v, v. 15, CO194, MG11, LAC.

colony with passports obtained in Cape Breton.³³ The British commander of Louisbourg had issued the passports in an attempt to encourage the Mi'kmaq to leave Cape Breton.³⁴

In 1765, an additional 130 to 150 Mi'kmaq began settling in the Baie d'Espoir region of southern Newfoundland. Palliser sent two ships to winter in Placentia Bay and the Baie d'Espoir to deter Mi'kmaq settlement and prevent any contact between the French and Mi'kmaq.³⁵ Correspondence between Newfoundland and the Board of Trade in London reveals that 175 Mi'kmaq were living around the Baie d'Espoir in October 1766.³⁶ Olaf Janzen argues that Mi'kmaq at Baie d'Espoir temporarily moved west to St. George's Bay in 1767 because of the British naval patrols in the region.³⁷ The parish registers of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon confirm the distinctly Cape Breton character of Mi'kmaq settlement in Newfoundland.

The Beguiddavalouet family provides one of the best examples of Mi'kmaq mobility and relocation to Newfoundland following the Seven Years' War. Bernard Beguiddavalouet, his wife Marie Anne Gougou, and their children Veronique and Louis, made two visits to Miquelon, first in 1773, and then again in 1778. The documents in the parish registers highlight the mobility of the Beguiddavalouet family, but also provide evidence that they were originally from Île Royale. Bernard's son, Louis Beguiddavalouet, was baptised on Île Royale by Pierre Maillard in 1751.³⁸ However,

³³ Janzen, "The Royal Navy," 9. Palliser to Board of Trade, 30 October 1765, doc. 173-173v, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC. Palliser to Francklin, 16 October 1766, doc. 308-309, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

³⁴ Upton, 65.

³⁵ Janzen, 11.

³⁶ Palliser to Lords of Trade, 21 and 27 October 1766, LAC, MG11, CO194, v. 16, doc. 302v.

³⁷ Janzen, 14-15.

³⁸ Mariage de Louis Beguiddavallouet et Janet Doujet, 26 julliet 1776, doc. 18, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC.

Bernard's daughter, Veronique, was baptised in Miramichi by father Bonaventure in 1761.³⁹

Pierre Maillard was responsible for the Catholic missions at Merligueche and Antigonish from 1738 onward.⁴⁰ On the first night of the siege of Louisbourg in 1758 Maillard fled to Miramichi with approximately sixty of his Mi'kmaq followers.⁴¹ It has been estimated that at least 200 others took part in the defence of Louisbourg, but when the British captured the fortress there were not any Mi'kmaq present.⁴² Most Mi'kmaq migrated west to escape the English and ended up somewhere in present-day New Brunswick.⁴³ Maillard remained in Miramichi until 1760, when he took a position in Halifax as an intermediary between the British and Mi'kmaq.⁴⁴ This series of events explains why Bernard's children were baptised in different locations, and reveals that the family was originally from Île Royale. Louis Beguiddavalouet was baptised on Île Royale by Maillard, in all likelihood at the Merligueche mission, which was the only one in the colony.⁴⁵ This is the same mission to which Jeannot Peguidalouet had a strong association. Bernard and his family then followed Maillard to Miramichi during the British siege of Louisbourg, where Veronique was born in 1761. Maillard had already been living in Halifax for a year when Veronique was born, which explains why Father

³⁹ Mariage de François Doujet et Veronique Beguiddavalouet, 26 juillet 1778, doc. 19, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁴⁰ Upton, 34.

⁴¹ Ibid., 57.

⁴² Dickason, "Amerindians Between French and English," 45.

⁴³ Plank, 163.

⁴⁴ Koren, 78.

⁴⁵ The mission was moved to Chapel Island in Lake Bras d'Or in 1750. Martijn, "An Eastern Micmac Domain," 220.

Bonaventure baptised her. The Beguiddavalouet family relocated to Newfoundland and were living on the Burgeo Islands in the 1770s when they made their trips to Miquelon.⁴⁶

Some have theorized that this family descended from Jeannot Peguidalouet. The similarity in surnames – Beguiddavalouet and Peguidalouet – is one of the reasons for this speculation.⁴⁷ The spelling of Mi’kmaq names often varied depending on which priest recorded them. For example, the parish registers of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon contain three different spellings of Doucet (Doujet, Douset), and three variations of Heli (Helie, Hely). When discussing Jeannot in his letters to Michael Francklin, Palliser referred to him as “Chief Jean Pegidawa Oulaut.”⁴⁸ Yet for all of these spellings the pronunciation is similar, including Pegidawa Oulaut and Beguiddavalouet. It has also been suggested that this family descended from Jeannot because the commander of the HMS Lark stated that Jeannot and a chief named Bernard were spotted together in Codroy in 1763.⁴⁹ Regardless of whether Bernard and Jeannot were related, it is clear that the Beguiddavalouet family had ties to Île Royale and were part of the initial migration to southern Newfoundland.

The Pikteuaruel family also migrated to Newfoundland from Cape Breton. In the case of this family the religious documents explicitly state that Gabriel Pikteuaruel, his wife Marie Doujet, and his brother Louis, were all former “habitants de Louisbourg.”⁵⁰ Gabriel and Marie’s son, Jean-Baptiste Pikteuaruel, was born in Codroy, Newfoundland

⁴⁶ Mariage de Louis Beguiddavalouet et Janette Doujet. Mariage de François Doujet et Veronique Beguiddavalouet.

⁴⁷ This argument is made by Charles Martijn in “Mi’kmaq in the Parish Registers.”

⁴⁸ Palliser to Francklin, 16 October 1766, LAC, MG11, CO194, v. 16, doc. 308v.

⁴⁹ Ruth Holmes Whitehead, *The Old Man Told Us: Excerpts from Micmac History 1500-1900* (Halifax: Nimbus Publishing Limited, 1991), 167-168.

⁵⁰ Baptême de Jean-Baptiste Pikteuaruel, 15 julliet 1778, doc. 17, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC.

in 1778.⁵¹ The parish priests on the islands did not always include information about where Mi'kmaq visitors had lived before relocating to Newfoundland. However, priests almost always indicated where the Mi'kmaq were living in Newfoundland at the time of their visits to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. The places of origin that priests most frequently ascribed to Mi'kmaq visitors to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon were Baie d'Espoir and Baye St. Georges. Both of these locations were home to large numbers of Mi'kmaq who had come from Cape Breton following 1763.

As late as 1784, Mi'kmaq from Cape Breton continued to relocate to Baie d'Espoir. In August of that year eighty Mi'kmaq from Cape Breton visited Saint-Pierre, where they expressed their loyalty to France and desire to settle at Baie d'Espoir so that they could visit Saint-Pierre and Miquelon more frequently.⁵² In September 1794 nine Mi'kmaq families, consisting of sixty individuals from Baye St. Georges, landed in Sydney Harbour on Cape Breton Island and asked permission to settle near Lake Bras d'Or. These Mi'kmaq claimed to have descended from Cape Breton. They also suggested that there were ten more families in Baye St. Georges who wished to return to Cape Breton the following spring.⁵³ These two accounts demonstrate that Cape Breton Mi'kmaq maintained a consistent view of what constituted their traditional territory. Mi'kmaq did not resign themselves to settling permanently in Newfoundland, but continued to practise mobility by travelling throughout their "domain of islands." These accounts also lend weight to the claim that Baie d'Espoir and Baye St. Georges were primarily settlements of Mi'kmaq from Cape Breton. That there was a distinctly Cape Breton character to Mi'kmaq settlements in Newfoundland had a lot to do with the

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² L'Esperance à ?, 26 août 1784, doc. 28, v. 8, MG1-C12, LAC.

⁵³ Martijn, "Early Mi'kmaq Presence," 84.

presence of a large contingent of French and Acadian fishermen and traders from the former French colony of Île Royale in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.

Cape Breton/ Île Royale Before the British Conquest:

Relations between Mi'kmaq and Acadians of eastern Acadia and Île Royale were historically more harmonious than those in western Acadia, particularly around the Bay of Fundy, where agricultural settlements abounded.⁵⁴ This was in large part due to the differing economies of the two regions. Acadians and Mi'kmaq in the east were both engaged in the fishery and fur trade. Early European success in these endeavours depended on the goodwill of Aboriginal peoples. However, Aboriginal peoples would only engage in commercial relations with individuals with whom they had established kinship relationships, either real or fictive.⁵⁵ The result was a large number of mixed marriages and the establishment of kinship ties between Mi'kmaq and Acadians.⁵⁶ Another factor in the development of these connections was the gender imbalance in eastern Acadian communities.⁵⁷ Because the fur trade and fisheries attracted more men than women, many Acadians had to look outside of their communities for marriage partners.

Cultural and kinship connections between Mi'kmaq and Acadians were not as widespread in the west. The connections that the fur trade helped establish decreased in importance as agriculture expanded in western Acadia.⁵⁸ The second half of the

⁵⁴ Anne Marie Lane Jonah, "Unequal Transitions: Two Métis Women in Eighteenth-Century Île Royale," *French Colonial History*, v. 11 (2010), 113.

⁵⁵ Miller, *Compact, Contract, Covenant*, 32-33.

⁵⁶ Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 252.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 238.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 307.

seventeenth century saw many Acadians establish farms on marshlands that they reclaimed from the Bay of Fundy using a system of dikes. Acadians and Mi'kmaq were able to coexist because Acadian agriculture did not interfere with Mi'kmaq subsistence activities.⁵⁹ However, Mi'kmaq and Acadians began to grow apart as the Acadian population around the Bay of Fundy expanded during the eighteenth century.⁶⁰ By the eighteenth century there was no longer a substantial gender imbalance in Acadian agricultural settlements, which meant that there was one less reason to engage in mixed marriages with Mi'kmaq.⁶¹ French missionaries reinforced the growing social distance in western Acadia by attempting to keep Mi'kmaq and Acadian communities separate from each other.⁶²

The British conquest of Port Royal in 1710 also helped drive a wedge between Acadians and Mi'kmaq in western Acadia, which became known as western Nova Scotia after 1713.⁶³ Mi'kmaq and Acadians took different approaches to their relations with the British. Mi'kmaq focussed on preventing settler encroachments onto their lands and were opposed to any cooperation with Britain.⁶⁴ The British administration enlisted Acadians to act as interpreters to help convince Mi'kmaq to swear allegiance to the Crown.⁶⁵ Acadians worked to some extent with the British and hoped that cooperation would help protect their agriculture. Many Acadians in the west realized that they would be hard-

⁵⁹ Faragher, 49-50

⁶⁰ Jonah, 111. Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 271.

⁶¹ Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 238.

⁶² William C. Wicken, "Re-examining Mi'kmaq-Acadian Relations, 1635-1755," in *Vingt ans après Habitants et marchands: lectures de l'histoire des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles canadiens*, eds. Sylvie Dépatie, Catherine Desbarats et al. (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998), 102.

⁶³ Port Royal was located at present-day Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia. It was the location of the first French settlement in North America, and served as the administrative centre of Acadia until the colony was ceded to Britain in 1713. It was also the administrative centre of British Nova Scotia until the founding of Halifax in 1749.

⁶⁴ Faragher, 203.

⁶⁵ Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 241.

pressed to produce agricultural surpluses in times of war, and without agricultural surpluses they could not trade for European goods.⁶⁶ Mi'kmaq saw Acadian cooperation with Britain as a betrayal of their friendship, and often threatened or even attacked Acadians who they suspected of working with the enemy.⁶⁷ The British conquest of Port Royal drove a wedge between Mi'kmaq and Acadians in western Nova Scotia. In eastern Nova Scotia and Île Royale, where there was a French imperial presence, there was less incentive for Acadians to work with the British. The fact that agriculture was secondary to the fisheries also made it easier for Mi'kmaq and Acadians to maintain close ties and continued kinship connections.

The Relocation of Acadians

The return of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon presented the French government with an opportunity to resettle many of the Acadians who were deported to France during the *Grand Dérangement*.⁶⁸ The French government had financially supported Acadians since the deportation, and had come to view them as a substantial drain on the national treasury.⁶⁹ Saint-Pierre, with its rocky terrain and natural harbour sheltered by a series of islets, was an ideal location to settle a group of people familiar with fishing. The majority of those who settled in Saint-Pierre were former fishermen and traders from Île Royale.⁷⁰ As Michel Poirier noted, Île Royale became “la principale source de peuplement pour cet archipel [Saint-Pierre] destiné à reprendre la succession de l'établissement de l'île

⁶⁶ Ibid., 242.

⁶⁷ Faragher, 147.

⁶⁸ This term is used to describe the Acadian deportations during the Seven Years' War.

⁶⁹ William F. Rannie, *Saint Pierre and Miquelon* (Beamsville, Ontario: Rannie Publications Limited, 1968 (third edition)), 48-50. Brasseaux, 55-59. Thorpe, 63.

⁷⁰ Poirier, 60. Rannie, 24.

Royale.”⁷¹ In April 1763, 300 traders and fishermen who had found sanctuary in La Rochelle and St. Malo after the Acadian deportations were sent to Saint-Pierre, along with fifty French administrators. Later that year another 100 former inhabitants of Île Royale settled in Saint-Pierre.⁷² However, Saint-Pierre was not strictly an Acadian settlement; it was also home to French administrators, traders, ship captains, soldiers, and fishermen.⁷³ Many of these fishermen and traders were former French inhabitants of Plaisance who migrated to Île Royale after 1713.⁷⁴

In contrast to Saint-Pierre, Acadians from Île Saint-Jean, which was known as St. John’s Island from 1763 to 1799, and Nova Scotia constituted the main body of inhabitants who settled at Miquelon. In 1763, the French Crown determined that besides military personnel and administrators, only fishermen and their families should be allowed to settle at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Governor D’Angeac was ordered to restrict the number of Acadian farmers on the islands.⁷⁵ However, over 250 Acadians arrived in Miquelon from Boston and Halifax without permission during 1763 and 1764.⁷⁶ Two separate groups arrived in Miquelon in October 1765, one made up of seventy-two individuals from Beauséjour, and a second containing 115 individuals from St. John’s Island, Halifax, Beauséjour, Beaubassin, and a small contingent from Cape Breton.⁷⁷

⁷¹ Poirier, 45.

⁷² Ibid., 22.

⁷³ Ibid., 65-6. According to Poirier, in 1778, ninety-five percent of the inhabitants of Saint-Pierre came from Île Royale, while the remainder came from France or Île Saint-Jean

⁷⁴ Griffiths, 254. Poirier, 60. Olaf Janzen, “‘Une Grande Liason’: French Fishermen from Ile Royale on the Coast of Southwestern Newfoundland 1714-1766 – A Preliminary Survey,” *Newfoundland Studies*, v. 3, no. 2 (1987), 184-186.

⁷⁵ 23 fevrier 1763, doc. 3-4, v. 1, MG1-C12, LAC.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Poirier, 22.

Most of the Acadians who settled on Miquelon were from Nova Scotia and did not have experience as fishermen. The Nova Scotian Acadians were accustomed to an agricultural lifestyle, but Saint-Pierre and Miquelon did not have enough arable land to support a large agricultural population.⁷⁸ Upon recognizing that the Acadians of Miquelon were a drain on his administration's resources, Governor d'Angeac strengthened his opposition to their presence in the colony.⁷⁹ D'Angeac explained to the French government, "il n'est pas possible de conserver ceux qui ne sont pas pecheurs dans un pays qui ne leur offre pas des ressources."⁸⁰ Taking d'Angeac's complaints seriously, the Crown offered the Acadians the choice of settling in France or returning to Acadia.⁸¹ In 1767, a total 763 individuals were deported, and only forty families were left on Miquelon.⁸² Many of these Acadians were permitted to return to Miquelon in 1768 because the colony had acquired enough wood to house a larger population.⁸³

Saint-Pierre provided an environment that was conducive to the transplanting of Île Royale society. Saint-Pierre was populated largely by French and Acadians from Île Royale who transported the society and many facets of its culture to a new location. Saint-Pierre developed into a fishing and trading society because of its location in the North Atlantic, its sheltered harbour, and rocky terrain. The former inhabitants of Île Royale were accustomed to a fishing and trading lifestyle and were able to continue these activities in Saint-Pierre. The close ties between Acadians, French, and Mi'kmaq of Île

⁷⁸ Rannie, 50.

⁷⁹ Thorpe, 63.

⁸⁰ Poirier, 85.

⁸¹ Rannie, 48-50.

⁸² Ibid.49. 103 families lived on Miquelon before 1767. Poirier, 87.

⁸³ Poirier, 93.

Royale were transported to Saint-Pierre.⁸⁴ Saint-Pierre was home to a mixed French-Acadian population that had regular contact with Mi'kmaq of southern Newfoundland. This contact allowed Mi'kmaq, Acadians, and French to maintain and expand the relationships they had formed on Île Royale before the Conquest.

Mi'kmaq visited both Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, but a special connection appears to have developed between Mi'kmaq and the inhabitants of Saint-Pierre. Nearly four times as many religious acts were performed on Saint-Pierre as on Miquelon (twenty-three versus eight). Why such a large disparity? Each island had one parish priest, and Miquelon is geographically closer to where the Mi'kmaq lived in southern Newfoundland. The size of sedentary populations on the islands was similar as well. In 1776, there were 604 permanent residents in Saint-Pierre and 649 in Miquelon.⁸⁵ The reason for the disparity in the number of visits is that there were cultural and kinship connections between Mi'kmaq in southern Newfoundland and the Acadian and French inhabitants of Saint-Pierre. Most Mi'kmaq chose to visit Saint-Pierre rather than Miquelon because it afforded them the opportunity to maintain and expand existing social relationships. An investigation of Mi'kmaq godparentage provides a more in depth look at the continuity of these relationships in the post-1763 period.

⁸⁴ For a discussion of métissage in Île Royale see, Jonah, "Unequal Transitions," 109-129. For a discussion of the role of Acadian women in Louisbourg see, Anne Marie Lane Jonah and Elizabeth Tait, "Filles d'Acadie, Femmes de Louisbourg: Acadian Women and French Colonial Society in Eighteenth Century Louisbourg," *French Colonial History*, v. 8 (2007), 23-51. There were frequent contacts between Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadians in southeastern Île Royale, especially in the region of Lake Bras d'Or/ Port Toulouse. Contact was maintained for the purposes of religion, joint military ventures, and trade. Balcom and Johnston, 121-126. In Port Toulouse Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadians all used the same chapel. A.J.B. Johnston, *Storied Shores: Isle Madame, St. Peter's, Chapel Island in the 17th and 18th Centuries* (Sydney: University College of Cape Breton Press Inc., 2004), 64.

⁸⁵ The total population of the islands including winterers was 1208 for Saint-Pierre and 776 for Miquelon. "Recensement St Pierre 1776," in Poirier, 261-279. "Recensement Miquelon 1776," in Poirier, 280-295.

