

SUBMISSION

**To the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs for the Government of Canada
and
To the Ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones for the Government of Québec**

**Regarding the Slaughtering of Nunavik “Qimmiit” (Inuit Dogs)
from the mid-1950s to the late 1960s**



(Photo: Masiu Ningiuruvik, circa 1960)

SUBMITTED BY:

**Makivik Corporation
January, 2005**

*This Submission is made on a without prejudice basis and under reserve of all the legal and other rights
and recourses in this matter available to the Inuit of Québec*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
A. The Nunavik Territory and its inhabitants	2
B. Makivik Corporation	2
II. Nunavik Qimmiit Killings	2
A. Qimmiit	2
1. Physical description and attributes	2
2. Importance of Nunavik Qimmiit	3
B. Historical Context	6
C. Government Activities Regarding Nunavik Qimmiit	8
1. Disease Control	8
2. Wandering Dogs	9
D. The Killings - Testimonies by Nunavik Inuit	12
E. Consequences	16
III. Government's Responsibility for the Nunavik Qimmiit Killings and Consequences	22
IV. Demands	24
V. Annexes	25

I INTRODUCTION

According to the Inuit of Nunavik, Northern Québec, a series of “Qimmik” (Inuit dog) slaughters were undertaken or ordered to be undertaken by Canada and Québec government officials or their representatives in several Nunavik communities during the time period spanning from the mid-1950s until the late 1960s. They claim that government officials and their representatives did not hold effective consultation with Nunavik Inuit, nor seek nor obtain their consent to the slaughters. Nunavik Inuit seek an acknowledgement of these events and remedial measures.

The importance of the sled dog to Inuit cannot be overstated. The actual dog killings and their dramatic consequences on Inuit and their culture will be described in the present brief, primarily through the testimonies of elders from Nunavik who experienced or witnessed the loss of the dogs. These accounts were compiled by interviewers mandated by Makivik Corporation, principally during the years 1999 and 2000. Quotes from these interviews, all translated from Inuktitut, will often be inserted into the body of the text.

The governments’ rationale for implementing measures that led to the killings seems to have been based on a concern for health and public safety. However, the governments were negligent in the manner in which they approached what they considered to be a problem with Qimmiit in Nunavik communities and negligent in the devise and implementation of their solutions.

In March 2000, Makivik Corporation formulated a request to the Québec government for a public inquiry to be undertaken into the dog killings in Nunavik during the period 1950-1975.¹ Also in March 2000 Makivik Corporation, in collaboration with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, made a similar request to the Federal government.² Neither the Québec government³ nor the Canadian government⁴ at that time accepted Makivik’s request.

Makivik Corporation is once again requesting that a public inquiry be undertaken.

¹ Letter from Pita Aatami, President, Makivik Corporation, to The Honourable Guy Chevrette, Ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones, Gouvernement du Québec (March 28 2000).

² Letter from Pita Aatami, President, Makivik Corporation and Pauloosie Keyootak, President, Qikiqtani Inuit Association, to The Honourable Robert Nault, Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, Canada (March 29 2000).

³ Letter from Guy Chevrette, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones, Gouvernement du Québec to Pita Aatami, President, Makivik Corporation dated June 21 2000 and letter from Serge Ménard, ministre de la Sécurité publique to Pita Aatami, President, Makivik Corporation dated (September 5 2000).

⁴ Letter from Lawrence MacAulay, Solicitor General of Canada to Pita Aatami, President, Makivik Corporation and Pauloosie Keyootak, President, Qikiqtani Inuit Association, (December 1 2000).

A. The Nunavik Territory and its inhabitants

The vast territory of Quebec north of the 55th parallel, now known as Nunavik, covers more than 560,000 square kilometres. The Inuit have inhabited Nunavik for at least 4,000 years. Through their knowledge of the land, Inuit developed skills and technology uniquely adapted to one of the harshest and most demanding environments on earth.

Approximately ten thousand (10,000) Inuit reside in the fifteen (15) Nunavik communities today.

B. Makivik Corporation

Makivik Corporation was created in 1978 pursuant to the signing of the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement (JBNQA). Makivik is the recognized Inuit Party to this Agreement. A not for profit corporation, its central mandate is the protection of the integrity of the JBNQA and it focuses on the political, social, and economic development of the Nunavik region. The members of the Makivik Board of Directors include sixteen (16) community representatives and five (5) Executive Directors universally elected by the Inuit residents of Nunavik.

II. NUNAVIK QIMMIIT KILLINGS

A. Qimmiit

1. Physical description and attributes

"The Eskimo dog has the persistence and tenacity of the wild animal, and at the same time the domestic dog's admirable devotion to its master. It is the wildest breath of Nature, and the warmest breath of civilization." (Otto Svendrup, 1904 *New Lands*, Vol. 1, p. 18)

The Qimmik, also known as the Inuit dog, Eskimo dog and Husky dog, is the last remaining aboriginal dog of the Americas.⁵ It is remarkably adapted to life in the arctic climate and has an observable desire to pull in harness. It is a deeply ingrained behavioural trait of the Inuit dog breed and dogs have been known to pull without quitting until they died in their harnesses.⁶

⁵ Ian Kenneth MacRury, *The Inuit Dog: Its Provenance, Environment and History*, Master of Philosophy in Polar Studies thesis, Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge (1991) at p. 1.

⁶ *Ibid* at p. 24.

The characteristics of a pure bred Qimmik, as described in the Ivakkak website⁷, include a robust and muscular body, with a slightly long and straight back, stumpy neck, strong, deep, broad thorax and sturdy legs. It has a wide head with a dome-shaped skull, a square pointed muzzle, short, erect, triangular-shaped ears and almond-shaped generally brown eyes. The tail is bushy and curls up just above the small of the back. Its fur is thick, straight and long or semi-long. Qimmiit weigh 25 to 50 kg and measure at least 55 to 60 centimetres from the withers.