Godparentage: Linking Mi'kmaq and Acadian Communities Together

One of the primary reasons why Mi'kmaq visited Saint-Pierre and Miquelon was to seek the services of Catholic priests for baptisms, burials, and marriages. Between 1763 and 1793, there were twenty-two Mi'kmaq baptisms performed on Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Fourteen of the forty-two godparents chosen by Mi'kmaq families were Mi'kmaq individuals.⁸⁶ Ten of the remaining godparents were French and Acadian individuals with confirmed ties to the former French colony of Île Royale. The selection of these godparents was not random. Mi'kmaq selected godparents with whom they had existing connections. Godparentage was a means of maintaining connections between individuals, families, and communities.⁸⁷

The case of Jacques Heli demonstrates that pre-existing connections played an important role in the Mi'kmaq selection of godparents. In November 1784, Jacques Heli, a Mi'kmaq child, was brought to Saint-Pierre from Baie d'Espoir, Newfoundland, to be baptised by the Catholic priest, Abbé Jean-Baptiste-François Paradis.⁸⁸ The Heli family came from a Cape Breton Mi'kmaq settlement in southern Newfoundland. In the 1780s the Conne River region in the Baie d'Espoir was the site of a settlement of Cape Breton Mi'kmaq.⁸⁹ In August 1784, a group of Mi'kmaq living in Cape Breton notified the

⁸⁶ Godparents are not listed for one Mi'kmaq child, Joseph Marie Douset. This explains why there are forty-two godparents listed for twenty-two baptisms, instead of the expected forty-four. Baptême de Joseph Marie Douset, 30 juillet 1784, doc. 4, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁸⁷ Susan Sleeper-Smith argues that fictive kinship ties established through godparentage create “an ever-expanding kinship network...” She also suggests that godparenting roles reinforced kinship ties when families were geographically distant from one another. Susan Sleeper-Smith, “Women, Kin, and Catholicism: New Perspectives on the Fur Trade,” *Ethnohistory*, 47, 2 (Spring 2000), 433-435. Another factor in the selection of godparents was that they were individuals who could care for and provide religious instruction to a godchild in the event that his/her parents passed away. Godparents were often family members or family friends.

⁸⁸ Baptême de Jacques Heli, 8 novembre 1784, doc. 51, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁸⁹ Martijn, “An Eastern Micmac Domain of Islands,” 224.

French administration in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon that they were considering settling in the Baie d'Espoir region so that they could be closer to the French colonies.⁹⁰

Jacques Heli's godparents were a married couple named Josephine Le Roy and Jacques Cabos.⁹¹ Josephine was born in Louisbourg, while her husband was a former French soldier who had been born in France.⁹² Although Cabos was not a native of Île Royale, his experience as a colonial soldier and marriage to Josephine Le Roy connected him to the colony. Jacques Cabos and Josephine Le Roy's ties to Louisbourg and Île Royale were a factor in the Heli family's selection of them as godparents. Like countless other families, the Helis could have selected godparents from amongst the many Mi'kmaq individuals residing in the Baie d'Espoir region. In this instance the choice of godparents was a means of tying communities together. The Heli family's selection of Josephine Le Roy and Jacques Cabos as godparents speaks to the enduring connections between Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadians of Île Royale after the British Conquest.

Another example of these enduring connections is the baptism of Julien-Charles Abamou, a Mi'kmaq child born in Baye St. Georges, Newfoundland in 1789. Julien-Charles was baptised in Saint-Pierre on 10 August 1791.⁹³ Julien-Charles' parents lived in Baie d'Espoir in 1778, but relocated to Baye St. Georges before 1789.⁹⁴ While no place of origin is listed for the Abamou family, their presence in Baie d'Espoir and Baye St. Georges suggests that they were from the former French colony of Île Royale.

⁹⁰ l'Espérance à ?, 26 août 1784, doc. 28, v. 8, MG1-C12, LAC.

⁹¹ Depending on the document Cabos is sometimes spelled Cabosse or Caboche as well. Baptême de Jacques Heli.

⁹² "La Rochelle 1778: Listes des passagers arrives sur différents navires en 1778, venant des îles St Pierre et Miquelon," in Poirier, 326-327.

⁹³ Baptême de Julien-Charles Abamou.

⁹⁴ Baptême de Jeanne Heli, 18 août 1778, doc. 20v, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC. Baptême de Julien-Charles Abamou.

Julien-Charles' godparents were Julien Herpin and Charlotte Guillaume. Little information is available about Charlotte Guillaume other than that she was born and baptised on the island of Miquelon.⁹⁵ Guillaume is a very common Acadian name, which makes it difficult to locate a specific individual with that surname. There is substantially more information available about Julien-Charles' godfather, Julien Herpin. Herpin dit Turpin is an Acadian last name with roots in the Port Royal region of Acadia. In 1714, the Herpins were one of twenty-three Acadian families to move from Port Royal to Cobequid, the site of present-day Truro, Nova Scotia.⁹⁶ After 1714, Julien Herpin's parents moved to Louisbourg, where Julien was born on 26 April 1753. Julien was sent to France when the British captured Louisbourg in 1758.⁹⁷ After the Seven Years' War Julien and his family settled in Saint-Pierre. In the Saint-Pierre census for 1765, Julien's father, Charles Herpin, is listed as possessing a house, a store, and a dory. Julien himself owned a shallop and a dory. These possessions point to the family's possible involvement in the fishing and trading industries of Saint-Pierre.⁹⁸ Julien Herpin was too young during his brief time spent in Louisbourg to have developed any deep relationships with the Abamou family. Yet, the Herpin family did have an opportunity to develop connections with Mi'kmaq communities. The family lived in the colony for a minimum of six years (1753-1758), which was ample time for them to have formed lasting relationships. The selection of Julien Herpin as the godfather of Julien-Charles Abamou is evidence of the connections between Mi'kmaq, Acadian, and French communities of Île Royale. After the British Conquest these communities continued to renew kinship ties and form new

⁹⁵ Baptême de Julien-Charles Abamou.

⁹⁶ Bona Arsenault, *Histoire des Acadiens* (Québec: Éditions Fides, 2004), 100.

⁹⁷ "St Malo 1793: Liste extraite des listes d'Acadiens réfugiés à cette époque dans la région de St Malo-St Servan," in Poirier, 381.

⁹⁸ "Recensement St Pierre 1765," in Poirier, 195-197.

relationships. Mi'kmaq sought to form kinship connections with Julien Herpin because of his family's ties to Île Royale and the fact that the Herpin family owned a store and could provide Mi'kmaq with supplies.

A distinct pattern of Mi'kmaq selecting Acadian and French godparents with connections to Île Royale can be gleaned from the documents found in the parish registers of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Ten of the total forty-two godparents listed had definite connections to the former French colony of Île Royale.

GODPARENTS WITH CONNECTIONS TO ÎLE ROYALE

Mi'kmaq Child	Date and Place of Baptism	Place of Origin	Godparent	Godparent's Connection to Île Royale
Margueritte Sekaquet	20 August 1790, Saint-Pierre	Unknown	Margueritte Banet	Parents (Pierre-Joseph Banet and Marie-Anne Arondel) were both from Louisbourg ⁹⁹
Margueritte Sekaquet	20 August 1790, Saint-Pierre	Unknown	Pierre Banet	Parents (Pierre-Joseph Banet and Marie-Anne Arondel) were both from Louisbourg ¹⁰⁰
Jacques Heli	8 November 1784, Saint-Pierre	Baie d'Espoir	Jacques Cabos	Married to Josephine Le Roy. Served as a colonial soldier in Louisbourg.
Marieanne Françoise Helie	7 May 1790, Saint-Pierre ¹⁰¹	Baie d'Espoir?	Marie David	Father (Louis David) was a carpenter-fisherman from Louisbourg ¹⁰²
Julien-Charles Abamou	10 August 1791, Saint-Pierre	Baye St. Georges	Julien Herpin	Born in Louisbourg
Joseph Le Basq	28 September 1776, Miquelon ¹⁰³	Unknown	Jeanne Le Grand (Sabot widow) ¹⁰⁴	Recorded in 1752 Île Royale Census ¹⁰⁵
Jacques Heli	8 November 1784, Saint-Pierre	Baie d'Espoir	Josephine Le Roy	Born in Louisbourg
Denis Huri	28 August 1768, Saint-Pierre ¹⁰⁶	Bonne Bai, Newfoundland	Anne Mancel	Born in Louisbourg in 1754. ¹⁰⁷ Her parents (Robert Mancel and Jeanne Goupil) were also from Louisbourg. ¹⁰⁸
Jean Noel Hely	10 September 1786, Saint-Pierre ¹⁰⁹	Baie d'Espoir?	Marie Sublime	Mother (Judith Marcadet) was from Louisbourg ¹¹⁰
Denis Huri	28 August 1768, Saint-Pierre ¹¹¹	Bonne Bai, Newfoundland	Pierre Tompic	Father (Etienne Tompic) and grandfather listed in 1752 Île Royale Census. ¹¹² The 1776 Miquelon census states that Etienne Tompic is Pierre's father. ¹¹³

⁹⁹ "La Rochelle 1778: Paquebot "LE BETHSY"," in Poirier, 330. Mariage de Joseph Bannet et Anne Arondel, 1 septembre 1771, doc. 64, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Baptême de Marieanne-Françoise Helie, 7 mai 1790, doc. 9, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC.

¹⁰² "La Rochelle 1778: Paquebot "LE BETHSY"," in Poirier, 334

¹⁰³ Baptême de Joseph Le Basq, 28 septembre 1776, p. 317, v. 2, Série E: Registres de la paroisse Notre-Dame des Ardillers, MG6-A2, LAC.

¹⁰⁴ Baptême de Joseph Le Basq states that she is a widow.

¹⁰⁵ "1752 Census of Île Royale," in *L'Acadie des ancêtres: Avec la généalogie des premières familles acadiennes*, Bona Arsenaault (Québec: Le Conseil de la Vie française en Amérique, 1955), 974.

¹⁰⁶ Baptême de Denis Huri, 28 août 1768, doc. 43v, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC.

¹⁰⁷ "La Rochelle 1778: Paquebot "LE BETHSY"," in Poirier, 334.

¹⁰⁸ "La Rochelle 1778: Equipage et passagers du paquebot "LA JEUNE CREOLE"," in Poirier, 327.

¹⁰⁹ Baptême de Jean Noel Hely, 10 septembre 1786, doc. 25v, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

¹¹⁰ "St Servan 1778: Listes des générales des ci-devants, habitants des îles St Pierre et Miquelon qui reçoivent les secours à raison de 12 sols par jour et 6 sols pour ceux au-dessous de 10 ans," in Poirier, 322.

¹¹¹ Baptême de Denis Huri

¹¹² "1752 Census of Île Royale," in Arsenaault, *L'Acadie des ancêtres*, 975.

¹¹³ "Recensement Miquelon 1776," in Poirier, 286.

Mi'kmaq selection of godparents reveals three key pieces of information about the post-Conquest Northeast.¹¹⁴ First, one-third of the godparents (fourteen out of forty-two people) involved in Mi'kmaq baptisms on Saint-Pierre and Miquelon were Mi'kmaq family members or friends. Priests indicated whether or not a godparent was Mi'kmaq, by writing "sauvage" on the baptismal record. This demonstrates that access to Catholic religious services was a major motivation for Mi'kmaq visits to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Otherwise, those who chose Mi'kmaq godparents would not have travelled to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to have their children baptised. Second, the fact that fifty-five percent of the godparents selected (twenty-three individuals) were either French or Acadian, shows that religious services were not the only reason why the Mi'kmaq travelled to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. The connections between Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadian communities also factored into the Mi'kmaq decision to visit the islands. Third, twenty-four percent (ten individuals) of the godparents were French or Acadians with definite connections to the former French colony of Île Royale. This trend highlights the continuity of connections between Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadian communities of Île Royale after 1763. By shifting their primary location of settlement from Cape Breton Island to southern Newfoundland, Mi'kmaq were able to maintain their kinship connections to the French and Acadians who settled in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.

Conclusion

Mi'kmaq and Acadians from Île Royale were able to adapt to geopolitical changes after 1763 through mobility and relocation. Mi'kmaq communities in southern

¹¹⁴ See Appendix A for a complete list of Mi'kmaq baptisms in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. See Appendix B for a breakdown of the statistics used in this conclusion.

Newfoundland, and the French-Acadian communities at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon were both linked to the former French colony of Île Royale. Godparentage served as a means of maintaining the cultural and kinship connections between these communities despite the geographical distances between them. In their selection of godparents, Mi'kmaq families demonstrated a clear preference for French and Acadians, especially those with connections to Île Royale. Despite widespread geopolitical changes following the British Conquest, the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities of Île Royale were able to maintain a level of continuity in their historical relationship and kinship connections.

Chapter 2: “leur attachement pour la France”: Mi’kmaq Spirituality and Historical Ties to the French

Following the British Conquest it became increasingly difficult for Mi’kmaq to access Catholic priests and maintain their relationship with France. While discussing how to approach Mi’kmaq Catholicism in 1764, the President of the Board of Trade, Lord Hillsborough, wrote that “the appointment of Catholick Priests...will lend to confirm their [Mi’kmaq] prejudices in favour of that Religion [Catholicism], which so long as they retain, they never can be united in Interest and affection to the British government...”¹ Hillsborough saw a clear connection between religious affiliation and the loyalties of the Mi’kmaq. As long as they continued to practise Catholicism, Hillsborough believed, Mi’kmaq would remain connected to France rather than Britain.

Hillsborough’s prediction was ultimately correct. After the fall of New France, Mi’kmaq retained both their Catholicism and historical ties to France. Even though Mi’kmaq did not have access to Catholic priests in British territory for much of the time between 1763 and 1793, they continued to practise Catholicism. When Mi’kmaq could not travel to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to access the services of Catholic priests, they practised on their own using religious materials that they had received from French priests before 1763. The Mi’kmaq-French relationship also survived and adapted to geopolitical realities. The relationship no longer included a military alliance, but it continued to be renewed through gift exchanges and declarations of loyalty after 1763. Both groups continued to see each other as friends and trading partners. Mi’kmaq proved remarkably resilient in their ability to adapt to imperial changes. Despite the fact that they

¹ Hillsborough et al. to King’s Most Excellent Majesty, 19 June 1764, doc. 429, v. 6, CO217, MG11, LAC.

were denied access to Catholic priests by Britain, and geographically separated from the French, Mi'kmaq continued to practise Catholicism and have a relationship with France.

Religious Continuity

Mi'kmaq experience with Catholicism began on 24 June 1610, when Membertou, the Grand Chief of the Mi'kmaq nation, was baptised at Port Royal by a French Catholic priest named Jessé Fléché. Membertou's baptism confirmed the French-Mi'kmaq friendship, reinforced their trading relationship, and ensured that Mi'kmaq would receive French military support against their enemies.² By the beginning of the eighteenth century Mi'kmaq had embraced Catholicism, but also continued to practise elements of Aboriginal spirituality.³ An example of this religious syncretism can be seen in the annual festival of Saint Anne. Saint Anne, the patron saint of the Mi'kmaq, was adopted in 1628 in Île Royale.⁴ Mi'kmaq believed that Saint-Anne served as their spiritual representative in Heaven, and that she blessed them with qualities such as good health and relief from misery.⁵ Each year, on July 26, Mi'kmaq gathered at churches to feast and celebrate Saint Anne's Day. By the mid-1700s Saint Anne's Day had become a regular event that had

² Prins, 81-82. Balcom and Johnston, 119.

³ There is a rich historiography focussed on why Native peoples adopted Christianity. Early accounts in the 1970s and 1980s stressed that a growing dependence on European trade goods and the impact of epidemic disease undermined the authority of Aboriginal religious leaders. More recent interpretations make the case that while disease and European goods had an impact on Aboriginal spirituality, Native peoples did not replace their traditional belief systems with Christianity. They simply adopted elements of the Christian world-view that they considered to be beneficial, and the two religions functioned in parallel. For dependency interpretations of Mi'kmaq spirituality see Robert Conkling, "Legitimacy and Conversion in Social Change: The Case of French Missionaries and the Northeastern Algonkian," *Ethnohistory*, v. 21, no. 1 (Winter 1974), 1-21. For a religious syncretism perspective see Wicken, "Encounters with Tall Sails and Tall Tales." For a description of religious syncretism see James Rodger Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000 (third edition)), 71. Balcom and Johnston, 119, 129.

⁴ Wallis and Wallis, 183.

⁵ Prins 172. Balcom and Johnston, 120. Saint Anne was also believed to be the mother of Virgin Mary, and therefore the grandmother of Jesus Christ.

replaced many local religious festivals.⁶ While Saint Anne's Day was a Catholic religious festival, it was adapted to fit Mi'kmaq seasonal cycles.⁷ Summertime was when Mi'kmaq traditionally gathered in large villages and participated in activities such as matchmaking, dispute resolution, and the election of new chiefs. These same activities continued to be practised when Saint Anne's Day became a regular event during the mid-eighteenth century. Saint Anne's Day fulfilled many of the functions of a traditional summer village gathering.⁸ During Saint Anne's Day festivities Catholic priests also held mass, heard confessions, and performed religious services such as consecrating marriages. Many Mi'kmaq individuals deferred their Easter religious rites until Saint Anne's Day because it was a more convenient time than during the spring fishing season.⁹ Mi'kmaq continued to celebrate Saint Anne's Day after the British Conquest.

When Acadia was ceded to Britain in 1713, Île Royale became the centre of French missionary efforts for the Aboriginal peoples of the Northeast. The French tried to convince Mi'kmaq living in British Nova Scotia to relocate to Île Royale to join those already present in the colony.¹⁰ Most Mi'kmaq in Nova Scotia refused to move because of the limited availability of game on Île Royale. The furthest they agreed to move was Antigonish, which was just outside of Île Royale in British territory.¹¹ In 1716,

⁶ Janet Elizabeth Chute, "Ceremony, Social Revitalization and Change: Micmac Leadership and the Annual Festival of St. Anne," in *Papers of the Thirty-Third Algonquian Conference*, ed. William Cowan (Ottawa: Carleton University, 1992), 53. Saint Anne's Day became a more regular event after Pierre Maillard established Chapel Island as a religious centre in 1742.

⁷ Prins, 172.

⁸ Chute, 45, 50, 56. Chute argues that Saint Anne's Day had as much to do with politics as it did with Catholicism. Saint Anne's day was the preferred time for selecting new chiefs, settling internal disputes, and distributing band revenues.

⁹ Prins, 172-3. Chute, 54.

¹⁰ Balcom and Johnston, 121. French officials estimated that there were twenty-five to thirty Mi'kmaq families in Île Royale in 1713. According to Balcom and Johnston this likely meant between 125 and 180 individuals.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 121-123.

missionary Antoine Gaulin established a mission at Antigonish.¹² Gaulin later founded a second mission within British territory near the Shubenacadie River in 1722.¹³ Escalating warfare with Britain between 1722 and 1725 caused a number of Mi'kmaq at Antigonish to relocate to Île Royale so that they would be further away from British military action.¹⁴ This afforded Gaulin the opportunity to move the Antigonish mission to Merligueche on the west side of Lake Bras d'Or on Île Royale.¹⁵ Governor Saint-Ovide of Île Royale reported that most of the Mi'kmaq of Antigonish had settled at Merligueche by 1723.¹⁶ There were three French Catholic missions in the Northeast in 1738: one at Merligueche with a subordinate station located at Antigonish, which were the responsibility of Pierre Maillard; a second at Malpeque on Île Saint-Jean, which was visited once a year by Maillard; and a third at Shubenacadie, which was operated by Louis-Joseph Le Loutre.¹⁷ In an effort to maintain Mi'kmaq allegiance to the Catholic Church, Maillard and Le Loutre lived amongst Mi'kmaq year-round. In earlier times, including during Gaulin's tenure, it was more common for missionaries to visit Mi'kmaq on special occasions, rather than to live in their communities for most of the year.¹⁸ Maillard and Le Loutre also became well versed in the Mi'kmaq language and acted as interpreters between Mi'kmaq and French.¹⁹

¹² Antigonish occasionally appears as Antigoniche in primary and secondary sources.

¹³ Shubenacadie can also be spelled Chebenacadie.

¹⁴ Balcom and Johnston, 123.

¹⁵ Merligueche is also sometimes spelled Maligoueche or Mirligueche. Upton, 34. Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 330-332.

¹⁶ Balcom and Johnston, 123. There is some dispute as to when the Merligueche mission was officially established. Balcom and Johnston suggest that it was founded in 1723, but Upton and Martijn both state that it was founded in 1724. Upton, 34. Martijn, "An Eastern Micmac Domain," 220.

¹⁷ Upton, 34.

¹⁸ Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 340. The exception to this pattern is Christien LeClerq who spent over ten years living with the Mi'kmaq of Gaspésie.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 360. Chute, 53. Balcom and Johnston, 126. Maillard mastered the Mi'kmaq language and taught it to Le Loutre.

The Treaty of Paris presented a number of challenges to Mi'kmaq religious identity. France's colonies were ceded to Britain, and Pierre Maillard, the last Catholic priest working in British Nova Scotia, passed away in 1762. The British guaranteed Mi'kmaq religious freedom in the 1760-1 treaties, but refused to appoint a Catholic priest to replace Maillard until 1768. Mi'kmaq did not have the opportunity to fully exercise their religious freedom despite having the right to do so. When Mi'kmaq asked Governor Wilmot of Nova Scotia for a Catholic priest in July 1763, they were instead sent three French-speaking Protestant missionaries.²⁰ Britain believed that converting Mi'kmaq to Protestantism would loosen their ties to France and encourage loyalty to Britain.²¹

In 1768, Britain temporarily abandoned the idea of religious conversion, and sent a loyal Catholic priest from Québec to officiate amongst Mi'kmaq. Charles-François Bailly was appointed because of the failure in converting Mi'kmaq to Protestantism, as well as the belief that Mi'kmaq would cease visiting Saint-Pierre and Miquelon if they had access to Catholic priests in British territory.²² Bailly travelled to Québec on personal business in May 1772. The British suspected that Bailly had passed away in 1774 because he had not returned to Nova Scotia or reported back to the governor.²³ The British learned that Bailly was still in Québec a year later, but were not sure if he would return to Nova Scotia.²⁴ Bailly accepted a position as coadjutor bishop of Québec and did not resume his duties in Nova Scotia.²⁵

²⁰ Ponwall to Reverend Doctor Burton, 20 June 1764, doc. 430-432, v. 6, CO218, MG11, LAC.

²¹ Upton, 65.

²² Francklin to Hillsborough, 20 July 1768, doc. 176-179, v. 45, CO217, MG11, LAC.

²³ Legge to Dartmouth, 25 August 1774, doc. 215-217, v. 50, CO217, MG11, LAC.

²⁴ Legge to Dartmouth, 7 January 1775, doc. 208-212, v. 51, CO217, MG11, LAC.

²⁵ Upton, 68.

After Bailly's departure the closest Catholic missionary to Mi'kmaq in Nova Scotia was Jean-Baptiste de la Brosse on the Québec side of the Baie des Chaleurs.²⁶ Despite the absence of Catholic priests for much of the post-Conquest period, Mi'kmaq continued to practise Catholicism. They were able to practise by using the materials provided by Maillard, and through contact with Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Those in Newfoundland also made use of Maillard's materials, but had greater access to Catholic priests. Mi'kmaq adapted to imperial changes in order to keep and practise their faith.

The religious materials produced by Spiritan missionary Pierre Maillard were one of the most effective means by which Mi'kmaq were able to practise Catholicism without priests. Maillard's goal was to make Mi'kmaq as religiously self-sufficient as possible.²⁷ After mastering the Mi'kmaq language, Maillard created grammar books and dictionaries in Mi'kmaq using a system of hieroglyphs. This allowed Maillard to translate religious materials into a form that was discernible to Mi'kmaq. Maillard furnished Mi'kmaq with religious handbooks, which contained sermons, prayers, hymns, Biblical passages, the Lord's Prayer, and the rites for baptisms, marriages, and funerals.²⁸ Maillard appointed Mi'kmaq captains to administer these materials when Catholic priests could not be reached.²⁹ These materials, and Maillard's system of appointing captains, proved invaluable for Mi'kmaq after the Seven Years' War.

Mi'kmaq had materials left over from Maillard's tenure, but continued to receive new materials from the French at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. In the summers of 1765 and 1766, British authorities discovered that Mi'kmaq had been provided with "Holy Water,

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Chute, 54-55.

²⁸ Koren, 27. Prins, 171.

²⁹ Prins, 171. Chute, 54.

Relics and other Articles that relate to the Superstition of the Romish Religion [Catholicism]” from Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.³⁰ These items were used during summer gatherings on Cape Breton, most likely for Saint Anne’s Day, which was celebrated at the Chapel Island mission.³¹ Mi’kmaq living in Newfoundland continued to travel back to Cape Breton each summer to participate in Saint Anne’s Day festivities.³² Despite relocating to Newfoundland, Mi’kmaq continued to view Cape Breton as part of their traditional territory. Catholicism became an important part of this larger regional understanding of Mi’kmaq territoriality. Religious rituals and ceremonies like Saint Anne’s Day linked Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, southern Newfoundland, and Cape Breton. Mi’kmaq continued to celebrate Saint Anne’s Day in the absence of Catholic priests by using Maillard’s religious materials.

Maillard’s work also had a lasting impact in Newfoundland. While Mi’kmaq in Newfoundland could travel to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon with greater ease than their counterparts in Nova Scotia, there were times when it was not always possible to reach a priest. One of these instances occurred from 1765 to 1767, when Newfoundland Governor Hugh Palliser decided to station two cruisers in southern Newfoundland to prevent Mi’kmaq from visiting Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.³³ One Mi’kmaq family was able to reach the colony, but was sent back to Newfoundland because the French did not wish to create conflict with Britain.³⁴ Mi’kmaq were also unable to reach Catholic priests

³⁰ Francklin to Palliser, 11 September 1766, doc. 307, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

³¹ In 1750 the Merligueche mission was moved to Chapel Island in Lake Bras d’Or, which became the main location for Saint Anne’s Day festivities on Île Royale/Cape Breton Island. Charles Martijn, “An Eastern Micmac Domain,” 220 and 224.

³² Martijn, “An Eastern Micmac Domain,” 224. Martijn, “Early Mi’kmaq Presence,” 81.

³³ Janzen, “The Royal Navy,” 12-14.

³⁴ L’Esperance à Dubuq, 28 avril 1766, p. 8-10, v. 2, MG1-C12, LAC.

from September 1778 to September 1783.³⁵ A British force under the command of Governor Montagu of Newfoundland attacked Saint-Pierre and Miquelon on 14 September 1778 because the French had decided to support the American Revolution. The British force burned and pillaged everything on the islands and deported all of the inhabitants, including the Catholic priests, to France.³⁶ The parish registers of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon do not contain any documentation of religious acts involving Mi'kmaq individuals between 1765 and 1767, or between August 1778 and 1784. While Mi'kmaq in Newfoundland did not always have access to the Catholic priests in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, they continued to practise Catholicism between visits.

The religious materials provided by Catholic priests were crucial in allowing Mi'kmaq in Newfoundland to adapt to imperial realities. The role of captains was particularly significant in Newfoundland. When Mi'kmaq families could not travel to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon because of weather, imperial conflict, or British naval patrols, Mi'kmaq leaders performed religious acts.³⁷ Conditional baptisms were the most common example of this practice. Conditional baptisms were unofficial baptisms that were performed by respected Mi'kmaq community members when priests could not be reached. These baptisms were undertaken to avoid the risk of a child passing away without having been baptised at all.³⁸ Children who received conditional baptisms were often officially baptised by a priest at a later point in time. Eighteen of the twenty-two Mi'kmaq children baptised in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon received conditional baptisms

³⁵ Poirier, 98-99.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 98. Accounts of the British decision to destroy everything on Saint-Pierre and Miquelon can be found in the following primary documents: Evans to Montagu, September 1778, doc. 36-37, v. 34, CO194, MG11, LAC; Montagu to Germain, 16 October 1778, doc. 42-43, v. 34, CO194, MG11, LAC. Montagu to Germain, 19 November 1778, doc. 46-47, v. 34, CO194, MG11, LAC.

³⁷ Chute, 54.

³⁸ Martijn, "Mi'kmaq in the Parish Registers."

prior to their official baptisms. One of the four that was not conditionally baptised was brought to Saint-Pierre to be baptised by a priest the same day he was born, which made a conditional baptism unnecessary.³⁹ In a few cases the priests indicated who performed the conditional baptism. There are three instances where priests specifically stated that a Mi'kmaq community member conducted a conditional baptism.⁴⁰ Fourteen of the eighteen conditional baptisms noted in the parish registers were performed at birth, which indicates that Mi'kmaq placed a great deal of importance on this Catholic ritual.⁴¹ The practice of conditional baptism highlights the continued centrality of Catholicism within Mi'kmaq culture after the British Conquest. Mi'kmaq in Newfoundland modified their religious practice in order to adapt to new geopolitical realities.⁴² While Mi'kmaq were able to adapt to life without Catholic priests, they also continued to value official religious confirmation.

Mi'kmaq living in Newfoundland made frequent visits to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon for religious services such as baptisms, marriages, burials, and Easter rites. With the exception of the years 1765-1767 and 1778-1783, Mi'kmaq travelled to Saint-

³⁹ Baptême de Pierre, 14 mars 1764, doc. 4, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁴⁰ Baptême de Jeanne Heli. Baptême de Jacques Heli. Baptême de Pierre Paul, 18 août 1778, doc. 20, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC. There are two interesting exceptions to this pattern in the parish registers. One conditional baptism was performed by an Acadian, and another by an Irish Catholic. Because these rituals were often performed by Mi'kmaq leaders or respected community members, it is likely that these two individuals had married into Newfoundland Mi'kmaq communities. Baptême de Denis Huri. Baptême de Jean-Baptiste Pikteuaruel, 15 juillet 1778, doc. 17, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁴¹ Baptême de Dominique, 6 juin 1785, doc. 16, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC. Baptême d'Anasstasie, 6 juin 1785, doc. 16, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC. Baptême de Pauline Nikes, 12 septembre 1785, doc. 18v, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC. Baptême de Jean André Etienéhuit, 16 septembre 1789, doc. 17, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC. Baptême de Esther Marie Etienéhuit, 16 septembre 1789, doc. 18, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC. Baptême de Jean-Philippe Sekaquet, 16 septembre 1789, doc. 18, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC. Baptême de Margueritte Sekaquet, 20 août 1790, doc. 21, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC. Baptême de Julien Gougou, 8 septembre 1790, doc. 24, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC. Baptême d'Anne Guillaume, 8 septembre 1790, doc. 25, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC. Baptême de Julien Charles Abamou. Baptême de Pierre Paul. Baptême de Joseph Marie Dousset. Baptême de Jean Noel Hely. Baptême de Marieanne Françoise Helie.

⁴² Carolyn Podruchny, "Baptizing Novices: Ritual Moments among French Canadian Voyageurs in the Montreal Fur Trade, 1780-1821," *The Canadian Historical Review*, v. 83, no. 2 (June 2002), 186-187. Podruchny discusses the same type of modified religious belief with respect to voyageur culture.

Pierre and Miquelon on a semi-annual basis for religious purposes.⁴³ In total there were thirty-five religious acts involving more than 100 Mi'kmaq individuals conducted on Saint-Pierre and Miquelon between 1763 and 1793.⁴⁴ The number of acts, frequency of visits, and the fact that Mi'kmaq relocated to be closer to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon indicates that access to official religious services performed by Catholic priests was of considerable importance to a substantial number of Mi'kmaq. The families living in southern and southwestern Newfoundland brought their children to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to be baptised even though most had already received conditional baptisms. The Heli family of Baie d'Espoir valued the ritual to such an extent that when they adopted a ten-year old Montagnais boy they brought him to Saint-Pierre to be baptised.⁴⁵

Mi'kmaq in Newfoundland also valued the services of Catholic priests for marriages, even though they could have conducted marriages on their own using the instructions laid out in Maillard's religious handbooks. While there were only six documented Mi'kmaq weddings in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, the number of witnesses highlights the broader involvement of Mi'kmaq in the ceremonies. Large groups of Mi'kmaq travelled to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to attend weddings. In September 1785 "une groupe de Sauvages" was present for the marriage of Joseph Guillaume and Anne

⁴³ There were no recorded Mi'kmaq religious acts performed in the years 1765-1767, 1770-1773, 1774, 1777, 1779-1783, 1787, 1788, 1792, and 1793. The periods of absence in the early 1770s can be explained by Palliser's decision to increase the number and quality of British vessels patrolling Saint-Pierre and Miquelon during the late 1760s. The rationale behind this decision was limiting trade between the French and New Englanders after the Stamp Act crisis of 1765. British patrols were so strict that they occasionally followed vessels into Saint-Pierre harbour. Thorpe, 66. *Memoire de l'Ambassadeur de France*, 9 janvier 1766, doc. 174-174v, v. 27, CO194, MG11, LAC. *L'Esperance à Dubuq*, 28 avril 1766, p. 8-10, v. 2, MG1-C12, LAC.

⁴⁴ It is impossible to come up with a definite number of individuals. Priests occasionally made errors in the records, and some documents refer to groups of Mi'kmaq witnesses, but do not indicate a specific number. Charles Martijn estimated that 120 Mi'kmaq individuals were mentioned between 1764 and 1848. It is important to note that only six religious acts involving Mi'kmaq were recorded after 1791. Martijn, "Mi'kmaq in the Parish Registers."

⁴⁵ *Baptême de Jean Martin*, 24 août 1790, doc. 22, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC.

Etienne.⁴⁶ Similarly, “plusieurs Sauvages” attended the wedding of Bernard D’Aques and Jeanne Germain.⁴⁷ The presence of large numbers of witnesses speaks to the community-wide involvement in these ceremonies, and thus, the greater significance of marriages despite the relatively small number that were recorded.⁴⁸

Mi’kmaq also came to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to have relatives buried. In most cases the bodies of the deceased were preserved in Newfoundland over the winter and brought to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to be buried the following spring.⁴⁹ However, there were two cases where individuals died in the spring and were not brought to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon until autumn.⁵⁰ The priests did not indicate what measures were taken to preserve these bodies. They may have been smoked over a fire or left outside to dry in the sun after the entrails had been removed.⁵¹ The trouble that these families went to for the sake of a Catholic burial is indicative of the importance they placed on official Catholic ritual.

Finally, Catholic priests were valued for their assistance in providing religious rites. As previously noted, Mi’kmaq delayed their Easter rites until summer to coincide with traditional gathering times. This practice continued after the British Conquest. Two weddings were held in Miquelon on Saint Anne’s Day in 1778. Both marriage contracts mention that the Mi’kmaq involved were issued “leur pâques” or Easter rites. Under the

⁴⁶ Mariage de Joseph Guillaume et Anne Etienne, 12 septembre 1785, doc. 18, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁴⁷ Mariage de Bernard D’Aques et Jeanne Germain, 12 septembre 1785, doc. 18, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁴⁸ Father Jean Longueville noted that the two marriages held on Saint-Pierre in 1790 were both attended by the parents and friends of the bride and groom. Mariage de Julien Helie et Anne Magdeleine Guillaume, 10 septembre 1790, doc. 25, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC. Mariage de Julien Etiennehuit and Rosalie Gougou, 10 septembre 1790, doc. 25-26, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁴⁹ Sépulture de Jacque, 15 fevrier 1785, doc. 14v, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC. Sépulture de Jean André Etiennehuit, 6 mai 1790, doc. 8, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC. Sépulture de Jean Marie Noel Helie, 6 mai 1790, doc. 9, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁵⁰ Sépulture d’Anne Etiennehuit, septembre 1786, doc. 5, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC. Sépulture de Marie, 12 septembre 1785, doc. 18v, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁵¹ Martijn, “Mi’kmaq in the Parish Registers.”

French regime Mi'kmaq usually received their Easter rites during the Saint Anne's Day celebrations on Île Royale.⁵² Although the priest did not indicate whether festivities were held on Miquelon to commemorate Saint Anne's Day, the fact that Mi'kmaq chose to receive their Easter rites on July 26 is significant because it represents continuity with pre-1763 practices.

Mi'kmaq Catholicism was challenged, but not significantly disrupted by the British Conquest of New France. Mi'kmaq adapted to the absence of Catholic priests in British Nova Scotia, either by practising Catholicism on their own using the materials and guidance of Pierre Maillard, or by relocating to Newfoundland to be closer to the priests at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Mi'kmaq continued to hold Saint Anne's Day festivities on Cape Breton Island, which were regularly attended by Mi'kmaq living in Newfoundland.⁵³ Mi'kmaq in Newfoundland frequently travelled to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon for religious services, despite British opposition. Continuity in Mi'kmaq Catholicism played a role in maintaining their ties with France, which were rooted in a historical relationship that pre-dated British imperial dominance of the Northeast.

Trade, Gift-Giving, and Historical Relationships

Looking solely at the parish registers of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon one might be inclined to conclude that most Mi'kmaq individuals visited the colony at most once or twice between 1763 and 1793. Religious documents provide the clearest indication of a Mi'kmaq presence at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, but they can also be misleading. Mi'kmaq did not visit Saint-Pierre and Miquelon solely for religious purposes. While

⁵² These celebrations typically lasted two weeks. Chute, 54.

⁵³ Martijn, "Early Mi'kmaq Presence," 224. Balcom and Johnston, 118-119.

individuals may only have travelled to the islands once for religious reasons, they often had contact with French and Acadian inhabitants on other occasions. Mi'kmaq visits to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon are not frequently mentioned in French colonial correspondence, since official French policy was to discourage Mi'kmaq visits to the colony to avoid unnecessary conflict with Britain. However, this does not mean that Mi'kmaq visits did not occur on a regular basis. The governor of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, François-Gabriel d'Angeac, tolerated Mi'kmaq visits to the islands, but did not make a habit of mentioning them in correspondence with his superiors.⁵⁴ D'Angeac was born in Plaisance and raised in Île Royale, and therefore recognized the need to balance imperial policy with colonial reality.⁵⁵ Mi'kmaq visits had multiple purposes, which aside from religion, also included trade and gift exchanges. These activities had the effect of maintaining and renewing the historical relationship between the French and Mi'kmaq.

In the early eighteenth century Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadian communities of Île Royale had regular contact with one another. The Acadian fur trade, although negligible when compared to Canada, created social, political, and kinship ties between all three groups. Mi'kmaq traded furs to the French and Acadians in exchange for European goods, including hatchets, kettles, clothing, firearms, tobacco, and alcohol.⁵⁶ In eastern Acadia and Île Royale descendants of the original fur traders maintained the trading relationships that had been established during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁵⁷

While Mi'kmaq had social and cultural ties to particular French and Acadian communities, they also formed a relationship with the French state. The alliance between

⁵⁴ Martijn, "An Eastern Micmac Domain," 223.

⁵⁵ Thorpe, 64.

⁵⁶ Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 173.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 301.

the French and Mi'kmaq began in 1606 at Port Royal. Chief Membertou and Jean de Biencourt, Sieur de Poutrincourt exchanged gifts and expressed a mutual desire to enter into a friendship with one another.⁵⁸ Aboriginal peoples placed symbolic importance on the practice of gift giving. Exchanging gifts tied two groups together through fictive kinship bonds. Richard White has noted that “Gift exchanges, through conventions of reciprocity, created channels of mutual aid.”⁵⁹ When Jean de Biencourt and Membertou exchanged gifts in 1606, they became fictive kin.⁶⁰ Aboriginal peoples required kinship relations, either real or fictive, before they would engage in trade with Europeans. According to J.R. Miller, “trade and peaceful relations were two sides of the same coin.”⁶¹ The French-Mi'kmaq relationship was strengthened in 1610 when Membertou and his large extended family were baptized and accepted Christianity.⁶² Membertou chose Henri as his baptismal name to honour the French King at the time.⁶³ Membertou's baptism confirmed the friendship between Mi'kmaq and French, reinforced existing trade relationships, and ensured that Mi'kmaq would receive French military support in any future conflicts with their enemies.⁶⁴

The French-Mi'kmaq alliance was renewed at annual gatherings throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. An important component of alliance renewal ceremonies was gift exchange.⁶⁵ Shortly after the founding of Louisbourg until the late 1750s, the Governor of Île Royale met annually with Mi'kmaq chiefs and elders at Port

⁵⁸ Miller, *Compact, Contract, Covenant*, 26.