2. Importance of Nunavik Qimmiit

"In the past, a man without dogs wasn't a man" (Paulusie Weetaluktuk, Inukjuak)

Until the 1940s and 1950s, the need to search for food and to follow the resources on the land meant that Inuit led a nomadic existence. Dog teams were central to the lives of Inuit. Inuit depended on the Qimmiit to survive. They were the only means of transportation. They were also the key element in hunting practices (for example, dogs would find seal breathing holes for hunters). Dogs could find their way home in a storm. They have been known to rescue the lives of people. Even when they died, dogs had their importance. Inuit would make use of the flesh to feed the other dogs and would use the fur for parka hoods. In periods of starvation the dogs could be eaten to enable families to survive. The dogs were not simply companion animals; they were an essential means of survival.

"The relationship between the Qimmiit and Inuit could be described as symbiotic. One could not have survived without the other." (Robbie Watt, Kuujjuaq)

"The Qimmiit (...) were survival tools. In a blizzard, where you can't see anything, they could bring their master home. They are the real reason why people survived (...) the Qimmiit were the first ones to realize when the ice was dangerous, the first ones to recognize danger...the Qimmiit are the reason why I am alive today." (Mark Uninnak, Aupaluk)

"My grandmother often told me that I am still alive today because of our Qimmiit". (Paulusie Cookie, Umiujaq)

"They were the most important resource in our life... they were our basic tools for living. The most important things in our lives were the dog teams and qajaks; they were all we used to hunt for food, in those days." (Naala Nappaaluk, Kangiqsujuaq)

"... during spring time if the Qimmiit were to fall in the water while travelling on ice they would simply get back up on the ice. They would also know where to travel even during whiteout storms when we did not know where we were heading. The Qimmiit could even travel at night and find the trail without our guidance." (Charlie Okpik, Quaqtak)

⁷ Ivakkak website: www.ivakkak.com

"They were the most important part of our lives. We would become anxious if we were running out of Qimmiit and when their food supplies would run low..." (David Oovaut, Quaqtq)

"The Inuit and Qimmiit were very knowledgeable of the land and never got lost even when they travelled everywhere (...) They were our only means of transportation, I don't think anyone would have survived without the use of dog teams. They were used for long distance travel and hunting. Even when the Inuit were starving, they used to survive by eating their dogs (...) We used them for trapping, hunting, to transport our belongings to shore when we had to travel by qayak in the spring...I've seen a few summer dogs .. which they used for caribou hunting during summertime." (Issacie Padlayat, Salluit)

"...one time Juugini was out hunting at the open sea during winter and he fell in the water and was drowning and the only help he got was from a dog. As he was drowning, his own dog saved him (...) during a starvation period, Juugini was very hungry and freezing and (...) he killed one dog and ate it." (Mary Irraju Anugaaq Sr., Kangiqsujuaq)

"They were the most treasured possessions." (Eva Ilimasaut, Kangiqsujuaq)

Qimmiit were so important that Inuit would sometimes prioritize feeding the dogs to feeding their families. There was also a spiritual dimension to the relationship. For example, there was a belief that dogs would become sick so that humans would remain healthy; that the Qimmiit would take on diseases to protect humans.

The historical importance of the dog to Inuit cannot be overstated. According to Ken MacRury who conducted a master's thesis on the subject of the Qimmik:

*"The association of the Inuit and their dogs was an enduring and significant aspect of life in the Arctic region for over a thousand years. The one was dependent upon the other for their mutual existence in an extreme environment."*⁸

Mr. MacRury postulates that the domestic Qimmik was present in the Arctic from the earliest occupancy of hunting humans⁹ and he adeptly summarized the importance of the Qimmiit as follows:

*"The Inuit dog is foremost a draught animal used by the Inuit in their long distance hunting expeditions and when moving from one hunting location to another. The dogs are also companions and assistants essential to the Inuit in the hunting of seal, polar bear and muskox. The Inuit dog, in times of general starvation, was also eaten by its owners. The fur of the Inuit dog was used for clothing..."*¹⁰

⁸ MacRury, *supra*, note 5 at p. 40

⁹ *Ibid.* at p. 46

¹⁰ *Ibid* at p. 39

In an article entitled "The dogs of the Inuit: companions in survival", Lynn Peplinski, at one time Manager of the Iqaluit Research Centre, Science Institute of the Northwest Territories, described the value of the Qimmiit.

"With the ability to travel being central to the successful survival of northern cultures, the value of the working dog is immeasurable. As hunting companion, pack and draught animal, the Inuit dog (Canis familiaris borealis) enhanced the ability of the Inuit and their ancestors to move from place to place, toting their few belongings, in the constant search for game.

While hunting with its master on the vast expanse of sea ice, the Inuit dog's superior olfactory sense would allow it to sniff out the seal's breathing hole (alluk), an opening a few centimetres in diameter on the surface of the ice concealing an inverted funnel reaching several feet across at its base. The breathing hole, which is gnawed and scratched out by the seal through several feet of ice, is detectable only by a slightly protruding mound on the surface of the sea ice. Once an "active" alluk was located, the hunter might stoop for hours, harpoon at the ready, in anticipation of the return of the seal.

As a hunting companion, the Inuit dog's predatory skills have helped stack the odds of locating and retrieving game in the hunters' favour. This, in a harsh environment where animals were almost the sole source of all that was needed to sustain life."¹¹

Qimmiit were at one time indispensable to anyone wishing to travel in the North. The RCMP themselves used Qimmiit in their patrols. Qimmiit were also invaluable to successful early Arctic and Antarctic exploration and scientific investigation. Captain R.E. Peary, who claimed attainment of the North Pole in 1909, depended on the Qimmiit as his means of transport. He credited discovery of the North Pole to the dogs: "...it is an absolute certainty that it [the North Pole] would still be undiscovered but for the Eskimo dog to furnish traction power for our sledges ... enabling us to carry supplies where nothing else could carry them".¹² Roald Amundsen, whose party was the first to attain the South Pole in 1911, fully acknowledged the importance of Qimmiit as a key element in the success of this achievement.

¹¹Peplinski, Lynn, *The dogs of the Inuit: companions in survival*, www.fao.org/ag/AGa/AGAP/WAR/warall/W0613b/w0613b0m.htm

¹² Peary, R.E. *Secrets of polar travel*, The Century Co., New York (1917) at p. 196, as quoted in MacRury, *supra*, note 9 at p. 41.

B. Historical Context

Administration of Nunavik

The Supreme Court decision, Re Eskimo ([1939] S.C.R. 104), confirmed the Federal Government's responsibility towards Inuit. Although Nunavik has been part of the territory of Quebec since the coming into force of the Québec Boundaries Extension Act of 1912, the federal government administered this portion of the province exclusively from the time it became active in northern Canada, around the end of the Second World War, until the 1960s.

During the time it decided to administer Nunavik, the Federal government provided services such as health, education and welfare. The first Federal Day Schools, for example, were opened in 1949 and the RCMP established its first Nunavik detachment at Port Harrison (now Inukjuak) in 1936 and a second one at Fort Chimo (now Kuujjuaq) in 1942. Federal administrators were later posted in other Nunavik settlements.

In addition to crime-related work, which represented a small portion of their actual duties, RCMP officers accomplished many administrative functions, such as the distribution of welfare, the keeping of vital statistics and the carrying out of an annual dog vaccination program.

Until 1960, Québec assumed no responsibility for the Inuit of Nunavik. In 1960, however, Québec's newly elected Liberal government's agenda included the development of Nunavik's natural resources. In the 1960s and 1970s, the provincial and federal governments undertook ongoing negotiations and the Québec Government gradually assumed responsibility for the various government services in Nunavik.¹³

In 1960, the Quebec police force established detachments in two settlements and the RCMP were withdrawn.¹⁴ The Quebec police did not take on many of the social tasks previously performed by the RCMP and appear to have intended to take over policing activities only.¹⁵

In 1962, Premier Lesage wrote the first official correspondence regarding Québec's intention to assume responsibility for administering Northern Québec to Prime Minister Diefenbaker.¹⁶ In 1963, the first provincial school in Nunavik opened. Also in 1963, the *Direction Générale du Nouveau-Québec* was established.

¹³ See, for example, Draft Memorandum to Cabinet, 1964, presented by Arthur Laing, the Minister of Northern Affairs and National resources; Memo from G.W.Rowley, Secretary, ACND, to Deputy Minister ACND (February 28 1962) relating a conversation with Eric Gourdeau, Deputy Director of Planning in the Natural Resources Department (Québec) regarding the transition of authority.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, Draft Memorandum to Cabinet, 1964.

¹⁵ *Ibid*.

¹⁶ Letter from Premier Jean Lesage to Prime Minister John Diefenbaker (December 27 1962).

As the two levels of government were working out their respective responsibilities over Nunavik, the Inuit themselves were beginning the uphill battle to regain control of their own destiny. These parallel developments culminated in 1975 with the signing of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, which gave the Inuit extensive responsibilities in the areas of economic and social development, education, the environment, and territorial management.

Settlement in permanent communities

The establishment of schools and nursing stations had an enormous effect on the Inuit way of life and accelerated the transition from a nomadic to a settled existence. School attendance by children was a pre-requisite for Inuit to receive family allowance and welfare payments.¹⁷

"A lot of our culture started changing gradually, as the education buildings and teachers started arriving. During the 1960s we were first told that we should no longer go camping in order to get schooling and as we were told that, we started to reside in one place, when we were from all over the place." (Luukasi Nappaaluk, Kangiqsujaq)

Between 1953 and 1957, the Canadian Government relocated several individual Inuit and families from the vicinity of Inukjuak, Québec, to Resolute Bay and Craig Harbour/Grise Fiord. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, in its report on the High Arctic Relocation concluded that "the relocation took place at a time when the government was concerned about *de facto* Canadian sovereignty arising from the presence of the United States in the Arctic (...) The weight of the evidence points to sovereignty as a material consideration in the relocation decision, although the primary concerns were social and economic."¹⁸

Introduction of the Snowmobile

The snowmobile was slowly introduced in Nunavik over a period of several years in the 1960s and early 1970s. There was, in most cases, a lapse of time during which hunters were immobilized due to the loss of their dogs (pursuant to the killings) and to the inaccessibility of snowmobiles.

Despite acknowledging the usefulness of snowmobiles, nearly everyone interviewed noted its unreliability, expense and the advantages of dog team travel over snowmobile travel.

There is some evidence to suggest that the governments perceived dogs as competing with Inuit for food resources. The Federal Government, in collaboration with the

¹⁷ Kativik School Board internet site: www.kativik.qc.ca

¹⁸ Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, "*Shedding New Light on the Relocation: Summary of the Commission's Conclusions*" (1994).

Humane Society, initiated distribution of dog food to several communities in the former NWT and in Nunavik around the years 1965-1966. The project was entitled "Operation Artichow".¹⁹

Also in 1965, the Federal Government commissioned a study by Dr. Milton Freeman on the role of the sled dog in the changing economy of the population of the eastern Arctic.²⁰ In his argument for the need for a study of working dogs, Mr. G.W. Rowley noted two points that reflect government's concerns with the dogs at the time: (1) the dogs were in competition with the Inuit for food resources; and (2) the important and increasing cost of the rabies vaccination program. He stated: "Working dogs depend on just the same resources as the Eskimos. There are more dogs than Eskimos, and they consume a greater quantity of food. They are therefore in direct competition with the Eskimos for the limited renewable resources of the country. (...) Rabies is very common among Eskimo dogs and they are carriers of other diseases. This necessitates a prophylactic program costing nearly \$20,000 in the past year and covering only Northern Quebec and Baffin Island. The cost will increase as the program is extended." It is significant that he also noted that no data existed on how many "unnecessary dogs" were in the North.²¹

In 1966, despite Mr. Rowley's recommendation for continued funding²², the government seems to have decided to the contrary and without financing, Milton Freeman was unable to complete the originally requested study.²³

C. Government Activities Regarding Nunavik Qimmiit

Government activities regarding Qimmiit in northern Quebec almost exclusively dealt with the issue of disease control and the issue of loose dogs in communities.