⁵⁹ Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Regions, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011 (20th anniversary edition)), 15.

⁶⁰ Miller, *Compact, Contract, Covenant*, 285.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 60.

⁶³ Prins, 81.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 81-82.

⁶⁵ Wicken, “Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales,” 396.

Toulouse to exchange gifts and renew the alliance. These meetings took place in the summer and were attended by French officers, their servants, interpreters, and missionaries.⁶⁶ Missionaries held mass every morning to maintain harmony between the two parties. The missionaries and interpreters acted as intermediaries between the Governor and Mi'kmaq leaders.⁶⁷ After discussions were completed a feast was held, which was followed by an exchange of gifts and Mi'kmaq proclamations of their recognition of the alliance.⁶⁸ The number of gifts exchanged to renew the alliance increased as the eighteenth century wore on. The British adopted the practice of gift giving in the 1720s to try to break up the Mi'kmaq-French alliance. Threatened by British efforts, the French increased their own gift giving. In the early days of the Mi'kmaq-French alliance the French spent an average of 2,000 livres per year on presents, but by 1756 they were spending upwards of 37,000 livres annually.⁶⁹ French officials were often forced to pay for gifts out of their own pockets when the colonial budget was not enough to meet Mi'kmaq needs.⁷⁰

The Mi'kmaq-French alliance endured British challenges after the Treaty of Utrecht. The French kept the alliance intact by meeting British trade prices, establishing permanent missions on Île Royale, and holding annual ceremonies of renewal.⁷¹ Mi'kmaq supported the French militarily right up until the conquest of New France. While expecting a British attack against Louisbourg in the summer of 1757, Mi'kmaq and French participated in a war dance and several days of feasting.⁷² Mi'kmaq expressed

⁶⁶ Johnston, 54. Dickason, 42. Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 401-403.

⁶⁷ Wicken, "Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales," 405.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 408.

⁶⁹ Dickason, "Amerindians Between French and English," 41.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 42.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 44.

their solidarity with the French and their willingness to engage in battle with Britain.⁷³ At least 200 Mi'kmaq participated in the defense of Louisbourg in 1758, but when the British captured the fortress none of them were to be found.⁷⁴ The capitulation terms offered to the French did not make any provision for their Aboriginal allies. Shortly before the siege of Louisbourg, English prisoners being held at Fort William Henry were massacred by French Aboriginal allies. Even though Mi'kmaq were not at Fort William Henry, they likely would have faced British retribution because they were France's Indian allies. Olive Dickason suggests that the French intentionally allowed Mi'kmaq to escape from Louisbourg as a gesture of goodwill, so that they would not be subjected to British revenge attacks.⁷⁵

The French and Mi'kmaq maintained their historical relationship after the British Conquest. The relationship continued to be renewed through gift exchanges, but no longer included a military alliance. Instead the relationship had come to be based primarily on mutually beneficial commercial exchange. British authorities regularly reported seeing Mi'kmaq and French engaging in trade from 1763 to 1793. In 1763, a group of Mi'kmaq from Louisbourg visited Cape Ray, Newfoundland, to trade with the French and seek the services of a Catholic priest.⁷⁶ The French of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon also traded with Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia. Those living on the coast between Canso and the Baie des Chaleurs exchanged furs and pelts for brandy, wine, and other

⁷³ Earl Lockerby, "Maintaining the Alliance: A French Officer's Account of the Mi'kmaq, Maliseet, and Kennebec at Louisbourg in 1757," *Native Studies Review* 18, no. 2 (2009), 11.

⁷⁴ Upton, 57.

⁷⁵ Dickason, "Amerindians Between French and English," 45.

⁷⁶ Thomas Graves to Lords of Trade, 20 October 1763, doc. 108v, v. 15, CO194, MG11, LAC. Thorpe, 62. Although the southern limit of the French Shore was placed at Pointe Riche, neither the French nor British knew where it was actually located. The French argued that it was located at Cape Ray on the west coast. The issue was not settled until 1783, which explains why the French were at Cape Ray in 1763.

French commodities.⁷⁷ In the 1780s there was a group of Mi'kmaq in western Newfoundland who traded solely with the French.⁷⁸ In 1783, a French naval commander, Scipion de Castries, negotiated an agreement to have Mi'kmaq in Newfoundland leave firewood and lumber on the Newfoundland coast where it could easily be picked up by French ships.⁷⁹

Mi'kmaq and French also had many opportunities to trade when they spent time in each other's communities. The search for lumber and fish frequently led the French to Mi'kmaq communities in southern Newfoundland. The French were familiar with many of these communities. When Plaisance was ceded to the British in 1713, some Frenchmen from the colony swore oaths of allegiance to Britain so that they could remain in Newfoundland. Pockets of French settlement persisted in areas such as Baie d'Espoir, Cape Ray, and Codroy Island.⁸⁰ The French were forced to abandon these settlements when war broke out between France and Britain in 1744.⁸¹ In 1765, the British captured a large group of French fishermen from Saint-Pierre in Baie d'Espoir, which was the location of a sizeable Mi'kmaq community of at least 130 to 150 individuals.⁸² Upon interrogating their prisoners the British learned that they were almost all French, and that they had spent the previous winter in southern Newfoundland.⁸³ This incident indicates that there were opportunities for contact between Mi'kmaq and the inhabitants of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon outside of the French colony.

⁷⁷ Campbell to Dartmouth, 26 April 1773, doc. 30-32, v. 49, CO217, MG11, LAC.

⁷⁸ Reynolds' Report of French Fisheries 1788, doc. 172, v. 21, CO194, MG11, LAC.

⁷⁹ Martijn, "Early Mi'kmaq Presence," 83.

⁸⁰ Olaf Janzen, "Une Grande Liason," 186-187, 190.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 194.

⁸² Janzen, "The Royal Navy, 11.

⁸³ French residents of Saint-Pierre to Palliser, 20-25 June 1765, doc. 72-75v, v. 27, CO194, MG11, LAC.

Most of the captured Frenchmen testified to having wintered in Grand Jarvis Harbour, Rattling Brook, or Conne River, all of which were Mi'kmaq settlements in Baie d'Espoir. Alexis Sabot from La Rochelle, France, spent the winter in Rattling Brook with three other men and his sister. During their time in Newfoundland the group constructed a schooner and cut wood to bring back to Saint-Pierre.⁸⁴ A man named Thomas Sperin also spent the winter of 1764-1765 in Rattling Brook with seventeen men in his company. Sperin told the British that there were other Frenchmen from Saint-Pierre who had wintered in the region, but was not sure of the exact number. Sperin's group spent the winter cutting wood, building fishing boats, and hunting. Sperin's party also included two Mi'kmaq hunters.⁸⁵ Sperin's testimony confirms that there was interaction between the French and Mi'kmaq in southern Newfoundland. Considering their familiarity with the region, it is reasonable to suspect that the Mi'kmaq assisted the French with hunting and fishing. The French may have even wintered in Mi'kmaq settlements. Another captured Frenchman told the British that there were many French families wintering in the Baie d'Espoir, especially at Grand Jarvis Harbour. This man also claimed to have fished all along the southern coast of Newfoundland in the summer of 1764 with at least 150 boats in his company.⁸⁶ The French presence in Baie d'Espoir was quite large, which suggests that Sperin's experience with Mi'kmaq was probably not an isolated incident. With such a large number of Frenchmen operating close to Mi'kmaq communities, trade and social interaction were the norm, not the exception.

In 1776, Britain passed an act allowing the inhabitants of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to cut wood in Newfoundland. Britain hoped that this act would have the effect

⁸⁴ Ibid., 72.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 73.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 73v.

of limiting trade between Saint-Pierre and Miquelon and the Thirteen Colonies. The act was conditional on the French taking only what was “essential to the maintaining and supporting of their Establishments” and the promise that illicit trade would not be conducted in Newfoundland.⁸⁷ The fact that the British were concerned about illicit trade suggests that they were aware that it had been a problem in the past. Certainly Palliser’s decision to station cruisers in southern Newfoundland between 1765 and 1767 demonstrates that some unwanted activity between Mi’kmaq and French had taken place.⁸⁸ After 1763, Mi’kmaq and French continued to spend time in each other’s communities and maintain a trading relationship. These activities allowed the French and Mi’kmaq to preserve their historical relationship and sense of loyalty toward one another. This relationship was continually confirmed and renewed through the ritual of exchanging gifts.

Renewing French-Mi’kmaq Relationships

Prior to the British Conquest, Mi’kmaq and French renewed their historical relationship on an annual basis. The official policy of the French government after 1763 was to turn Mi’kmaq away when they came to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. However, Mi’kmaq made regular appearances in the colony for both religious and non-religious purposes. Despite official policy to discourage Mi’kmaq from visiting Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, the Mi’kmaq-French relationship was renewed on multiple occasions from 1763 to 1793.

⁸⁷ Instructions to Montagu, 9 March 1776, doc. 2v-3, v. 33, CO194, MG11, LAC.

⁸⁸ Janzen, “The Royal Navy,” 12-13.

In August 1764, a French ship visited the west coast of Cape Breton and “Landed Presents of Arms and Ammunition for the Indians.”⁸⁹ The British account does not mention whether the French gift giving was accompanied by a formal ceremony, but a number of details about the visit are consistent with the traditional alliance renewals practiced by the French and Mi’kmaq. First, the French typically presented Mi’kmaq with manufactured goods, including firearms and ammunition. Mi’kmaq had a need for these items following the Seven Years’ War. After the fall of Louisbourg they lacked a supply base from which to obtain firearms and powder. As a result, Mi’kmaq ran out of supplies in the winter of 1759 and could no longer hunt effectively.⁹⁰ Second, the timing of the French visit to Cape Breton suggests that it may have included an alliance renewal ceremony. From the 1720s onward the French and Mi’kmaq renewed their alliance once a year during the summer. The French visit in August 1764 was consistent with the timing of alliance renewals. Mi’kmaq also received French gifts in the summers of 1765 and 1766.⁹¹ The British reported that the French had furnished Mi’kmaq with religious materials, but did not mention whether the gifts were received in Cape Breton or Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Once again the timing of the exchange was consistent with the timing of annual alliance renewal ceremonies held in Port Toulouse before the Conquest.

The way in which the French and Mi’kmaq conceptualized their relationship was also consistent with pre-Conquest practices. In 1778, a Mi’kmaq family of seven from Cape Breton visited Saint-Pierre to inquire about “la Santé du Roy de France leur Pere...”⁹² Many French Algonquian allies, including Mi’kmaq, referred to the French

⁸⁹ Palliser to Lords of Trade, 9 October 1764, doc. 34-37, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

⁹⁰ Upton, 57.

⁹¹ Francklin to Palliser, 11 September 1766, doc. 307, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

⁹² Lettres de L’Esperance, 21 fevrier 1778, p. 5, v. 5, MG1-C12, LAC.

King as their father, and themselves as his children. However, Mi'kmaq did not consider themselves to be subservient to the French. As a father the French King was expected to act as an ally, protector, and supplier of goods. His power came from distributing goods to ensure that his children were properly cared for. As Richard White has noted, "Goods bestowed wisely, were the mark of leadership and the route to influence..."⁹³ When Mi'kmaq asked about the health of "leur Pere" in 1778 they demonstrated that the King still occupied an important place in their relationship with the French. During this visit, Mi'kmaq also expressed a desire to once again live in French territory. The French administration fulfilled the role of a father and offered Mi'kmaq relief supplies ("quelques secours") to ensure that they were in a proper state to return home.⁹⁴ This visit demonstrates an acknowledgement by both Mi'kmaq and French of their continued relationship to one another. Mi'kmaq recognized the French King as their father, and the French at Saint-Pierre fulfilled the expected paternal role of caring for the King's allies.

The most explicit example of the enduring connection between the French and Mi'kmaq occurred in 1784. A group of eighty Mi'kmaq men, women, and children traveled from Cape Breton to Saint-Pierre in the summer of 1784. Fifteen of the adults spent three weeks on the island and expressed a desire to settle in the "Baye de Desespoir" so that they could visit the French more frequently.⁹⁵ The visitors declared their continued loyalty to France and were given presents before returning to Cape Breton.⁹⁶ This visit shares many similarities with French alliance renewal ceremonies.

⁹³ White, 36.

⁹⁴ Lettres de L'Esperance, 21 fevrier 1778, p. 5, v. 5, MG1-C12, LAC.

⁹⁵ Baye de Desespoir is the Baie d'Espoir region of Newfoundland. In one of the greatest ironies of Newfoundland history, the British mistakenly referred to Baie d'Espoir – or Bay of Hope in English – as the Bay of Despair. In this document the French referred to the area as the Baye de Desespoir, a French translation of Bay of Despair.

⁹⁶ L'Esperance à ?, 26 août 1784, p. 28, v. 8, MG1-C12, LAC.

Mi'kmaq arrived in Saint-Pierre in the late summer, which was traditionally when the alliance was renewed in Port Toulouse.⁹⁷ The visit also included an exchange of gifts and recognition of the continuing relationship between the two parties. The Mi'kmaq visitors demonstrated their recognition of the relationship by expressing their loyalty to France and their desire to relocate to Newfoundland to strengthen the ties between the two nations.

The historical bonds between France and Mi'kmaq from Île Royale remained strong after 1763. Despite geographical obstacles, Mi'kmaq and French managed to maintain regular contact with one another in Newfoundland and Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Their relationship was strengthened through commercial exchange and was renewed and reconfirmed through ritualized gift giving. The loyalties and metaphorical kin relationship between Mi'kmaq of Cape Breton and France remained intact after the British Conquest.

Conclusion:

On the surface life changed dramatically for Mi'kmaq of Cape Breton after 1763. Without access to Catholic priests, their Acadian kin, or French allies, Mi'kmaq appeared destined to undergo cultural change. Cape Breton Mi'kmaq maintained a remarkable degree of continuity in their lifestyles by adapting to the imperial realities with which they were confronted. Mi'kmaq did not abandon Catholicism when Britain refused to provide them with Catholic priests and attempted to convert them to Protestantism. They

These presents included guns, powder, shot, tobacco, hatchets, cord, canvas, and various foodstuffs. L'Esperance à ministre, 20 août 1784, p. 72v-73, v. 8, MG1-C12, LAC.

⁹⁷ The document is dated 26 August 1784, which means that the Mi'kmaq probably landed on Saint-Pierre in mid to late July. This date accounts for delays in correspondence, and the fact that the Mi'kmaq spent three weeks in the colony.

continued to practise Catholicism by using Pierre Maillard's translated religious materials, or by seeking the services of Catholic priests at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Cape Breton Mi'kmaq also continued to value their relationship with France. The French-Mi'kmaq relationship was maintained through regular contact and commercial exchange between communities in Newfoundland, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, and Cape Breton, and was periodically renewed through gift giving. Despite geopolitical changes and relocation, Mi'kmaq continued to practise Catholicism and maintained their historical ties to France.

Chapter 3: Financial Insecurities and Enemy Aliens: A New Political History of the Northeast

At the end of 1763, the British Empire was larger than it had ever been. British victories during the Seven Years' War had secured and expanded its colonial possessions in India, West Africa, the West Indies, and North America, but success also brought a new sense of insecurity to the Empire.¹ Britain feared that it was only a matter of time until France and Spain initiated a war of revenge. Both powers were aware that the most effective way to harm Britain was to attack its colonies and deprive it of the wealth gained through colonial trade.² Britain's fears of France and Spain were heightened by its tenuous financial situation at the end of the Seven Years' War. Britain's debt at the start of the Seven Years' War was £74.6 million, but it rose to £132.6 million by the end of the war. This debt carried annual interest payments of £4.4 million and represented a substantial drain on the nation's financial resources. Britain's budget in 1763 was only £8 million.³

Britain also had to worry about the presence of large numbers of 'other' peoples in its enlarged North American Empire. Many of these new subjects were not only French-speaking, but also Catholic – something that Britain had not dealt with seriously outside of Ireland.⁴ In the mid-eighteenth century religion was more than a spiritual

¹ In the Treaty of Paris Britain gained all of France's North American territories east of the Mississippi River (with the exception of New Orleans); the French West Indian islands of St. Vincent, Dominica, Tobago, Grenada, and the Grenadines; Senegal in West Africa; Minorca and two East India Company posts in Sumatra that the French captured during the war; all French fortifications and territories in India that were occupied after 1749; and Spanish Florida. Anderson, 505-506. "Treaty of Paris, February 10, 1763," in *Statutes, treaties and documents of the Canadian Constitution, 1713-1929* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1930), p. 31-34.

² P.J. Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empires: Britain, India, and America, c. 1750-1783* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 275.

³ Calloway, 12; John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (London: Unwyn Hyman, 1989), 30.

⁴ In the eighteenth century Britain was officially anti-Catholic. Its anti-Catholic policies were referred to as the penal laws. Some of these policies included prohibiting Catholics from holding office; restricting the

matter to governments. According to Philip Lawson, “confessed religion determined what role a citizen played in the political, social, and, often through these, economic life of the nation.”⁵ Britain could never completely trust its new subjects because of their religious affiliations, and expected them to launch insurrections in support of French and Spanish attacks.⁶ Britain’s suspicion of these peoples led it to increase its peacetime military presence in the colonies, which added to its financial difficulties. In 1764, Britain was spending £1.5 million more on colonial defence per year than it had before the war.⁷

British insecurities were magnified in the Northeast because of the French presence at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. The re-establishment of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon was of great concern to Britain for three reasons. First, the British expected that Saint-Pierre and Miquelon would encourage clandestine economic activities across the Northeast. Admiral Thomas Graves, governor of Newfoundland from 1761-1764, warned that the islands could become “the common mart for every kind of French Manufacture and India goods.”⁸ Secondly, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon afforded France access to the North Atlantic cod fishery, which allowed it to develop a strong merchant marine and produce competent sailors. This merchant marine helped strengthen the French navy. The French navy did not have to spend the time or money training these sailors, but could

right of Catholics to vote; preventing Catholics from serving as representatives in assemblies; restricting the succession of the British throne to Protestant heirs; and a ban on instructing youth in Catholicism in schools or private houses. These laws were not as strictly enforced in the colonies as they were in England and Ireland. In Acadia, for example, the British appointed Acadians to administrative posts, but restricted their suffrage and representation in colonial assemblies. Plank, 59, 88.

⁵ Philip Lawson, *The Imperial Challenge: Quebec and Britain in the Age of the American Revolution* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1989), 43.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 12. Marshall, 275.

⁷ Marshall, 276.

⁸ Thomas Graves to Board of Trade, 20 October 1763, doc. 108, v. 15, CO194, MG11, LAC.

draw upon the merchant marine's manpower pool for service during war.⁹ Thirdly, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon allowed the French to remain in contact with their former Acadian and Mi'kmaq allies now living under British rule. The fact that both groups were Catholic added to Britain's suspicions about the loyalty of its new subjects. The French presence at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon heightened Britain's fears about its tenuous financial situation and the possibility of a Franco-Spanish attack.