1. Disease Control

The Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources along with the RCMP and, to a lesser extent, the Federal Department of Agriculture played a role in dealing with disease control among Nunavik Qimmiit.²⁴

Specifically in terms of rabies, the federal authorities were responsible for controlling outbreaks and epidemics relating to the disease.²⁵ The Federal Department of Agriculture supplied the necessary serums for anti-rabies injections for the Qimmiit in Nunavik.²⁶

¹⁹ Letter from A. Stevenson, Administrator of the Arctic to Mr. Hughes, Ontario Humane Society (January 25 1966).

²⁰ Letter from G.W. Rowley to Mr. Gordon (March 5 1965).

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Letter from G.W. Rowley to Mr. Gordon (August 19 1966).

²³ Verbal information provided by Mr. Milton Freeman (December 2002).

²⁴ Memo from A. Stevenson, Administrator of the Arctic (April 18 1963).

²⁵ Memo from the Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources (December 17 1962).

²⁶ Letter from C.M Boger, Nov. 3rd, 1960; Letter from K,F, Wells, Nov. 8th, 1960.

During the take-over of the region's administration by the Québec government, it appears that there was a lapse of time during which the vaccination program was unimplemented. An exchange of correspondence in February and March 1966 between the Sûreté Provinciale du Québec, the Ministry of Justice and DIAND addresses the subject of rabies encountered among the dog populations in Fort-Chimo (now Kuujuuaq) and Poste-de-la-Baleine (now Kuujuaraapik). This exchange of correspondence demonstrates that the lack of action by the government led to a situation where there was no other alternative but to kill the dogs in Poste-de-la-Baleine. This is one example of the insensitive approach of government towards the importance of dogs in the way of life of the Nunavik population. A translation of an extract of a letter addressed by Sûreté du Québec officer Richard Dubé is self-explanatory:

“In September 1965 I made a request to Mr. Edmond Bernier, Engineer at the Department of Natural Resources, in order to obtain injections against rabies. He stated to me that he would take care of it as soon as he returned to Quebec City. In November 1965, I phoned Mr. Bernier to remind him of the importance of obtaining injections against rabies for Great-Whale-River. Both these requests have, to date, remained unanswered, and today in Great-Whale-River we have many cases of rabies.

It should be mentioned that none of the Departments in Great-Whale-River have taken steps to obtain injections. At this stage, the only remedy being used is to kill the dogs.”²⁷

2. Wandering Dogs

Both Canada and Québec enforced sections 11 and 12 of the Québec *Agricultural Abuses Act*, R.S.Q. 1941, c. 139 (hereinafter the *Act*). This law was entirely inappropriate for application in Nunavik.

The relevant sections of the *Act*, unchanged to date, state:

“11. Every owner, possessor or custodian of a dog, is forbidden to allow it to wander in territory which is not organized, between the first of May and the fifteenth of December.”

12. Any person may destroy a dog found wandering in violation of the provisions of the previous section.”

Some government representatives working in Nunavik recognized the inappropriateness of enforcing the *Act* in the region. W.G. Kerr, a Northern Service Officer in 1960

²⁷ Letter dated February 10, 1966

criticized the application of the *Act* in Nunavik and stated that "...I personally do not think that "wandering" dogs create any greater hazard than does the normal automobile traffic of southern Canada. In the south we warn our children of the necessary safe-guards and there is no reason why we can't do the same in the North. It is also my experience that a tied up dog, if approached by children, is more dangerous than a "wandering" one."²⁸

Local administrators' opinions do not seem to have been taken into account. The loose dog issue was such an important concern to the federal administration during its presence in Nunavik that in November 1958, Alvin Hamilton, then Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, wrote to the then Premier of the Province of Quebec, Maurice Duplessis to request "consideration to the amendment of the Agricultural Abuses Act to permit the shooting of dogs wandering at large in unorganized territory of Québec at any time of the year, rather than from May 1st to December 15th only."²⁹

The Québec police force also seems to have taken a narrow approach to the issue of loose dogs, as evidenced by a 1964 internal Surete du Quebec correspondence in which the Chief Inspector recommended that the only solution to the issue of loose dogs in Port Harrison (now Inukjuaq) was the enforcement of the *Act*.³⁰

The governments at the time failed to secure Nunavik Inuit understanding, cooperation and consent in addressing what it perceived to be a problem with wandering dogs. In addition, in attempting to simply enforce the *Act*, the governments and their representatives did not fully understand the nature of the alleged problem of roaming dogs.

Many of the individuals interviewed stated their traditional belief that tying up Qimmiit was unhealthy and caused the dogs to become vicious. Tying up dogs thus resulted in endangering people. There is a need for dogs, especially Qimmiit, to be socialized. Tying up dogs, especially young dogs, caused a lack of appropriate human-dog socialisation, which in turn caused the dogs to become more aggressive. If, in addition to the lack of socialization allowing the dogs to accept humans as dominant, the dogs were hungry, the danger posed by the dogs to humans increased significantly. The government's misunderstanding of the situation led to a serious problem.

Ken MacRury confirms that the "Inuit dog seems to require earlier and more intensive socializing than other breeds to develop its emotional attachment to humans." Many of the elders interviewed noted that as children, they had spent much time playing with puppies. According to MacRury, if the pups were left until even eight weeks of age without human handling, they will be wild and unmanageable dogs exhibiting strong "fear aggression".³¹

²⁸ Memo from W.G. Kerr, Northern Service Officer, to Mr. Stevenson, Northern Affairs (June 3 1960).

²⁹ Letter from Alvin Hamilton to Maurice Duplessis dated November 17 1958.

³⁰ Letter from F. de Miffonis, Inspecteur chef to Le Commandant, Subdivision de Hull, SQ (October 26 1964).

³¹ MacRury, *supra* note 5 at p. 25.

"When dogs are used to being tied up they will tire more easily and will be more dangerous. They will become more dangerous when their interaction with people is reduced." (Davidee Niviaxie, Umiujaq)

"There was never any need to tie them up and we avoided that. [If they were tied up] they would have been more dangerous and tire more easily and not run as fast [as they normally would]... Today's dogs are more dangerous than in the past as they are being kept tied and they are not around children as much as they had in the past. Our dogs used to be gentle to our children as they recognized them as part of the family." (David Oouvaut, Quaqtuq)

"The governments tried to eliminate us by eliminating the dogs we depended on for survival but fortunately the Inuit are able to withstand hardships. When we owned dog teams, we never used to keep them tied up, once you tie up your dogs, you limit their ability and they would get weak and lose weight. The dogs used to keep the community clean too by eating leftovers." (Issacie Padlayat, Salluit)

"...in our customs there were a lot of regulations, though it seems typical that the Inuit don't have regulations, but in spite of that assumption, we did have a lot of regulations. For example, in raising dog team, while they're still puppies we had to stretch the legs, and rub their underarms, tickle them in order for them to get used to the harnesses, we did that during summer. While they're becoming adolescent dogs, we would have to take them for walks with their harnesses on. If they are not tamed that way, they cannot become anything. I mentioned about tickling, because when they are harnessed they are irritated if they were not tamed in this way while they're still puppies, and they are not comfortable to run if they are not used to being stretched on their forepaws while they're puppies, doing all kinds of stretching on the paws, and feeding them with soup, making sure that they don't get into the habit of being hungry (...) that was how it was. It seemed that there was no less work for them even during summer. We would make them run with their harnesses on, in order to keep them fit. If the Qimmiit are not tamed that way they cannot be part of a dog team, they would not know how to run appropriately, they would be stubborn. We trained a lead dogs from the beginning, while they're puppies." (Papikattuq Sakiagaq, Salluit)

For the above-mentioned reasons, many Inuit refused to comply with the orders to tie up their dogs. Those who did attempt to comply faced logistical problems due to a lack of materials strong enough to restrain a Qimmik.

"We used any type of rope, and seal skin ropes, at that time there were no chains." (Urpigaq Ilimasaut, Kangiqsujaq)

"Since my dogs were not used to being tied up it was difficult to try to keep them under control as at that time we did not have available means (...) such as collars and chains." (Eli Elijasiapik, Inukjuak)

"They were loose because the stores didn't offer any collars and chains for sale and the police didn't have any of those themselves. When we came to this community, we used to camp just outside of it and we would try to have our dogs tied up with rope. They would become loose especially at night so we ended up having to get up at night checking if our dogs got loose." (Daniel Inukpuk, Inukjuak)

D. The Killings - Testimonies by Nunavik Inuit (Nunavimmiut)

Reports from and interviews held with over 100 Nunavik residents indicate that during the period 1955 to 1969, government representatives and police forces undertook a massive killing of Qimmiit throughout Nunavik. Not only did Nunavimmiut not consent to this extermination program, they were never even properly consulted as to the necessity or appropriateness for such a program.

The interviews and reports suggest that the manner in which the massive dog killing was executed was arbitrary, abusive, at times done in a negligent and dangerous manner and unnecessarily cruel vis-à-vis the Inuit owners of the Qimmiit.

The interviews were conducted men and women who had witnessed or been affected by the sled dog killings. Many interviews indicate that a very large number, if not all, dogs were killed in most Nunavik communities. Due to the passage of time, it was difficult for interviewees to pinpoint the exact date the dog killings occurred in their communities.

Taamusi Qumaq provided the following account in an article entitled "L'avenir de l'inuktitut" (as translated by Louis-Jacques Dorais):

"In 1968, the Qimmiit were shot with rifles; it was an order from the Sûreté du Québec. At the time, there were only two or three snowmobiles in each village. In some, however, there were none. We learned that a Quebec regulation ordered the killing of the dogs. Inuit who did not yet have a snowmobile found that regulation difficult to accept since they were being asked to shoot dogs that were not restrained and that represented their only means to obtain food... The problem must be considered in the following way: who wouldn't be angry if ordered to eliminate their only means of transportation, their only means of obtaining food in winter?"

In those days, the Inuit had a hard time making money. Indeed, without their dogs they had to devote much effort, in winter, to obtain country food and products to exchange for money, such as fox pelts and soapstone sculptures."³²

Nearly every report indicates that the orders for the killings were given by the police or by other government representatives in the communities. For example, the late Ittukutaaq Saviarjuk of Salluit stated: "the police were doing the killing presumably under orders

³² Qumaq, Taamusi, "L'avenir de l'inuktitut" 343 Les Langues autochtones du Québec. Translated from Inuktitut by Louis-Jacques Dorais.

from the government". In Kangirsuk, Peter Nassak stated "I know of one Qallunaak (non-Inuk) who was a teacher who did most of the killing of the dogs, including mine. I believe he may have been ordered by both the provincial and federal governments as I can only presume that he wouldn't have done such a thing on his own."

"In February 1961 a policeman came into town. We asked: 'why did the dogs have to be slaughtered?' and their answer was that they attacked people. (...) I think half of the population of dogs were killed. Even though the men cherished their dogs, they tried picking the ones they cherished less than others and brought them down to the sea ice to be put to death. They were being shot down there nearby the dump, because there used to be a dump on the sea ice. (...)