At times British fears bordered on paranoia in the Northeast. Britain mistook illicit trade and the continued connections between French, Mi'kmaq, and Acadians as part of a plan to undermine the Empire, instead of representing the continuity of pre-war social, cultural, and economic relations.¹⁰ In an effort to secure the Northeast, Britain focussed on severing the ties between Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadians. Britain attempted to separate its new subjects from France by converting them to Protestantism and limiting their contact with Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. British reactions were a tacit acknowledgement of the continuity of connections between Mi'kmaq, French and Acadians after the Seven Years' War. The British recognized that trade, religion, and kinship, which continued to tie these groups to one another, needed to be eliminated if the Northeast was to be completely secure.

⁹ The fishery is often referred to as a 'nursery for seamen' because it produced competent sailors that the navy could draw upon during war. Thorpe, 63. Palliser to Lord Halifax, 11 September 1765, doc. 122-123, v. 27, CO194, MG11, LAC. Palliser wrote that French involvement in the Newfoundland fishery "Operates to the Prejudice of the Manufactories, Shipping, Trade and Navigation of the Kingdom, and Transfer the Wealth and Naval Strength supos'd to arrive from the Fishery's to France instead of Britain." Palliser to Lords of Trade, 21 and 27 October 1766, doc. 288-290, v. 27, CO194, MG11, LAC. In 1766 the British flirted with the idea of excluding their own colonists from the Labrador cod fisheries because it would "cause the Ruin of the British Newfoundland Fishers...and that Grand Nursery for Seamen [will] be wholly lost to Britain."

¹⁰ An example of British fears concerning French illicit trade can be seen in, Palliser to Lords of Trade, 21 and 27 October 1766, doc. 303, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC. According to Palliser the goal of French trade with the inhabitants of Britain's colonies was "ruining our Fishery and augmenting theirs..."

Illicit Trade

The British government feared that unless its financial situation could be improved the Empire would succumb to military weakness, which would leave it vulnerable to French and Spanish attacks. Raising taxes was the most logical solution to staving off bankruptcy, but the government did not believe that domestic taxes could be increased any further. Instead, Britain turned to its colonies to help cover national expenses. After all, British officials argued, the Seven Years' War had been fought on behalf of the colonies.¹¹ Britain also sought to overcome its financial difficulties by strictly enforcing a mercantilist economic system. This entailed limiting illicit colonial trade and forcing its colonies to purchase British manufactured goods while sending their colonial commodities to Britain. Colonists were also prohibited from transporting their commodities on any ship that did not belong to Britain.¹² Britain's regulation of the national economy aimed to promote a favourable balance of trade; support industries that enhanced its military power, such as the production of metals and timber; and establish a strong merchant marine to develop competent seamen.¹³ Britain believed that commercial wealth and military strength went hand-in-hand. Commerce provided the funding and skilled seamen that the Royal Navy needed to defend and police the Empire.¹⁴

Britain had great difficulty preventing illicit trade in the Northeast after Saint-Pierre and Miquelon were handed back to France. As early as 1764 the French adopted a

¹¹ Brewer, 176. T.H. Breen, "'Baubles of Britain': The American Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century," *Past and Present*, issue 119 (May 1988), 89. Breen argues that Britain's decision to raise taxes on goods that the colonies could not produce led colonists to develop an awareness of their dependence on Britain. This awareness united colonies that were very different, but which shared the experience of having to purchase British goods.

¹² Marshall, 274-275. Breen, 84. After 1764 the Navigation Acts were more strictly enforced, making it increasingly difficult for colonists to purchase goods produced in North America.

¹³ Breen, 167.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 167-168.

secret plan to make Saint-Pierre and Miquelon a haven for illicit trade. The French plan was to provide Britain's colonies with manufactured goods and Caribbean commodities in exchange for wood, foodstuffs, and fish. The purpose of this trade was to undermine British mercantilism, and allow France to carry on a profitable fishery that could supply Europe and the West Indies with cod.¹⁵ It is important to note that the French plan to exploit illicit trade was about securing Saint-Pierre and Miquelon as viable colonies despite scarce resources, not about launching attacks against Britain. However, the Duc de Choiseul, France's Foreign Minister, foresaw that an added benefit of the plan was that it might promote independence movements in Britain's colonies.¹⁶

Britain recognized that France intended to disrupt the British Empire through illicit trade, but did not understand that regional trade was primarily based on connections that pre-dated the Seven Years' War. Newfoundland Governor, Hugh Palliser, wrote in 1766 that he had "no doubt" that the Mi'kmaq trading with the French at Baie d'Espoir had been "invited by the French."¹⁷ Palliser also suspected that this presence "was part of the French Plan for rendering that part of the Coast useless to us, by frightening our People away and more easily getting into their own hands that Coast and Fishery..."¹⁸ Palliser viewed regional trade with Saint-Pierre and Miquelon as a new development that was part of a French plan to undermine Britain's colonies economically. He failed to see any reason why Mi'kmaq sought to trade with the French, except that they had been invited. Palliser did not acknowledge the fact that the peoples of the Northeast had traded

¹⁵ Thorpe, 72.

¹⁶ Ibid., 64, 72, According to Thorpe, "Choiseul astutely forecast an eventual uprising of Britain's North American colonies, and naturally supported anything, even on a small scale, that might further their independence while strengthening France."

¹⁷ Palliser to Lords of Trade, 21 October 1766, doc. 287, v. 27, CO194, MG11, LAC.

¹⁸ Palliser to Lords of Trade, 21 and 27 October 1766, doc. 302v, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

with France throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Illicit trade was not premised solely on a “French Plan” as Palliser suggested, but was also motivated by pre-Conquest regional trade networks.

The commercial networks between Acadians, New Englanders, and French adapted to imperial realities and continued to function after 1763. New Englanders traded with Acadians in Nova Scotia right up until the deportation of 1755.¹⁹ Britain had no intention of investing in the development of Nova Scotia when it took possession of the colony in 1713, and therefore relied heavily on Acadian farmers to supply its garrisons.²⁰ Acadians smuggled their agricultural surpluses to New England merchants in towns such as Baie Verte along the Northumberland Strait, despite the fact that local British garrisons in Nova Scotia were on the verge of starvation.²¹ New Englanders traded Acadian agricultural products to the French at Louisbourg in exchange for manufactured goods, wine, and West Indian molasses.²² In an effort to ensure that Nova Scotia’s agricultural resources served only the interests of Britain, Governor Richard Philipps issued a proclamation in 1731, which forbade the Acadians from trading to seaborne traders anywhere except Annapolis Royal.²³ Acadians ignored the proclamation and continued to supply Louisbourg while British garrisons suffered.

Economic ties between New England and Louisbourg were also very important. Between 1730 and 1744 one in five vessels that entered the port of Louisbourg was from New England. Massachusetts in particular was one of Louisbourg’s most important

¹⁹ Joshua M. Smith, “Humbert’s Paradox: The Global Context of Smuggling in the Bay of Fundy,” in *New England and the Maritime Provinces*, eds. Stephen J. Hornsby and John G. Reid (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2005), 115.

²⁰ Faragher, 137.

²¹ Baie Verte is located on the isthmus of Chignecto in present-day northeastern New Brunswick. Brasseaux, 16.

²² Faragher, 149-150. Wicken, “Encounters With Tall Sails and Tall Tales,” 223.

²³ Faragher, 185.

trading partners. Until 1749 eleven percent of the ships that left Boston sailed for Louisbourg.²⁴ Trade between the French and New Englanders continued during the Seven Years' War.²⁵ The British received reports that ships from New England traded with Louisbourg, Canada, and the French West Indies throughout the course of the war.²⁶ Britain interpreted colonial trade with its enemies as a sign of suspect political loyalties. Harming the Empire economically was just as problematic as doing so militarily. Yet, it made sense for the New Englanders to put aside their political affiliations for the sake of economic gain. The Northeast was still a contested region before 1763, and New Englanders were able to exploit the French-British rivalry to their advantage by selling products to whoever offered the best rates.²⁷

After the Seven Years' War the French, Acadians, and New Englanders shifted their trade from the Bay of Fundy and Louisbourg to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. New England vessels regularly brought lumber to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon during the 1760s.²⁸ In 1764, determined to put an end to New England-French trade, Governor Palliser ordered his naval officers to "seize and detain" any New England vessels that could be proved to have traded at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.²⁹ The effort was unsuccessful. Palliser reported that New Englanders and Newfoundland colonists were trading fish for French manufactured goods at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon the following

²⁴ Julian Gwyn, "Comparative Economic Advantage: Nova Scotia and New England, 1720s-1860s," in *New England and the Maritime Provinces*, eds. Stephen J. Hornsby and John G. Reid (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005), 95-96. Faragher, 185. According to Faragher over 100 ships from New England traded at Louisbourg each year during the 1740s.

²⁵ Griffiths, 156, 437-438. 156 ships from New England visited Louisbourg in 1752.

²⁶ Marshall, 100,108.

²⁷ Smith, 115.

²⁸ Thorpe, 72.

²⁹ Palliser to Naval Officers at St. John's, Ferryland, and Placentia, 7 November 1764, doc. 69, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

year.³⁰ The same problem was observed in Labrador in 1766. “Ships from the colonies” and “American Vessels” traded their cod catches to the French in western Newfoundland.³¹

Even though the French adopted a policy of restraint after the Stamp Act to avoid unnecessary conflict, Britain was never able to entirely eliminate trade between New England and Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.³² During the lead up to the American Revolutionary War, Britain was desperate to deny the Rebels access to European manufactured goods. In late September 1775, the French traded gunpowder and arms to New Englanders for a variety of building materials and foodstuffs.³³ In an effort to prevent the Rebels from obtaining weapons from the French, Britain granted the inhabitants of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon the right to cut timber in southern Newfoundland.³⁴ It was hoped that this act would furnish Saint-Pierre and Miquelon with the resources necessary to carry on the fishery, and therefore remove any incentive the French had for trading and interacting with the Rebels. This British concession demonstrates that the French continued to have influence in the Northeast. The British were in a vulnerable position during the American Revolution, and regional trade networks heightened Britain’s awareness of its vulnerability. Britain preferred to grant France access to the resources it needed to carry on a rival fishery, rather than allow

³⁰ Palliser to Lords of Trade, 16 July 1765, doc. 54, v. 27, CO194, MG11, LAC.

³¹ Palliser to Lords of Trade, 21 and 27 October 1766, doc. 289-290, v. 27, CO194, MG11, LAC.

³² Montagu to Lords of Trade, 12 November 1776, doc. 34-34v, v. 33, CO194, MG11, LAC. In 1776, a British ship was blown into Saint-Pierre harbour and encountered an American privateer. This led the ship’s captain to conclude that “some very improper communication and correspondence” was held between the French and “Rebellious Provincials.”

³³ Robert Duff to L’Esperance, 19 October 1775, p. 88-89, v. 4, MG1-C12, LAC. In Boston Graves learned that the Rebels had been supplied with “gunpowder, and arms from St. Pierre and Miquelon.” Extrait de la lettre de Monsieur le Baron de l’esperance et Beaudeduiet, de 29.9.1775, 18 mars 1776, p. 55-56, v. 4, MG1-C12, LAC. An account of the items that the New Englanders traded to the French: 2,000 feet of lumber, 35,500 feet of bordage/ edging, 21,900 feet of boards and planks, 24,000 shingles, 79 pieces of oak, 67 quarts of flour, 10 quintals of biscuits.

³⁴ Instructions to Montagu, 9 March 1776, doc. 2v, v. 33, CO194, MG11, LAC.

France to trade with New England and risk military cooperation between them. When France entered the American Revolutionary War in support of the Rebels in 1778, Britain responded by capturing Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, claiming that the colony was being used to transfer weapons to the Rebels.³⁵ The British burned and pillaged everything on the islands, and deported the population to France.³⁶ Illicit trade with Saint-Pierre and Miquelon was temporarily halted until the islands were returned to France in accordance with the Treaty of Paris of 1783.

Trade between Newfoundland and Saint-Pierre and Miquelon was also a major British concern. Considering that Saint-Pierre and Miquelon are located only twenty-five kilometres from southern Newfoundland it seems almost inevitable that smuggling took place between the two colonies.³⁷ Historically Britain did not wish to promote settlement in Newfoundland because of the lack of arable land and the potential economic threat posed by a permanent colonial population.³⁸ Britain preferred that Newfoundland operate as a migratory fishery so that its profits would benefit Britain directly instead of being shared with the colonists.³⁹ The British feared that colonists would sell fish to the French and New Englanders in exchange for manufactured goods. This problem was magnified

³⁵ Lloyd to L'Esperance, 12 July 1778, doc. 30-31, v. 5, MG1-C12, LAC. A Rebel privateer escaped into Saint-Pierre harbour and had been there for almost a week when Lloyd sent a letter to L'Esperance stating that "any pretence for the getting of water and the procuring other matters, must be futile not to be seen thus." Rannie, 36.

³⁶ Poirier, 31. Evans to Montagu, 17 September 1778, doc. 36-37, v. 34, CO194, MG11, LAC. Evans stated that "I shall destroy all the Fishing Stages, Storehouses, and Shallops, and the Houses in the Town, as the Inhabitants embark from them." Further indications of the British decision to deport the inhabitants of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon and burn everything on the islands can be found in: Montagu to Germain, 16 October 1778, doc. 42-43, v. 34, CO194, MG11, LAC. Montagu to Germain, 19 November 1778, doc. 46-47, v. 34, CO194, MG11, LAC. Campbell to L'Esperance, 17 September 1783, doc. 234-235, v. 35, CO194, MG11, LAC.

³⁷ Martijn, "Mi'kmaq in the Parish Registers."

³⁸ Peter E. Pope, *Fish Into Wine: The Newfoundland Plantation in the Seventeenth Century* (United States: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 46-47.

³⁹ Palliser to Lords of Trade, 20 October 1765, doc. 170v, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC. Palliser sought to prevent colonial fishermen from "Converging on the Cod Fishery in this Government, which is Ruinous to the British Cod Fishery..."

by the fact that colonists participating in a sedentary fishery could begin fishing earlier in the season and finish later than migratory fishermen.⁴⁰ An important function of the Newfoundland fishery was that it produced competent sailors that could be called upon by the Royal Navy in times of war. A drawback of a sedentary fishery was that colonial fishermen were not available for service in the Royal Navy.⁴¹ Ultimately the British feared that a sedentary fishery would lead to the establishment of a Newfoundland colonial government that operated in the interests of the colony rather than Britain.⁴²

The Seven Years' War accelerated Newfoundland's shift from migratory to sedentary fishery, which began in the early eighteenth century.⁴³ Britain relied more heavily on its colonial fishermen to supply cod during war because its own ships were largely committed to military operations.⁴⁴ Britain tolerated a sedentary fishery during the war because it helped lengthen the fishing season and acted as a counterweight to French claims to territory in Newfoundland.⁴⁵ Britain was all but forced to accept a sedentary fishery at the end of the Seven Years' War because of French activity at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon and the 'French Shore' in northern Newfoundland. However, official policy continued to focus on developing English migratory fisheries and discouraging sedentary colonial fisheries.

The majority of the trade that was conducted between Saint-Pierre and Miquelon and Newfoundland involved the exchange of English cod for French manufactured

⁴⁰ Thorpe, 73.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 73.

⁴² Cadigan, 27.

⁴³ Janzen, "The Royal Navy," 4.

⁴⁴ Sean Thomas Cadigan, *Newfoundland and Labrador: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 58. Brewer, 193. Brewer suggests that there was also a greater risk of losing ships during war, which made Britain reluctant to send transports across the Atlantic.

⁴⁵ Cadigan, *Hope and Deception*, 27. Cadigan, *Newfoundland and Labrador*, 48-51. Pope, 67-70. Because colonial fishermen did not have to travel to and from England they could begin fishing in Newfoundland as soon as the ice broke up.

goods. In 1763-4 alone, British colonists in Newfoundland shipped 10,000 quintals of cod to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.⁴⁶ The British spotted 300 colonial whaling vessels operating off the coast of Labrador in 1766. Many of these ships were fishing for cod and bringing it to the French in Newfoundland.⁴⁷ This trade was damaging to Britain in a number of ways. First, colonists harmed Britain economically by selling fish to one of its enemies. Not only did this take money away from Britain, but it also benefitted France. French trade with Newfoundland also disrupted Britain's monopoly on supplying the colony with European commodities. British colonial officials were painfully aware that Saint-Pierre and Miquelon could not succeed without clandestine trade with British colonies.⁴⁸

In 1764, Palliser ordered year-round naval patrols between southern Newfoundland and Saint-Pierre and Miquelon in an effort to put an end to illicit trade.⁴⁹ When Parliament forbade trade between Britain's colonies and Saint-Pierre and Miquelon in 1765, Palliser adopted even harsher measures for dealing with smuggling. The Governor issued an act stating that individuals caught trading with the French would be deported from Newfoundland, and have their property made available for public use. Anyone found to be employing Frenchmen in the English fisheries would be forced to forfeit a shallop for each foreigner employed.⁵⁰ In July 1765, Palliser exiled nine Newfoundland residents who were caught fishing for and trading with the French.⁵¹

⁴⁶ Thorpe, 70. A quintal is a hundredweight measurement, in this case indicating 100 pounds.

⁴⁷ Palliser to Lords of Trade, 21 and 27 October 1766, doc. 289v, v. 27, CO194, MG11, LAC.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 288v.

⁴⁹ Thorpe, 64. Janzen, "The Royal Navy," 11-13. Examples of these patrols can be found in: 21 and 27 October 1766, doc. 302-305, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC. Palliser to Lords of Trade, 16 July 1765, doc. 52-55, v. 27, CO194, MG11, LAC. French residents of Saint-Pierre to Palliser, 20-25 June 1765, doc. 72-75v, v. 27, CO194, MG11, LAC.

⁵⁰ Palliser to ?, 9 July 1765, doc. 184-184v, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

⁵¹ Thorpe, 68.

Illicit colonial trade with Saint-Pierre and Miquelon was substantial enough to warrant British attention. Smuggling was dangerous to Britain because it was a source of trade that could not be taxed, and as such, it threatened the financial security of the Empire. Because of Britain's already tenuous financial situation, French illicit trade had an impact on British colonial policy. Britain conducted naval patrols, adopted harsh measures to deal with its own colonists, and even made concessions to France in an attempt to curb illicit trade. When French trade had the potential to be seriously damaging in 1778, Britain granted the inhabitants of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon access to British timber so that they would cease trading with the rebellious Thirteen Colonies. British responses to smuggling indicate that France was able to retain influence in the Northeast through Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. French trade heightened Britain's insecurities about the financial state of its Empire, and caused it to further question the loyalties of peoples it already had reason to mistrust.

Cultural and Kinship Connections

Britain's insecurities were compounded by the presence of 'other' peoples in its North American Empire. In the Northeast British suspicions focussed on Mi'kmaq and Acadians. Britain could never completely trust either group because of their cultural and religious ties to France. Britain believed that cultural connections between Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadians were concealing a secret French plan to recapture North America.⁵²

⁵² Palliser to Lords of Trade, 30 October 1765, doc. 173, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC. Palliser feared that Mi'kmaq presence in southern Newfoundland was part of a French plan to retake the fisheries in the area. Palliser to Lords of Trade, 21 and 27 October 1766, doc. 302v, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC. Belief that Mi'kmaq in Baie d'Espoir were involved in a French plan to retake the south coast. Francklin to Hillsborough, 20 July 1768, doc. 172, v. 45, CO217, MG11, LAC. Francklin expressed a fear that the Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia received encouragement to support the French in future conflicts from Saint-

However, these connections were simply a continuation of pre-war relationships. Britain attempted to secure the loyalty of its new subjects by separating them from France culturally and physically. This involved converting the Mi'kmaq and Acadians to Protestantism and restricting their access to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Britain's response to dealing with Mi'kmaq and Acadians provides a tacit acknowledgment of the continuity in cultural connections between Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadians after 1763.