Unfortunately I do not remember the name of the policeman, he had moustache, he was a big man and he came from Kuujjuaq, saying that he was mandated to reduce the number of dogs, because there had been too many incidents of dogs attacking people (...) But they went too quick in taking action before consulting the Inuit. Those communities where there were incidents of dogs attacking their residents were given the right solution of having the dogs killed, but those communities whose dogs were okay (...) were stripped of their property." (Lucasi Nappaluk, Kangiqsujaq)

"I believe we had eight of our dogs killed. We were informed by the teachers and missionaries that all of the dogs had to be killed. That was not comprehensible as we had no stores, we had no snowmobiles and our dogs had to be killed! How were we to go on? I had numerous small children to take care of and their father had no choice but to approve of the killing. We heard that the police of whom we were 'iligasutuq' (intimidated by) were to do the killing. We were informed that there was a small child attacked and killed in Kangirsuk and that was the reason for having to kill the dogs although no one was ever attacked by dogs in our community." (Susie Aloupa, Quaqtac)

"Without providing any explanation to any of us, the Quebec Police would systematically start shooting the dogs that were loose around the community. I can particularly recall a residential house that used to be shot at, with the occupants inside, when the dogs were hiding under it. The walls were riddled with shotgun pellets that had penetrated inside. It is regretful that this house doesn't exist anymore as it would be a testament to the incident that happened at that time." (Cuniliusie Emudluk, Kangiqsualujjuaq)

"I believe it was the Police that arrived from Kuujjuaq. I can only recall that it was some intimidating white man that gave an order for the killing." (Charlie Okpik, Quaqtac)

"The police or rather the Quebec government agents had given orders to shoot dogs that were going around loose. All the dogs had to be tied up or risk getting shot if they got loose. It came to a point where I couldn't even sleep at night trying to keep the dogs alive. We used to watch out for each other's dogs and avoided getting them shot and killed and that was how we limited the killing of our dogs." (Eli Qumaaluk, Puvirnituc)

"I was angered when they started to kill my best lead dogs and when they killed the last of the breeding females (...) I couldn't speak the qallunaak language and there wasn't anyone available to interpret for me (...) It was ironic to see the dead dogs being pulled away on a sled by dogs to the place of cremation when the slaughter was still going on (...) we had to transport them (the four police officers) by dog team to the plane that was awaiting their departure." (David Etok, Kangiqsualujuaq)

"It seems that they don't comprehend how useful the dogs are to the Inuit. Whenever they were angered by the dogs or if they were troubled by them they would just shoot them. It was as if the qallunaat didn't understand their usefulness to our lives." (Markussie Ittuq, Kangirsuk)

According to reports in Kangiqsujuaq, the dogs were brought to the sea ice, shot and then the carcasses were burned. Maata Tuniq remembers: *"They were burned and left where they were, it became spring when they were still that way, so we use to see them dead down there. Even though they had been burned they were visible and the site had become a garbage dump right away after the event, down on the sea ice."*

The fact that the owners could not even skin their dogs for the fur indicates how insensitive the government representatives were to the Inuit way of life.

"The fur was not given back, I don't understand why?!?" (Maata Tuniq, Kangiqsujuaq)

"They were burned on the sea ice. They were simultaneously burned as they were killed(...). The skins were not saved (...). Prior to this time they used to be saved for fur trimmings, and they should have saved the good quality dog skins for trimming." (Naala Napaaluk, Kangiqsujuaq)

Iligasutug

Despite disagreeing with the decision to kill the Qimmiit, the individuals interviewed indicated feeling unable to object due to feeling *"iligasutug"* toward the police or government representatives (roughly translated as "felt intimidated by/had much respect for").

Dr. Mitiarjuk Napaaluk of Kangiqsujuaq explained:

"The Inuit have always respected the Qallunaat every time they see them, and they could not oppose them. That was the fact in those days (...) the men could not protest against the word of the white man because he was scary, revered, his word was the law".

An excerpt from an interview with Kumakuluk Jaaka of Salluit explains why he did not object more strongly to the killings: *"All of my dogs were killed. It as if the dogs were not killed, we would have been killed or arrested instead. The police at the time did not give us any choice. It was the first time that we had to deal with their authority and the*

feeling we had was that they would do something to us if we didn't not comply with their demands."

David Pinguapik of Kangirsuk also explained *"Since the Inuit at that time always complied with Qallunaat (Non-Inuit) requests, I believe the Qallunaat had ordered the dogs killed and the Inuit just consented."* An excerpt of an interview with Kusugalinig Illimasaut of Kangiqsujuaq corroborates: *"They did not inform the Inuit ahead of time, and came and said that they were here to kill, and were accepted just like that, because in those days the police force were scary and domineering."* Papikattuq Sakiagaq of Kangiqsujuaq also noted *"In those days the Qallunaat had begun domineering our lives for a while. It was in the 1960s that the Qallunaat had started manipulating the lives of the Inuit, at the same time they slaughtered our dogs and we were left without anything."*

"They were asked about it even when they couldn't refuse as we used to be 'iligasutuq' of the police and the Qallunaat. No one could refuse them even if they requested something undesirable." (Eli Qumaaluk, Puvirnituaq)

"Prior to the killing I could not protest (...) as at that time we used to have a lot of respect for them (the police officers)." (David Etok, Kangiqsualujuaq)

"People couldn't do anything about it and couldn't approach the police constables that had shot their dogs to complain, since the constables had acted with supreme authority. At that time people were treating Qallunaat as if they were superior over us, which we later learned was not the case. It is because of our attitude towards the Qallunaat that led to the slaughtering of the dogs." (Paulusie Cookie, Umiujaq)

"It was a great pleasure to travel by dog team but people don't own dogs these days. All our dogs were killed by Qallunaat. Dogs were necessary for our subsistence but Qallunaat didn't even bother giving us the slightest compensation for the loss of our dogs. As soon as the Quebec government police arrived they started slaughtering our dogs. They laughed and imitated people who were trying to stop them. I know well about it and it was pretty disgusting. Qallunaat were scary people, they still were a few years ago but today I wouldn't be afraid of any Qallunak." (Peter Stone, Kuujuaraapik)³³

"... no person was about to say you can finish off my dogs, that's for sure. I am sure they did not want their dogs to be killed, they were dominated and were not given a choice if they wanted to keep their dogs." (Eva Illimasaut, Kangiqsujuaq)

The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, in its Summary of Conclusions on the High Arctic Relocation found the following with respect to Inuit vulnerability toward non-Inuit in the 1950s:

"The High Arctic relocation took place in a cultural context where Inuit typically felt dependent upon non-Inuit and powerless in their dealings with them. The power that

³³ Interview compiled by Avataq Cultural Institute.