Britain was forced to come to terms with the Acadians and Mi'kmaq when fewer English-speaking Protestants than expected settled in Nova Scotia following the Seven Years' War.⁵³ Britain deported over 11,000 Acadians during the Seven Years' War, but they continued to constitute an important presence in the Northeast after 1763.⁵⁴ Many Acadians settled in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon or made their way back to Nova Scotia after the deportation. Some Acadians were able to avoid deportation by hiding out in the forests of present-day New Brunswick.⁵⁵ At least 900 Acadians returned to Nova Scotia between 1763 and 1767.⁵⁶ A large number of Acadians were also brought back to Nova Scotia as labourers to maintain the dikes they had constructed around the Bay of Fundy. More than 1,700 Acadians were working as labourers in Nova Scotia as of 1764.⁵⁷ By

Pierre and Miquelon. Campbell to Hillsborough, 25 October 1768, doc. 271, v. 45, CO217, MG11, LAC. Campbell refers to Acadians and Mi'kmaq as French agents.

⁵³ Reid, "Pax Britannica," 687. The population of mainland Nova Scotia (including New Brunswick) was smaller in 1781 than it was in 1755. In 1755 the number of non-Aboriginal inhabitants was 18,000, compared to just 14,000 in 1781. A.R. MacNeil, "The Acadian Legacy and Agricultural Development in Nova Scotia, 1760-1861," in *Farm, Factory and Fortune: New Studies in the Economic History of the Maritime Provinces*, ed. Kris Inwood (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1993), 1. According to MacNeil between 4,000 and 5,000 New Englanders migrated to the Bay of Fundy region in the 1760s.

⁵⁴ Plank, 149.

⁵⁵ Brasseaux, 26-29. Faragher, 393. Many Acadians fled to Shediac, Miramichi, and Baie des Chaleurs to escape the deportation and join up with Mi'kmaq.

⁵⁶ Leblanc, 176-177.

⁵⁷ Faragher, 418, 422.

1800, there were 8,400 Acadians in what are now the Canadian Maritime provinces, and another 8,000 in Québec.⁵⁸

Despite the deportation of the Acadians in 1755, Britain came to realize that Acadians could be of value to Nova Scotia. In 1764, Lord Hillsborough, the President of the Board of Trade, wrote, “the acquisition of so large a Body of useful Inhabitants [Acadians] would be of great advantage to and promote the Speedy Settlement of this Valuable Province [Nova Scotia]...”⁵⁹ More significantly Acadians’ knowledge of fishing and farming was beneficial to the colonies. As late as 1794, Britain contemplated allowing Acadians to settle in Nova Scotia because “they are more skilful and industrious than the British Fishermen...”⁶⁰ However, these benefits were always weighed against the risk that the Acadians might not remain loyal to Britain in future conflicts with France. It was more out of necessity than genuine desire that Britain accepted the presence of Acadians in its colonies.

Past experiences with subversive minority populations led the British to be suspicious of Mi’kmaq and Acadians. Britain had a history of distrusting Catholics dating back to the Glorious Revolution of the seventeenth century. During the Revolution, England’s Catholic King, James II, was deposed by his Protestant daughter Mary and her

⁵⁸ Leblanc, 188. The Fundy marshlands had largely been occupied by New Englanders, so many Acadians settled in the St. Mary’s Bay region in southwestern Nova Scotia.

⁵⁹ Hillsborough et al. to King’s Most Excellent Majesty, 19 June 1764, doc. 428-429, v. 6, CO218, MG11, LAC. Ponwall to Montagu, 19 July 1764, doc. 458, v. 6, CO218, MG11, LAC. Tyrrell to ?, 22 January 1768, doc. 11-13, v. 45, CO217, MG11, LAC. Allowing the Acadians to settle in Nova Scotia “il en peut resulter un avantage réel pour les possessions de Sa Majeste Britannique dans la Nouvelle Ecosse.”

⁶⁰ Wentworth to Duke of Portland, 21 December 1794, doc. 27, v. 66, CO217, MG11, LAC. When the British captured Saint-Pierre and Miquelon in 1793 they considered allowing the inhabitants to settle in Nova Scotia. According to Governor John Wentworth, settling the Acadians in Nova Scotia “will be of very great and permanent advantage to the public good.”

Dutch husband, William of Orange.⁶¹ The English population had become distrustful of James because he had formed close ties with Louis XIV of France, and attempted to establish a Catholic absolutist state in England, despite the fact that most of his subjects were Protestant.⁶² After taking power, William and Mary denied Catholics the right to vote and introduced a clause in the Bill of Rights restricting the succession of the Crown to Protestant heirs.⁶³ Yet, Catholic claimants to the throne continually popped up during the first half of the eighteenth century. Ruling monarchs lived in fear of French and Spanish-backed attempts to restore the Stuarts and Catholicism to England.⁶⁴

In 1745 Charles Stuart, a French-supported claimant to the British throne, landed in northern Scotland and attempted to restore his family to the throne.⁶⁵ Charles intended to take London, but was forced to make a stand in the Highlands because of a lack of support amongst the English population. The decisive battle was waged at Culloden between 5,000 Stuart supporters, known as Jacobites, and 9,000 government troops.⁶⁶ Charles lost the battle and went into hiding for five months before ultimately fleeing to France.⁶⁷ After the Stuart Rebellion, the English government passed the Act of

⁶¹ James was known as James II in England and Ireland, but James VII in Scotland. Lois G. Schwoerer, "The Glorious Revolution as Spectacle: A New Perspective," in *England's Rise to Greatness, 1660-1763*, ed. Stephen Bartow Baxter (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), 109-111. Stuart Reid and Gerry Embleton, *Culloden Moor 1746: The Death of the Jacobite Cause* (Great Britain: Osprey Publishing, 2002), 7. Both James and Mary were members of the Stuart family. The Stuarts were a Catholic family that had been on the throne of Scotland since the fourteenth century, but had only been on the throne of England for eighty-five years. There was little sympathy for the Stuarts in England because their reign had included a twenty-year civil war, and there were suspicions surrounding James' ties to France.

⁶² Steven C.A. Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 6, 125-126.

⁶³ Lawson, *The Imperial Challenge*, 43.

⁶⁴ John R. Gold and Margaret M. Gold, "The Graves of the Gallant Highlanders": Memory, Interpretation and Narratives of Culloden," *History and Memory*, v. 19, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2007), 11. The Stuarts gained European support for uprisings in 1689-91, 1708, 1715, 1719, 1744, and 1745.

⁶⁵ Plank, 108. Gold, 11.

⁶⁶ Gold, 6 and 11. Jacobite refers to individuals who wished to restore the Stuarts to the English, Irish, and Scottish thrones.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 12.

Proscription, which attempted to eliminate the distinct Highlander culture.⁶⁸ Britain also forcibly pacified the Highlands and considered moving the Highlanders to a new location within the British Empire so that they could be assimilated.⁶⁹ The Stuart Rebellion increased Britain's suspicions of Catholic minorities. Not only were Catholics potentially subversive, they also had a tendency to cooperate with Britain's enemies, France and Spain.

Catholicism contributed to Britain's suspicions of Mi'kmaq and Acadians, but these suspicions were also fuelled by individual experiences with the two groups. Britain distrusted Acadians because they refused to swear unconditional oaths of allegiance, which would commit them to take up arms in support of British interests, when Acadia was ceded to Britain in 1713. Britain interpreted the Acadians' refusal as a sign of their continued loyalty to France. The reality was that the Acadians did not wish to be drawn into imperial conflicts by either France or Britain. The colony of Acadia/Nova Scotia had changed hands so many times that Acadians had come to believe that they alone knew what was best for their communities.⁷⁰

After 1713, Britain feared that France would try to recapture Nova Scotia by launching an attack from Île Royale, and expected that Acadians would support such an attack. Britain saw its suspicions confirmed when Acadians in the contested territory west of the Isthmus of Chignecto openly supported France during the Seven Years' War. Many of these Acadians participated in the construction of Fort Beauséjour in 1750-51,

⁶⁸ Ibid. The Act of Proscription banned Highland ceremonies, the teaching of Gaelic, wearing tartans, and abolished the feudal powers of Highland landowners.

⁶⁹ Plank, 108.

⁷⁰ Griffiths, 238. Griffiths argues, "their [Acadians'] actions after 1710 can be seen as a logical consequence of their own appreciation of the immediate situation..."

and its defence against British and New England troops in 1755.⁷¹ These actions confirmed to Britain that the Acadians' refusal to swear unconditional oaths of allegiance was evidence of their continued loyalty to France. This distrust was one of the main reasons for the deportations, and continued after the Seven Years' War, even as Acadians were permitted to return to the Northeast.

The British also had reason to be suspicious of the Mi'kmaq. The two groups had frequently opposed one another in wars throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁷² Mi'kmaq fought alongside the French and their Aboriginal allies in the Wabanaki Confederacy.⁷³ The British signed a series of treaties with Mi'kmaq in 1726, 1749, 1752, and 1760-1 in an attempt to establish peace and develop a mutually beneficial relationship. In the 1760-1 treaties, Mi'kmaq promised that they would not molest British settlers or assist Britain's enemies with any ill designs.⁷⁴

Yet, in the summer of 1762, Mi'kmaq broke the treaties when they supported a French attack on St. John's, Newfoundland.⁷⁵ The French took the British forces at St. John's by surprise and quickly captured the town. While the French were simply trying to gain a bargaining chip in the coming peace negotiations, at the time it appeared that they were attempting to recapture the Northeast. Lieutenant-Governor Jonathon Belcher ordered all Nova Scotia militias to march to Halifax to defend the city against an expected French attack. The inhabitants of Lunenburg objected to this request on the grounds that withdrawing the militia would leave the settlement vulnerable to Mi'kmaq

⁷¹ Faragher, 271.

⁷² Some of these wars include King William's War (1689-97), Queen Anne's War (1702-13), Dummer's War (1722-25), King George's War (1744-48), Father Le Loutre's War (1749-55), and the Seven Years' War (1754-63).

⁷³ The Wabanaki Confederacy included the Mi'kmaq, Maliseet, Penobscot, Passamaquoddy, and Abenaki.

⁷⁴ "Micmac Treaty 1760," 86-87.

⁷⁵ For secondary accounts of the attack see Faragher, 421; Reid, "*Pax Britannica*," 683; Janzen, 3; Dickason, "Amerindians Between French and English," 47.

attack.⁷⁶ The Lunenburg administration notified Belcher that “The Indians which Surround us are Certainly very Numerous and by their Motion and Insults for the last Twenty Four hours it is more than doubtfull they are meditating an attack...”⁷⁷ Belcher excused the Lunenburg militia from travelling to Halifax, and sent a warship to reinforce the town.⁷⁸ The French were ousted from St. John’s in September 1762. Nevertheless, the attack confirmed to the British that Mi’kmaq would ultimately support France in any future conflicts.

Britain was already mistrustful of Mi’kmaq and Acadians, but the return of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to France magnified its fears. Once again Britain was placed in the situation of having to manage suspect populations with a French colony nearby. The British expected France to encourage Mi’kmaq and Acadians to remain in its sphere of influence by way of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.⁷⁹ This fear caused Britain to misinterpret Mi’kmaq and Acadian actions. Britain had an underlying suspicion that continued Mi’kmaq and Acadian cultural connections to France were disguising a French plan to recapture the Northeast.

The British expected that while Acadians “readily take the Oaths of Allegiance and perhaps in time of peace, may demean themselves as Subjects of Great Britain...they are so attracted in principal to the French that there can be no reliance on them in time of War...”⁸⁰ The President of the Board of Trade, Lord Hillsborough, also accused Acadians of having “a warm attachment to the french government and [being] capable under that

⁷⁶ Upton, 62.

⁷⁷ Sebastian Zouberbuhler, John Creighton, and Leonard Christopher Rudolf to Belcher, 15 July 1762, doc. 118, v. 19, CO217, MG11, LAC.

⁷⁸ Upton, 62.

⁷⁹ For examples of this thinking see Francklin to Hillsborough, 20 July 1768, doc. 172, v. 45, CO217, MG11, LAC. Palliser to Francklin, 16 October 1766, doc. 308, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

⁸⁰ Legge to Dartmouth, 20 August 1774, doc. 203, v. 50, CO217, MG11, LAC.

influence of greatly prejudicing Your Majesty's Interests in case of a future War...⁸¹ It is clear that Britain believed that the Acadians were in league with the French, but what exactly did it suppose this "warm attachment" was based upon? According to Francis Legge, the Governor of Nova Scotia from 1772 to 1776, Acadians were attracted to France because they were "to a man Roman Catholicks, [and] they do not Coalesce with our People that there Scarse ever was an intermarriage between them and the English..."⁸² Legge's comments highlight the British belief that culture and kinship were instrumental factors in connecting the Acadians to French interests. Britain could not accept that Acadian loyalty was genuine as long as Acadians continued to be culturally connected to France.

Similarly, Britain expected Mi'kmaq to support France in future imperial conflicts. According to Governor Michael Francklin,

if a Rupture should suddenly happen with France, and that Court should have any designs on Canada, and encouragement should be given by the way of the Islands of Saint Peter and Miquelon to the Savages, I make no doubt they [Mi'kmaq] would break with Us, and if this should happen before this Province is better settled it would be very difficult for the Government to prevent the disruption of the greatest part of the Out Settlements...⁸³

Francklin's main concern was communication between Mi'kmaq and the French at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Why did British administrators like Francklin believe that the Mi'kmaq could be so easily persuaded to assist the French? Once again cultural connections were the primary reason. In 1764, Hillsborough expressed the belief that "so long as they [Mi'kmaq] retain [Catholicism], they never can be united in Interest and

⁸¹ Hillsborough et al. to King's Most Excellent Majesty, 19 June 1764, doc. 429-430, v. 6, CO218, MG11, LAC.

⁸² Legge to Dartmouth, 20 August 1774, doc. 203, v. 50, CO217, MG11, LAC.

⁸³ Francklin to Hillsborough, 20 July 1768, doc. 172, v. 45, CO217, MG11, LAC.

affection to the British government...”⁸⁴ When Cape Breton Mi’kmaq received religious materials from the French in 1766, Francklin warned that French-Mi’kmaq religious ties could “prove of very Ill consequence to this young Province [Nova Scotia] as our settlements are very fragile and defenceless.”⁸⁵ These comments demonstrate Britain’s belief that cultural connections could not be separated from political loyalties. Britain expected that Mi’kmaq and Acadians would support French interests, which included disrupting British settlements, because the groups shared religious ties.

The way in which Britain attempted to deal with the challenges presented by Mi’kmaq and Acadians also reveals that its fears were based primarily on the persistence of cultural and kinship networks. In order to counter the expected difficulties, the colonial administration developed a number of plans to incorporate Mi’kmaq and Acadians into colonial society and ensure their allegiance to Britain. The Nova Scotian colonial administration suggested settling Acadians on wooded lots, which they would be given ten years to improve. This plan was intended to isolate Acadian families in the wilderness so that they would be “lost among the Croud of Protestant Inhabitants.”⁸⁶ A similar proposal, made by the President of the Board of Trade, consisted of placing Acadians

in Situations where they can have no opportunity of Commerce or Correspondence with the Subjects of France in the Islands of Miquelon and St. Peter...where every encouragement will be offered to them that can lend to establish their Prejudices for the Religion and Interests of that nation.⁸⁷

Britain hoped that these plans would detach Acadians from Catholicism and therefore loosen their ties to the French and Mi’kmaq. As long as Acadians remained culturally

⁸⁴ Hillsborough et al. to Wilmot, 13 July 1764, doc. 447, v. 6, CO218, MG11, LAC.

⁸⁵ Francklin to Palliser, 11 September 1766, doc. 307-307v, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

⁸⁶ Francklin to Shelburne, 20 February 1768, doc. 44-47, v. 45, CO217, MG11, LAC.

⁸⁷ Hillsborough et al. to King’s Most Excellent Majesty, doc. 429-430, v. 6, CO218, MG11, LAC.

connected to the French and Mi'kmaq, they could not be expected to support British interests.

Britain also tried to disrupt Mi'kmaq, Acadian, and French networks by renegeing on its guarantee of religious freedom. The British refused to allow Catholic priests to operate in Nova Scotia even though they had been promised to the Mi'kmaq in the 1760-1 treaties.⁸⁸ Instead, the British sought to separate the Acadians and Mi'kmaq from Catholicism by sending Protestant missionaries to work amongst them. According to one British administrator, establishing Catholic priests amongst Mi'kmaq and Acadians would strengthen their Catholic beliefs, and therefore “is in no respect advisable or proper...”⁸⁹ The British hoped that over time “pious and discreet protestant Missionaries” would be able to wean Mi'kmaq and Acadians from their religious superstitions, while encouraging them to remain loyal to Britain.⁹⁰

When it was clear that the plan to convert Mi'kmaq and Acadians to Protestantism had failed, the British decided to provide both groups with Catholic priests.⁹¹ The colonial administration verified that only priests who were loyal to the British Empire were sent to officiate amongst Mi'kmaq and Acadians. The primary reason for this concession was that Britain was forced to deal with unrest in the Thirteen Colonies following the implementation of the Stamp Act in 1765. The British hoped that their concession would secure the loyalty of Mi'kmaq and Acadians in case tensions escalated with the Thirteen Colonies. In 1768, François Bailly, a Canadian-born, liberal-minded, Catholic priest from a reputable family was sent to officiate amongst Mi'kmaq

⁸⁸ “Micmac Treaty 1760,” 86-87.

⁸⁹ Ponwall to Reverend Doctor Burton, 20 June 1764, doc. 431, v. 6, CO218, MG11, LAC.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Upton, 67.

and Acadians. The colonial administration trusted Bailly because he had sworn an oath of allegiance to the British Crown.⁹²

The British accepted that Bailly would instruct Mi'kmaq and Acadians in the Catholic faith, but hoped that this negative would be mitigated by his promotion of the idea of obedience to government. Bailly also urged Mi'kmaq, and other First Nations in Nova Scotia, to settle near Halifax so that they could be more easily monitored by the colonial administration.⁹³ The appointment of Bailly demonstrates the influence of the French, Mi'kmaq, and Acadians after 1763. The British were forced to make concessions to Mi'kmaq and Acadians to dissuade them from maintaining relations with the French. The British were so worried about a French attack following the Stamp Act that they appointed a Catholic priest to remove any reason that Mi'kmaq and Acadians had for visiting Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Contact with Saint-Pierre and Miquelon was deemed to be more dangerous than allowing Mi'kmaq and Acadians to remain Catholic.

When the British suspected that Bailly had passed away in 1774 – in actuality he had returned to Québec to accept a position as coadjutor bishop of Québec in 1772 – they suggested abandoning the practice of providing Catholic priests “unless the Indians should strenuously insist on a Successor being appointed...”⁹⁴ Because Bailly's efforts had failed to separate Mi'kmaq and Acadians from France, Britain determined that encouraging Catholicism had had more downside than upside. Yet, with hostilities

⁹² Francklin to Hillsborough, 20 July 1768, doc. 177-178, v. 45, CO217, MG11, LAC.

⁹³ Campbell to Hillsborough, 22 December 1770, doc. 11-12, v. 48, CO217, MG11, LAC.

⁹⁴ Dartmouth to Legge, 5 October 1774, doc. 241, v. 50, CO217, MG11, LAC. Upton, 68. Claude Galarneau, “Bailly de Messein, Charles-François,” in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online* [http://www.biographi.ca/009004-119.01-e.php?&id_nbr=1745], Accessed 30 May 2012. As coadjutor bishop, Bailly taught rhetoric and *belles-lettres* classes at the Petit Séminaire in Québec.

escalating in the Thirteen Colonies, the British were still willing to acquiesce to Mi'kmaq demands if it was necessary to avoid any harm to the colonies.⁹⁵

Britain's reactions to its suspicion of Mi'kmaq and Acadians focussed on securing their loyalty by eliminating cultural ties to France. First Britain tried to eliminate these connections by deporting the Acadians from the Northeast and establishing its own relationship with Mi'kmaq through treaties. When these efforts proved unsuccessful Britain attempted to eradicate Mi'kmaq and Acadian culture and religion through a combination of geographical isolation and Protestant missionaries. When this plan failed, the British accepted that Mi'kmaq and Acadians would remain Catholic, but nevertheless encouraged them to settle in groups close to British settlements, and to become obedient subjects. All of these efforts focussed on eliminating any connections Mi'kmaq and Acadians had to one another and France.

Conclusion

Britain faced a number of insecurities at the end of the Seven Years' War. Not only was it forced to confront a large national debt that threatened to bring down the Empire, it also worried that France and Spain would launch a war of revenge in the near future. With these concerns in mind, Britain also had to deal with the presence of 'other' peoples in its North American Empire. In Northeastern North America, Britain questioned the loyalties of Mi'kmaq and Acadians because they were former French allies and practised Catholicism. These insecurities – over national debt, the anticipation

⁹⁵ Ironically this is the same year that Britain passed the Québec Act, which protected the *Canadiens*' right to freely practise the Catholic faith. The Act also maintained Québec's seigneurial system and civil laws from the French period. Allain-G. Gagnon and Luc Turgeon, "Managing Diversity in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Canada: Québec's Constitutional Development in Light of the Scottish Experience," *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, v. 41, no.1 (March 2003), 11.

of a Franco-Spanish attack, and pre-existing suspicions of the Acadians and Mi'kmaq – caused Britain to misinterpret the nature of Mi'kmaq and Acadian relations with the French colony of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. Britain believed that illicit colonial trade with Saint-Pierre and Miquelon was intended to financially ruin the Empire, rather than secure Saint-Pierre and Miquelon as stable colonies despite scant natural resources. Britain could not accept that economic activity and political loyalties could be separated. Britain also believed that the cultural connections between Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadians, were masking a French plan to retake North America. However, these connections were premised on historical relationships that pre-dated the Seven Years' War.

Britain attempted to secure the loyalties of its new subjects by eliminating Catholicism and preventing contact with Saint-Pierre and Miquelon for both cultural and economic purposes. When conversion to Protestantism failed, the British determined that appointing a Catholic priest to serve Nova Scotia might have the effect of limiting the contact that Mi'kmaq and Acadians had with the French. Britain's fears and its reactions to dealing with Mi'kmaq and Acadians are a tacit acknowledgement of the high level of continuity in cultural, economic, and kinship networks. Perhaps more significantly, these networks continued to have an influence on British policy after 1763.

Conclusion:

The Seven Years' War has traditionally been portrayed as an event that initiated widespread change throughout North America. While the British Conquest of New France resulted in many geopolitical changes, including shifting territorial boundaries and the movement of thousands of people, it did not eliminate the social, cultural, and economic relationships that existed prior to 1763. The French colonies of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon provide a glimpse into the remarkable degree of social and cultural continuity in Northeastern North America in a period of profound change. In a 1766 letter to Nova Scotia Governor Michael Francklin, Hugh Palliser wrote,

As soon as I came to this government I perceived the extensive Views of France in contending for those two insignificant Islands as they were called, St. Pierres and Miquelon...[were] Communicating with and preserving their Influence over, the bigoted Savages, and the Rebellious and more dangerous Accadians...¹

Palliser's fears may have been somewhat sensationalized, but he was correct in his assessment that Saint-Pierre and Miquelon would allow the French, Mi'kmaq, and Acadians to maintain their connections with one another after 1763.

Many Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadians from Île Royale relocated to southern Newfoundland and Saint-Pierre and Miquelon after the fall of New France. The French colonies of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon were for the most part populated by French and Acadian individuals who had lived on Île Royale before the Conquest. The French government viewed these individuals as ideal colonists for Saint-Pierre and Miquelon because they were experienced fishermen. After 1763, Mi'kmaq from Île Royale began to shift their primary location of settlement to southern Newfoundland. Mi'kmaq chose southern Newfoundland because it was a familiar location that offered good hunting and

¹ Palliser to Francklin, 16 October 1766, doc. 308, v. 16, CO194, MG11, LAC.

fishing opportunities, but also because it allowed them to more easily travel to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. This shift in location should not be viewed as a “violent disruption” of Mi’kmaq culture, but rather as a traditional strategy of adapting to change by choosing a new primary residence within a larger understood regional territory.²

Relocation facilitated the continuation of kinship connections between the French, Mi’kmaq, and Acadians of Île Royale. When Mi’kmaq parents had their children baptised by Catholic priests stationed at Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, they often chose French and Acadian godparents who had previous connections to Île Royale. This preference indicates that pre-existing communal connections still factored into Mi’kmaq decision-making in the post-Conquest era. The British Conquest did not sever the ties that had bound these groups together on Île Royale.

Mi’kmaq also continued to practise Catholicism and maintained their historical relationship with France. Britain attempted to eliminate Mi’kmaq Catholicism by sending Protestant missionaries to work amongst Mi’kmaq in Nova Scotia, and by using naval patrols to prevent Mi’kmaq from making contact with the French. Mi’kmaq continued to practise Catholicism by using the translated religious materials provided to them by Abbé Pierre Maillard, and by travelling to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon to have religious services performed by Catholic priests. Cape Breton Mi’kmaq maintained a relationship with France even though it was no longer a major imperial power in North America. This relationship, which was based primarily on commercial and cultural exchange after 1763, continued to be renewed through gift giving.

The extent of social and cultural continuity in the Northeast was a source of unease for Britain. Although its empire was larger than ever before, Britain was

² Greenblatt, 4.

overcome with a feeling of vulnerability because of mounting national debt and the expectation that France and Spain would initiate a war to seek revenge for the losses of the Seven Years' War. These insecurities were magnified by the presence of 'other' peoples in the British Empire. Many of these peoples, including Mi'kmaq and Acadians, happened to be former French allies. Britain interpreted the fact that the French, Mi'kmaq, and Acadians continued to be linked through commercial, cultural, and kinship ties as evidence of suspect political loyalties. By attempting to sever these ties, Britain tacitly acknowledged that Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadians maintained a level of continuity in their relationships during a period of change.

In 1766, Palliser recognized the potential difficulties that Saint-Pierre and Miquelon could pose for Britain, but did not expect that the islands would be of any significance in the post-Conquest Northeast. Historians of the Northeast have for the most part shared Palliser's view, and attributed minimal importance to Saint-Pierre and Miquelon or their inhabitants. The islands played a crucial role in maintaining continuity in the commercial, cultural, and kinship connections between Mi'kmaq, French, and Acadians after the fall of New France. These groups adapted to geopolitical realities, but continued to make decisions based on pre-Conquest relationships. Despite the fact that Britain was in a dominant political position after 1763, the Northeast did not immediately become British. Mi'kmaq, French, Acadians, and Saint-Pierre and Miquelon played a larger role in Northeastern history than Palliser ever could have predicted, and were anything but "insignificant" after 1763.

Appendix A: Mi'kmaq Baptisms in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon

MIQUELON:

BERNARD [BEGUIDDAVALOUE], ANNE MARIE:¹

- Baptised 20 April 1773
- Born in St. Michel the previous year
- Parents were **Bernard Beguiddavalouet** and **Marie Anne Gougou**
- Godfather was **Jacob Abamou**:
 - Did not sign or mark baptismal register
 - Abamou was a Mi'kmaq man married to **Marie Barthelemi**²
- Godmother was **Marie Barthelemi**:
 - Did not sign or mark the baptismal register
 - Barthelemi was a Mi'kmaq woman and the wife of Jacob Abamou³

DOUSET, JOSEPH MARIE:⁴

- Baptised 30 July 1784
- Born 11 April 1784
- Received conditional baptism the day he was born
- Godparents not listed

HELI, JEANNE:⁵

- Baptised 18 August 1778
- Born 1 January 1778
- Received conditional baptism at birth in her home by **Jacob Abamou** (a Mi'kmaq of the Baie d'Espoir)
- Parents were **Jean Heli** and **Anne...** (daughter of **Charles...** spouse of **Magdeleine...**)
- Godfather was **Pierre Bonis**:
 - Did not sign or mark baptismal register
 - Uncle of **Jeanne Heli**
 - Bonis was a Mi'kmaq resident of the Baie d'Espoir
- Godmother was **Jeanne Bonis**:
 - Did not sign or mark baptismal register
 - Married to **Jacques...**
 - Mi'kmaq resident of the Baie d'Espoir

HURI, DENIS:⁶

- Baptised 28 August 1768 at the age of one year
- Received conditional baptism at birth by an Acadian in Bonne Bai, NL

¹ Baptême d'Anne Marie Bernard, 20 avril 1773, p. 222, v. 2, Série E, MG6-A2, LAC.

² Baptême de Julien Charles Abamou.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Baptême de Joseph Marie Douset.

⁵ Baptême de Jeanne Heli.

⁶ Baptême de Denis Huri.

- Son of **Antoine Huri** and **Manon Etienne**
- Godfather was **Pierre Tompic**:
 - Did not sign or mark the baptismal register
 - From Miquelon
 - Born in 1755
 - Parents **Etienne Tompic** and **Marguerite Theze**
 - Father was a fisherman and carpenter⁷
 - Etienne Tompic was recorded in the 1752 Île Royale census⁸
- Godmother was **Anne Mancel**
 - Signed baptismal record
 - Habitant de Miquelon
 - Born in Louisbourg in 1754⁹
 - Parents **Robert Mancel** and **Jeanne Goupil** were from Louisbourg¹⁰

LE BASQ, JOSEPH:¹¹

- Baptised 28 September 1776 in Miquelon
- Son of **Philippe Le Basq** and **Jeanne Bounis**
- Godfather was **Jacques Hobemouth**:
 - Mi'kmq
 - Did not sign or mark baptismal register
- Godmother was **Jeanne Le Grand (Sabot widow)**:
 - Habitant de Miquelon
 - From Louisbourg. Listed in the 1752 Île Royale Census.¹²
 - Daughter married a man from Port Toulouse (Cape Breton)¹³

PAUL, PIERRE:¹⁴

- Baptised 18 August 1778 at the age of two and a half months
- Received conditional baptism at birth in his house by **Pierre Bonis**, a Mi'kmaq from the Baie d'Espoir
- Parents were **Philippe... (son of Jacques...)** and **Jeanne Bonis**
- Godfather was **Paul Bonis**:
 - Did not mark or sign the baptismal register
 - Brother of **Jeanne Bonis**, therefore uncle of **Pierre Paul**
 - Mi'kmaq
- Godmother was **Anne... (daughter of Charles, spouse of Jean Heli)**:
 - Did not sign or mark the baptismal register
 - This is Anne Sourien, a Mi'kmaq woman married to Jean Heli

⁷ "Recensement Miquelon 1776," in Poirier, 286.

⁸ "1752 Census of Île Royale," in Arsenault, *L'Acadie des ancêtres*, 975.

⁹ "La Rochelle 1778: Paquebot "LE BETHSY"," in Poirier, 334.

¹⁰ "La Rochelle 1778: Equipage et passagers du paquebot "LA JEUNE CREOLE"," in Poirier, 327.

¹¹ Baptême de Joseph Le Basq.

¹² "1752 Census of Île Royale," in Arsenault, *L'Acadie des ancêtres*, 974.

¹³ Mariage de Joseph Brillant et Jeanne Marechal, 24 octobre 1765, doc. 23, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC.

¹⁴ Baptême de Pierre Paul.

PIKTEUARUEL, JEAN-BAPTISTE:¹⁵

- Baptised 15 July 1778
- Born 1 January 1778
- Received a conditional baptism from an Irish Catholic (Gabriel Gugoo?) in Codroy, NL on 31 May 1778
- Parents were **Gabriel Piktuearuel** and **Marie Doujet**
- Godfather was **Louis Hugo:**
 - Did not mark or sign baptismal register
 - Louis was a Mi'kmaq who formerly lived in Louisbourg
 - Paternal uncle of **Jean-Baptiste Piktuearuel** (brother of **Gabriel Piktuearuel**)
- Godmother was **Lisette Cormier:**
 - From Miquelon

PIKTEUARUEL, VERONIQUE:¹⁶

- Entry for 15 July 1778
- This document is a reproduction of a baptism performed on 13 October 1775 in St. Germain de Rimouski by Jean-Baptiste de la Brosse
- Parents were **Gabriel Piktuearuel** and **Marie Doujet**
- Godparents were **Louis Le Page** of St. Germain and **Genevieve Coté**

SAINT-PIERRE:**ABAMOU, JULIEN-CHARLES:**¹⁷

- Baptised 10 August 1791 at the age of 29 months
- Born in Baye St. Georges, Newfoundland
- Received conditional baptism at birth
- Son of **Jacob Abamou** and **Marie Barteley**
- Godfather was **Julien Herpin:**
 - Signed baptismal record
 - Born in Louisbourg 26 April 1753¹⁸
 - Listed in 1765 Saint-Pierre Census¹⁹
- Godmother was **Charlotte Guillaume:**
 - Signed baptismal record
 - Born and baptised in Saint-Pierre on 25 October 1765 to **Julien Guillaume** and **Guillaumette Valet**²⁰

¹⁵ Baptême de Jean-Baptiste Piktuearuel.

¹⁶ Baptême de Veronique Piktuearuel, 15 juillet 1778, doc. 17-18, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC.

¹⁷ Baptême de Julien-Charles Abamou.

¹⁸ "St Malo 1793: Liste extraite des listes d'Acadiens réfugiés à cette époque dans la région de St Malo-St Servan," in Poirier, 381.

¹⁹ "Recensement St Pierre 1765," in Poirier, 195-197.

²⁰ Baptême de Charlotte Jeanne Guillaume, 25 octobre 1765, doc. 20, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

ANASSTASIE:²¹

- Baptised 6 June 1785 at the age of 3 months
- Received conditional baptism at birth
- Daughter of **Jean-Baptiste** and **Agathe**
- Godfather was **Grégoire:**
- Godmother was **Julienne:**

DOMINIQUE:²²

- Baptised 6 June 1785 at the age of 2 months
- Conditionally baptised at birth
- Daughter of **Christophe** and **Susanne** who were married Mi'kmaq
- Godfather was **Grégoire:**
- Godmother was **Agathe:**

ETIENÉHUIT, ESTHER MARIE:²³

- Baptised 16 September 1789 at the age of 2 years
- Received conditional baptism at birth
- Daughter of **Raimond Etienéhuit** and **Isabelle Doucet**
- Godfather was **Jean Jacques Devers:**
 - Marked baptismal register
- Godmother was **Esther Lover-Deslandes:**
 - Marked baptismal record

ETIENÉHUIT, JEAN ANDRÉ:²⁴

- Baptised 16 September 1789 at the age of 3
- Conditional baptism at birth
- Godfather was **André La Vacquierre:**
 - Signed baptismal record
 - From St. Eloy in Bordeau, France²⁵
- Godmother was **Jeanette Godbout:**
 - Marked baptismal record
 - Born and baptised in Saint-Pierre²⁶

GOUGOU, JULIENNE:²⁷

- Baptised 8 September 1790 at the age of 3
- Received conditional baptism at birth
- Parents were **Louis Gougou** and **Marie Marthe Guillaume**
- Not sure where Gougou's were from, but at least 2 (Marie Anne Gougou and Anne Etiennehuit (a Gougou)) died in Newfoundland
- Godfather was **Julien Gregoire:**

²¹ Baptême d'Anasstasie.

²² Baptême de Dominique.

²³ Baptême d'Esther Marie Etienéhuit.

²⁴ Baptême de Jean André Etienéhuit.

²⁵ Mariage d'André Lavaquiere et Helene Vicel, 19 mars 1775, doc. 3, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

²⁶ Baptême de Jeanneanne Godebout, 27 fevrier 1765, doc. 13, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

²⁷ Baptême de Julien Gougou, 8 septembre 1790, doc. 24, v. 415, MG1-G1, LAC.

- Marked baptismal record
- Godmother was **Julienne Andress**:
 - Marked baptismal record
 - Mi'kmaq woman
 - Married to **Jean Helie** in her first marriage, with whom she had **Julien Helie**
 - Married to **Joseph Guillaume** in her second marriage, with whom she had **Anne Guillaume** on 8 September 1790²⁸

GUILLAUME, ANNE:

- Baptised 8 September 1790 at the age of 2 years
- Received conditional baptism at birth
- Daughter of **Joseph Guillaume** and **Julienne Andress**
- Godfather was **Julien Helie**:
 - Marked baptismal register
 - Mi'kmaq man married to **Anne Magdelenne Guillaume**²⁹
- Godmother was **Anne Magdeleine Guillaume**:
 - Marked baptismal register
 - Mi'kmaq woman married to **Julien Helie**

HELL, JACQUES:³⁰

- Baptised 8 November 1784 at the age of one month
- Conditionally baptised in Baie d'Espoir by a Mi'kmaq neighbour
- Parents **Jean Heli** and **Jeanne...** habitually live in Baie d'Espoir, NL
- Godfather was **Jacques Cabos**:
 - Signed baptismal record
 - Domicile de Saint-Pierre
 - Former soldier who was born in France in 1718³¹
 - Married to **Josephine Le Roy** in Miquelon on 3 September 1767³²
 - Godmother was **Josephine Le Roy**:
 - Did not sign baptismal register
 - Domicile de Miquelon
 - Born in Louisbourg in 1744³³

HELIE, MARIEANNE FRANÇOISE:³⁴

- Baptised 7 May 1790
- Born 27 April 1790 in Baie d'Espoir
- Received conditional baptism at birth
- Parents were **Jean Helie** and **Anne Sourien**

²⁸ Mariage de Julien Helie et. Anne Magdeleine Guillaume.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Baptême de Jacques Heli.

³¹ "La Rochelle 1778: Listes des passagers arrives sur différents navires en 1778, venant des iles St Pierre et Miquelon," in Poirier, 326-327.

³² Mariage de Jacques Cabos et Josite Roy, 2 septembre 1767, doc. 29-30, v. 413, MG1-G1, LAC.

³³ La Rochelle 1778: Listes des passagers arrives sur différents navires en 1778, venant des iles St Pierre et Miquelon," in Poirier, 326-327.

³⁴ Baptême de Marieanne Françoise Helie.