*non-Inuit held over Inuit was well understood by non-Inuit, and even the wishes of well-intentioned non-Inuit could be taken as orders by Inuit. The government was present in the Arctic in the form of the RCMP, who were held in particular awe by the Inuit.*³⁴

Communication

Reasons for the killing of the Qimmiit were occasionally provided government representatives to the Inuit owners of the Qimmiit: dog disease outbreaks (rabies, distemper, canine hepatitis), community public safety (dog attacks on children) and the perceived overall superfluous nature of large dog populations in the larger Nunavik communities.

However, there was a serious lack of communication during the time government officials decided to conduct the dog slaughters. This lack of communication was exasperated by the lack of interpreters in many instances.

"The lack of having people to translate what the Qallunaat were doing also contributed to this incident. We weren't even given any chance of having our say to this matter. I am not able to describe the terrible feeling that we felt when the Qimmiit were being killed. Since no one consulted us concerning this matter I think everybody had a pretty bad feeling about it." (Lucassie Ammaa Ittuq, Kangiqsualujuaq)

"We couldn't do anything as none of our Inuit members of the community could understand English and we had no such education. And it happened at the time when the school was just starting and there weren't any interpreters at that time." (Peter Nassak, Kangirsuk)

E. Consequences

The emotional, socio-economic and cultural impacts resulting from the execution of dogsled teams was tremendous and although the true extent of the impact cannot be known, the following includes some aspects: destruction of a whole traditional way of life revolving around the Qimmiit; loss of a large part of Inuit culture, acceleration of the transition towards a non-Inuit lifestyle; loss of a means to obtain a livelihood; loss of the only means of transportation, especially detrimental to a nomadic society in a harsh environment which depended and still depends on hunting for a large part of its sustenance; hunger and increased physical hardships; emotional distress; interference with and distressful to the lives of the individuals involved; and increased injuries and deaths due to the unreliability of snowmobiles as compared with dogsled teams.

³⁴ Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, *supra*, note 18 at p. 135.

Emotional Impacts

The killing of the Nunavik Qimmiit had a profound significance on the lives of many Nunavimmiut. It is unsettling how deeply emotional the question of the killing of the Qimmiit is even today.

By destroying the Qimmiit the authorities severed the mobility of the hunters and their independence, with ravaging results on their self worth. In some cases, individuals have attributed alcohol and criminal problems to the depression caused by the loss of their dogs.³⁵ Some Elders have recounted remembering the pitiful images of husbands who would sit for hours gazing out windows, longing to be on the land but without the means to do so.³⁶

"When my dogs were gone and not having a regular job that would allow me to buy me a snowmobile and not knowing where I could get assistance, I was left with nothing to do." (Paulusie Cookie, Umiujaq)

"We had all six of our dogs killed. When our dogs were killed it was like as if our loved ones passed away from us. The dogs to us were like human beings; as they were our only means to get something. It seemed as if we became little children." (Kaudjak Tarkirk, Salluit)

"The Inuit only blamed themselves whenever their Qimmiit got killed. We realized only later that we were letting the Qallunaat be superior over us." (Davidee Niviexie, Umiujaq)

Tension and bitterness toward Qallunaat

The elimination of Qimmiit in Nunavik has been a source of tension and resentment towards Qallunaat. These feelings persist to date. Many elders feel that Qallunaat treated them without respect.

Effects on Livelihood

Sled dog teams were the only means of transportation, until the arrival of the snowmobile, allowing harvesting activities. They were also used for other tasks such as the transportation of equipment, food, firewood or water.

With the loss of the Qimmiit, the ability to find food, materials for clothing, the ability to change camp and to travel disappeared instantly. Many hunters recall that after the slaughtering of Qimmiit, their only means of transportation to go hunting was by foot.

³⁵ Verbal testimonies by Nunavik residents during Makivik AGMs and regional radio programs.

³⁶ Verbal testimonies by Nunavik residents during Makivik Executive Field Trip radio programs.

"After our Qimmiit had been killed we didn't know how we were going to survive or to go hunting. We were left without any choice but to go by foot to go hunting. We had to walk long distances to go hunting for food (...) We became destitute when our dogs were gone." (Kaudjak Tarkirk, Salluit)

"At that time, I did not own a snowmobile and when my Qimmiit were gone I had nothing left to go hunting with." (Simionie Simonie, Kangirsuk)

"I regretted of losing them, we all did, and I know that my father was very regretful. He used to say: 'how am I going to survive now, without the dogs?' I don't remember travelling after the dogs were killed." (Nappaaluk Arnaituq Kangiqsujuaq)

"We became hungry for country food (...) we were getting short on our food supplies as our Co-op didn't offer real food at that time." (David Etok, Kangiqsualujjuaq)

"All I remember was that the only transportation were the dog teams, they were the only way to go out hunting (...) And no wonder after our dogs were slaughtered, food provision became scarce, because the only means of transportation was wiped out." (Lizzie Najummi Qissiq, Kangiqsujuaq)

"Having our dogs exterminated meant that we not only lost our personal property but also our means of travelling and survival since time began. This is unacceptable and what has replaced them are now very expensive to buy and whenever they break down the parts are just as expensive." (Jimmy Arnamitsaq, Inukjuak)

Families had no choice but to move closer to permanent settlements or posts established by southerners in search of wage employment or, where there was no wage employment, in search of relief. Being unable to continue to gain their life off the land many Inuit who lost their dog teams moved into settlements where welfare measures were available and thus became more dependent on southern help and assistance.