- Godfather was **Jean Neveu**:
 - Signed baptismal register
- Godmother was **Marie David**:
 - Signed baptismal register
 - Born and Baptised in Saint-Pierre on 12 June 1770³⁵

HELY, JEAN NOEL:³⁶

- Baptised 10 September 1786
- Conditionally baptised at birth
- No sure connection to other **Heli** family which resided in the Baie d'Espoir
- Godfather was **René Sasaure**:
 - Did not sign or mark baptismal record
- Godmother was **Marie Sublime**:
 - Did not sign or mark baptismal record
 - Born and baptised in Saint-Pierre on 25 July 1770³⁷
 - Her mother **Judith Marcadet** was from Louisbourg³⁸

MARTIN, JEAN (Montagnais):

- Baptised 24 August 1790 at the age of 10 years
- Adopted by the **Helie** family
- Godfather was **Julien Helie**:
 - Marked the baptismal register
 - A Mi'kmaq man married to **Anne Magdalenne Guillaume** (Mi'kmaq)
- Godmother was **Anne Leblanc**:
 - Signed baptismal register
 - Wife of Sieur Le Ticeq

NIKES, PAULINE:

- Baptised 12 September 1785 at the age of one year
- Born in Newfoundland and conditionally baptised at birth
- Godfather was **Etienne Remond**:
 - This is probably **Raimond Etiennéhuit**³⁹
- Godmother was **Isabelle**:
 - This is probably **Isabelle Doucet**, the wife of **Raimond Etiennéhuit**⁴⁰

PIERRE:⁴¹

- Born and baptised 14 March 1764
- Mother was **Marieanne La Sauvagese**
- Godfather was **Pierre Texier**:

³⁵ Baptême de Marie Angélique David, 12 juin 1770, doc. 55, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

³⁶ Baptême de Jean Noel Hely.

³⁷ Baptême de Marie Jeanne Sublime, 25 mai 1770, doc. 54, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

³⁸ "St Servan 1778: Listes des générales des ci-devants, habitants des îles St Pierre et Miquelon qui reçoivent les secours à raison de 12 sols par jour et 6 sols pour ceux au-dessous de 10 ans," in Poirier, 322.

³⁹ Martijn, "Mi'kmaq in the Parish Registers."

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Baptême de Pierre.

- Signed baptismal register
- Godmother was **Francoise Jaichot:**
 - Signed baptismal register

SEKAQUET, JEAN-PHILIPPE:⁴²

- Baptised 16 September 1789 at the age of 2
- Received a conditional baptism at birth
- Son of **Jean-Baptiste Sekaquet** and **Agathe Edouampiart**
- Godfather was **Jean-Baptiste Colin:**
 - Signed baptismal register
- Godmother was **Jeanette Turnier:**
 - Marked baptismal register
 - Born and Baptised in Saint-Pierre on 29 November 1769⁴³
 - Father **Jean-Pierre Tournier** was from La Rochelle, and her mother **Perinne Boulot** was from St. Germain in Rennes⁴⁴

SEKAQUET, MARGUERITTE:⁴⁵

- Baptised 20 August 1790
- Born in July 1790
- Received conditional baptism at birth
- Godfather was **Pierre Banet:**
 - Signed baptismal register
 - Born and baptised in Saint-Pierre on 6 August 1773⁴⁶
 - Parents **Pierre Joseph Gaummet Banet** and **Marieanne Arondel** were both from Louisbourg⁴⁷
- Godmother was **Margueritte Banet:**
 - Signed baptismal register
 - Born and baptised in Saint-Pierre 10 July 1772⁴⁸
 - Parents **Pierre Joseph Gaummet Banet** and **Marieanne Arondel** were both from Louisbourg⁴⁹

⁴² Baptême de Jean-Philippe Sekaquet.

⁴³ Baptême de Jeanne Elisabeth Fournier, 29 novembre 1769, doc. 51, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁴⁴ Mariage de Jean-Pierre Tournier et Perrine Boulot, 5 février 1765, doc. 13, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁴⁵ Baptême Margueritte Sekaquet.

⁴⁶ Baptême de Pierre Sebastien Banet, 6 août 1773, doc. 4, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁴⁷ “La Rochelle 1778: Paquebot “*LE BETHSY*,” in Poirier, 330. Mariage de Joseph Bannet et Anne Arondel.

⁴⁸ Baptême de Marguerite Banet, 10 juillet, doc. 7, v. 414, MG1-G1, LAC.

⁴⁹ “La Rochelle 1778: Paquebot “*LE BETHSY*,” in Poirier, 330. Mariage de Joseph Bannet et Anne Arondel.

Appendix B: Classification of Mi'kmaq Godparents

Unknown: 5 individuals (12% of total)

- Agathe
- Grégoire x 2
- Julien Gregoire
- Julienne

Mi'kmaq: 14 individuals (33% of total)

- Jacob Abamou
- Julienne Andress
- Anne... (Anne Sourien)
- Marie Barthelemi
- Jeanne Bonis
- Paul Bonis
- Pierre Bonis
- Anne Magdeleine Guillaume
- Isabelle (Isabelle Doucet)
- Julien Helie x 2
- Jacques Hobemouth
- Louis Hugo
- Etienne Remond (Raimond Etiennéhuit)

French or Acadian: 23 individuals (55% of total)

** indicates definite connections to Île Royale/ Cape Breton (24% of total)*

- Margueritte Banet*
- Pierre Banet*
- Jacques Cabos*
- Jean-Baptiste Colin
- Lisette Cormier
- Marie David*
- Jean Jacques Devers
- Jeanette Godbout
- Charlotte Guillaume
- Julien Herpin*
- Francoise Jaichot
- André La Vacquierre
- Anne Leblanc
- Jeanne Le Grand*
- Josephine Le Roy*
- Esther Loyer-Deslandes
- Anne Mancel*
- Jean Neveu
- René Sasaure

- Marie Sublime*
- Pierre Texier
- Pierre Tompic*
- Jeanette Turnier

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources:

Library and Archive Canada (LAC)

Manuscript Group 1 (MG1): Fonds des Colonies

Série C12: Correspondance général; Saint-Pierre et Miquelon

Série G1: Dépôt des papiers publics des colonies; état civil (1715-1830)

Manuscript Group 6-A2 (MG6-A2): Fonds des Archives départementales de la Charente-Maritime

Série E: Registres d'état civil

Manuscript Group 11 (MG11): Colonial Office Fonds

Colonial Office Papers 194. Newfoundland, Original Correspondence (1696-1922)

Colonial Office Papers 217. Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, Original Correspondence (1603-1867)

Colonial Office Papers 218. Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, Entry Books (1710-1867)

Published Primary Sources:

“1752 Census of Île Royale.” In *L'Acadie des ancêtres: Aven la généalogie des premières familles acadiennes*. Québec: Le Conseil de la Vie française en Amérique, 1955.

“Micmac Treaty 1760.” In *Maritime Indian Treaties in Historical Perspective*, W.E. Daugherty. Ottawa: Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, 1983. 86-87.

“Recensement St. Pierre 1765.” In *Les Acadiens aux îles Saint-Pierre et Miquelon 1758-1828*, Michel Poirier. Moncton: Les Éditions d'Acadie, 1984. 194-200.

“Recensement de mai 1767.” In *Les Acadiens aux îles Saint-Pierre et Miquelon 1758-1828*, Michel Poirier. Moncton: Les Éditions d'Acadie, 1984. 201-218.

“Recensement St. Pierre 1776.” In *Les Acadiens aux îles Saint-Pierre et Miquelon 1758-*

1828, Michel Poirier. Moncton: Les Éditions d'Acadie, 1984. 261-279.

“Recensement Miquelon 1776.” In *Les Acadiens aux îles Saint-Pierre et Miquelon 1758-1828*, Michel Poirier. Moncton: Les Éditions d'Acadie, 1984. 280-295.

R. v. Marshall, [1999] 3 S.C.R. 456

“Treaty of Paris, February 10, 1763.” In *Statutes, treaties and documents of the Canadian Constitution, 1713-1929*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1930. 31-34.

Secondary Sources:

Anderson, Fred. *The Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766*. New York: Vintage Books, 2000.

Arsenault, Bona. *L'Acadie des ancêtres: Avec la genealogie des premières familles acadiennes*. Québec: Le conseil de la vie française en Amérique, 1955.

---. *Histoire des Acadiens*. Québec: Éditions Fides, 2004.

Balcom, B.A. and A.J.B. Johnston. “Missions to the Mi'kmaq: Malagawatch and Chapel Island in the 18th Century.” *Journal of the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society*, v. 9 (2006), 115-140.

Bartels, Dennis A. and Olaf Janzen. “Micmac Migration to Western Newfoundland.” *Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, v. 10, no. 1 (1990), 71-96.

Bock, Philip K. “Micmac.” In *Handbook of North American Indians, v. 15: The Northeast*, ed. Bruce G. Trigger Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1978. 109-136.

Brasseaux, Carl A. *The Founding of New Acadia: The Beginnings of Acadian Life in Louisiana, 1765-1803*. Louisiana: Louisiana State Press, 1987.

Brière, Jean-François. “Pêche et politique à Terre-Neuve au XVIIIe siècle: la France véritable gagnante du traité d'Utrecht?” *Canadian Historical Review*, LXIV, 2 (1983), 168-187.

Breen, T.H. ““Baubles of Britain”: The American Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century.” *Past & Present*, issue 119 (May 1988), 73-104.

Brewer, John. *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783*. London: Unwyn Hyman, 1989.

Buckner, Phillip and John G. Reid, eds. *Remembering 1759: The Conquest of Canada in Historical Memory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.

- Burley, David V. "Proto-Historical Ecological Effects of the Fur Trade on Micmac Culture in Northeastern New Brunswick." *Ethnohistory*, v. 28, no. 3 (Summer 1981), 203-216.
- Cadigan, Sean T. *Hope and Deception in Conception Bay: Merchant-Settler Relations in Newfoundland, 1785-1855*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- . *Newfoundland and Labrador: A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Calloway, Colin G. *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Chute, Janet. "Ceremony, Social Revitalization and Change: Micmac Leadership and the Annual Festival of St. Anne." In *Papers of the 23rd Algonquian Conference*, ed. William Cowan. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1992. 45-61.
- Conkling, Robert. "Legitimacy and Conversion in Social Change: The Case of French Missionaries and the Northeastern Algonkian." *Ethnohistory*, v. 21, no.1 (Winter 1974), 1-21.
- Conrad, Margaret. *They Planted Well: New England Planters in Maritime Canada*. Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1988.
- . *Making Adjustments: Change and Continuity in Planter Nova Scotia, 1759-1800*. Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1991.
- Desbarats, Catherine and Allan Greer. "The Seven Years' War in Canadian History and Memory." In *Cultures in Conflict: The Seven Years' War in North America*, ed. Warren R. Hofstra. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2007. 145-178.
- Dickason, Olive Patricia. *Louisbourg and the Indians: A Study in Imperial Race Relations, 1713-1760*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976.
- . "Amerindians Between French and English in Nova Scotia, 1713-1763." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, v. 10, no. 4 (1986), 31-56.
- . "The Many Faces of Canada's History as It Relates to Aboriginal People." In *Walking a Tightrope: Aboriginal People and Their Representations*, eds. David McNab and Ute Lischke. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2005.
- Eccles, W.J. *The French in North America, 1500-1783*. Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside Limited, 1972.

- Englebert, Robert. "Beyond Borders: Mental Mapping and the French River World in North America." PhD Dissertation, University of Ottawa, 2010.
- Faragher, John Mack. "*A Great and Noble Scheme*": *The Tragic Story of the Expulsion of the French Acadians From their American Homeland*. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 2005.
- Gagnon, Allain-G. and Luc Turgeon. "Managing Diversity in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Canada: Québec's Constitutional Development in Light of the Scottish Experience." *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, v. 41, no. 1 (March 2003), 1-23.
- Galarneau, Claude. "Bailly de Messein, Charles-François." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online* [http://www.biographi.ca/009004-119.01-e.php?&id_nbr=1745]. Accessed 30 May 2012.
- Gitlin, Jay. *The Bourgeois Frontier: French Towns, French Traders, and American Expansion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Gold, John R. and Margaret M. Gold. "'The Graves of the Gallant Highlanders': Memory, Interpretation and Narratives of Culloden." *History and Memory*, v. 19, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2007), 5-38.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, "Cultural mobility: an introduction." In *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 1-23.
- Griffiths, Naomi. *From Migrant to Acadian, 1664-1755: A North American Border People*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005.
- Gywn, Julian. "Comparative Economic Advantage: Nova Scotia and New England, 1720s-1860s." In *New England and the Maritime Provinces*, eds. Stephen J. Hornsby and John G. Reid. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005. 94-108.
- Hofstra, Warren R. ed. *Cultures in Conflict: The Seven Years' War in North America*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2007.
- Janzen, Olaf. "'Une Grande Liason': French Fishermen from Ile Royale on the Coast of Southwestern Newfoundland 1714-1766 – A Preliminary Survey." *Newfoundland Studies*, v. 3, no. 2 (1987), 183-200.
- . "The Royal Navy and the Interdiction of Aboriginal Migration to Newfoundland, 1763-1766." *International Journal of Naval History*, v. 7, no. 2 (Aug. 2008), [e-journal].

- Johnston, A.J.B. *Storied Shores: Isle Madame, St. Peter's, Chapel Island in the 17th and 18th Centuries*. Sydney: University College of Cape Breton Press Inc., 2004.
- Jonah, Anne Marie Lane, "Unequal Transitions: Two Métis Women in Eighteenth-Century Île Royale." *French Colonial History*, v. 11 (2010), 109-129.
- . and Elizabeth Tait. "Filles d'Acadie, Femmes de Louisbourg: Acadian Women and French Colonial Society in Eighteenth Century Louisbourg." *French Colonial History*, v. 8 (2007), 23-51.
- Koren, Henry J. *Knaves or Knights? A History of the Spiritan Missionaries in Acadia and North America, 1732-1839*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1962.
- Lawson, Philip. *The Imperial Challenge: Quebec and Britain in the Age of the American Revolution*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989.
- . "A Perspective on British History and the Treatment of Quebec." *Journal of Historical Sociology*, v. 3, no. 3 (September 1990), 253-271.
- Lockerby, Early. "Maintaining the Alliance: A French Officer's Account of the Mi'kmaq, Maliseet, and Kennebec at Louisbourg in 1757." *Native Studies Review*, v. 18, no. 2 (2009), 1-25.
- Johnston, A.J.B. "Borderland Worries: Loyalty Oaths in Acadie/ Nova Scotia, 1654-1755." *French Colonial History*, v. 4 (2003), 31-48.
- Leblanc, Robert G. "The Acadian Migrations." In *French America" Mobility, Identity, and Minority Experience Across the Continent*, eds. Jean R. Louder and Eric Waddell. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993. 164-190.
- MacNeil, A.R. "The Acadian Legacy and Agricultural Development in Nova Scotia, 1760-1861." In *Farm, Factory and Fortune: New Studies in the Economic History of the Maritime Provinces*, ed. Kris Inwood. Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1993.
- Marshall, Ingeborg. "Beothuk and Micmac: Re-examining Relationships." *Acadiensis*, vol. 17, no. 2 (1988), 52-82.
- Marshall, P.J. *The Making and Unmaking of Empires: Britain, India, and America, c. 1750-1783*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Martijn, Charles. "An Eastern Micmac Domain of Islands." *Papers of the Twentieth Algonquian Conference*, ed. William Cowan. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1989. 208-231.

- . "Mi'kmaq in the Parish Registers of the Islands of Saint-Pierre et Miquelon, 1764-1848." [<http://www.cbu.ca/mrc/stpierre-miquelon>], September 1996.
- . "Early Mi'kmaq Presence In Southern Newfoundland: An Ethnohistorical Perspective, c. 1500-1763." *Newfoundland Studies*, v. 19, no. 1 (2003), 44-102.
- Miller, James Rodger. *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000 (third edition).
- . *Compact, Contract, Covenant: Aboriginal Treaty-Making in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Miquelon, Dale, ed. *Society and Conquest: The Debate on the Bourgeoisie and Societal Change in French Canada, 1700-1850* (Vancouver: Copp Clark Publishers, c1977).
- . "Envisioning the French Empire: Utrecht 1711-1713." *French Historical Studies*, v. 24, no. 4 (Fall 2001), 653-677.
- Patterson, Stephen E. "Indian-White Relations in Nova Scotia, 1749-61: A Study in Political Interaction." *Acadiensis*, v. 23, no. 1 (Autumn 1993), 23-59.
- . "Eighteenth Century Treaties: The Mi'kmaq, Maliseet, and Passamaquoddy Experience." *Native Studies Review*, v. 18, no. 1 (2009), 25-52.
- Pincus, Steven C.A. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Plank, Geoffrey. *An Unsettled Conquest: The British Campaign Against the Peoples of Acadia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Podruchny, Carolyn. "Baptizing Novices: Ritual Moments Among French Canadian Voyageurs in the Montreal Fur Trade, 1780-1821." *The Canadian Historical Review*, 83, 2, (June 2002), 165-195.
- Poirier, Michel. *Les Acadiens aux îles Saint-Pierre et Miquelon 1758-1828*. Moncton: Les Éditions d'Acadie, 1984.
- Pope, Peter E. *Fish into Wine: The Newfoundland Plantation in the Seventeenth Century*. United States: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Prins, Harald E.L. *The Mi'kmaq: Resistance, Accommodation, and Survival*. Fort Worth: Hartcourt Brace, 1996.
- Rannie, William F. *Saint Pierre and Miquelon*. Beamsville, Ontario: Rannie Publications Limited, 1968 (third edition).

- Reid, John G. *Pax Britannica or Pax Indigena? Planter Nova Scotia (1760-1782) and Competing Strategies of Pacification.* *The Canadian Historical Review*, v. 85, no. 4 (December 2004), 669-692.
- . "Empire, the Maritime Colonies, and the Supplanting of Mi'kma'ki/Wulstukwik, 1780-1820." *Acadiensis*, v. 38, no. 2 (Summer/Autumn 2009), 78-97.
- Reid, Stuart and Gerry Embleton. *Culloden Moor 1746: The Death of the Jacobite Cause*. Great Britain: Osprey Publishing, 2002.
- Schwoerer, Lois G. "The Glorious Revolution as Spectacle: A New Perspective." In *England's Rise to Greatness, 1660-1763*, ed. Stephen Bartow Baxter. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983. 109-149.
- Sleeper-Smith, Susan. "Women, Kin, and Catholicism: New Perspectives on the Fur Trade." *Ethnohistory*, 47, 2 (Spring 2000), 423-452.
- Smith, Joshua M. "Humbert's Paradox: The Global Context of Smuggling in the Bay of Fundy." In *New England and the Maritime Provinces*, eds. Stephen J. Hornsby and John G. Reid. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005. 108-124.
- Statistics Canada. "Minorities in Canada – Francophones in New Brunswick." [<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-642-x/2011005/article/conclusion-eng.htm>]. Accessed 28 June 2012.
- Trigger, Bruce R. "The Historians' Indian: Native Americans in Canadian Historical Writing from Charlevoix to the Present." *Canadian Historical Review*, LVXVII, no. 3, (1986), 315-342.
- Thorpe, Frederick J. "The Debating Talents of the First Governor of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, François-Gabriel d'Angeac, 1764-1769." *Newfoundland Studies*, v. 18, no. 1 (2002), 61-83.
- Upton, L.F.S. *Micmacs and Colonists: Indian-White Relations in the Maritimes, 1713-1867*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1979.
- Wallis, Wilson D. and Ruth S. Wallis. *The Micmac Indians of Eastern Canada*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955.
- White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011 (twentieth anniversary edition).
- Whitehead, Ruth Holmes. *The Old Man Told Us: Excerpts from Micmac History 1500-*

1950. Halifax: Nimbus Publishing Limited, 1991.
- Wicken, William. "Encounters with Tall Sails and Tall Tales: Mi'kmaq Society 1500-1760." PhD Dissertation, McGill University, 1994.
- . "Re-examining Mi'kmaq-Acadian Relations, 1635-1755." In *Vingt ans après: Habitants et marchands: lectures de l'histoire des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles canadiens*, eds. Sylvie Dépatie, Catherine Desbarats, et al. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998. 93-114.
- . *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial: History, Land and Donald Marshall Junior*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.