The advent of the snowmobile and its limited and tardy availability did not replace dog teams in the 1960s. Even today, the advantages of a dog team over a snowmobile are considerable. Snowmobiles were and continue to be less reliable and many families even today cannot afford to purchase one.

Cultural Impacts

Inuit knew the land on which they lived and had developed a lifestyle in accordance with it. The disappearance of Qimmiit from their lives has increased dependency on southern assistance. Inuit have lost, especially for the younger generation, an important part of their culture, a culture that allowed them sustain themselves for decades without foreign help or assistance.

The repercussions of the slaughters on the Inuit culture are continuing to this date and are especially detrimental to the youth due to increased inactivity, the loss of a means to attain self-esteem and self-sufficiency and an amplified generation gap between themselves and their elders, with the entailing loss of traditional knowledge.

"I know that people that would normally be camping weren't going to their camps anymore. There were many people who stopped going to camps as a result." (Itsik Kudluk, Tasiujaq)

"The owners of the dogs have lost that part of their culture that was related to the qimutsik. They had used the dogs to go hunting for food such as seal and other animals. When they were still using dogs, it was still their custom of equally sharing their catch, which then changed and people started to keep most of their catch for themselves." (Marcusie Ittuq, Kangirsuk)

"It seemed that my life went through a very sudden change when my hunting practices completely came to a halt and consequently I lived idly when I lost my dogs due to the killings. We seemed to have nothing to do anymore and began to just sit around. Our motivation to go hunting even diminished considerably. Our camping patterns were certainly changed, as we didn't have the means to travel. It seemed that we were stuck in the community. Camping out in the land became rare and we mostly went out when the spring season finally came around. Other than that we were mostly then living in the community with nothing much to do but sit around." (Cuniliusie Emudluk, Kangiqsualujjuaq)

Nelson H. Graburn, an anthropologist who travelled the Hudson Strait in 1959, 1964 and 1968, published the results of his research in a book entitled Eskimos without Igloos, where he made the following observations:

"In spring, April to June, most of the families move out to Sugluk Island by sled, and a large tent camp is set up.

It can be seen that in recent years there has been a trend toward a more static and concentrated population than ever before in the area. For most of the year, the Eskimos live in the settlement crowded among the buildings of the white agencies. Although the men go hunting as before, they generally leave their families in the settlement and since the coming of the school (1957) they have been supposed to leave the children in the settlement for nine months of the year.

The first Eskimo owned ski-doo was bought in 1963 and by the winter of 1967-68 there were over twenty-five in Sugluk. Conversely, the number of households owning dog teams dropped from thirty-five to one.

This changeover has had very serious consequences. Rarely are more than 70 percent of the vehicles in good repair so many men are unable to hunt as regularly, though two men often go on one vehicle. Because of the high incidence of breakdown, usually two or three teams accompany each other on long trips. Many men are financially insolvent through trying to pay for the parts to keep their machines going – many in fact fail and the remains of machines are scattered around the settlement or are cannibalised for the few that remain. The annual fall walrus hunt is no longer undertaken because there is no great need for supplies of dog food.”³⁷

Disadvantages of snowmobiles compared to dog sleds

Despite certain advantages of snowmobiles over dog sleds, most of the individuals interviewed stated their preference for travel by dog sled.

“Ever since snowmobiles have become the main method of transportation in the North, many have died of exposure to cold. Sometimes young people die when they go hunting. This situation is of concern to us all.” (Tamusi Qumaq)

“The snowmobiles are enjoyable, but are not comparable. The Qimmiit would never get us lost because we used to travel in a very bad blizzards, so bad sometimes we were not able to see our dogs in front of us while traveling.” (Nappaaluk Arnaituq Kangiqsujaq)

“They [the dogs] occasionally attacked people but I never had seen or heard of one in our community. If you compare which has caused more death between the dogs and the snowmobile the latter would win out”. (Daniel Oweetaluktuk, Inukjuak)

However, as Elijah Grey of Kangirsuk notes, snowmobiles and all terrain vehicles have become the main tools for harvesting purposes today:

“Personally, I believe we can get the dog teams back if we try. However we can never get back the same ways the dogs had at that time. I think we would not be able to train the dogs properly as in today’s world I don’t think we can give them an undivided attention as we used to in the past. I don’t believe the government will apologize and compensate. That is why I have come to think that the snowmobile and these ATV’s that are considered recreational vehicles by government standards should be treated as tools for living purposes and therefore have their prices adjusted accordingly. Even canoes should be treated they same way. All of these recreational vehicles we use, the snowmobile, the ATV, outboard motors canoes, to get food with should be treated by the government as tools instead of recreational vehicles and therefore be taxed less. They

³⁷ Graburn, Nelson H., *Eskimos without Igloos, Social and economic development in Sugluk*, Little & Brown, Series in Anthropology, 1969

are expensive because they are taxed according to their status as recreational vehicles which we use as hunting equipment."

Near-Extinction of purebred Nunavik Qimmik

The Nunavik purebred Qimmik is presently almost extinct.

Although he does not hypothesize on the cause, according to Ken MacRury, "Working teams of Inuit dogs reached a low population point in Canada in the 1970s with only a few teams left in the Baffin administrative region."³⁸ "In the 1990s, the Inuit dog is not found amongst the Inuit of Alaska; it is almost gone in Northern Canada... It is only in Greenland where substantial working populations survive."³⁹

Some individuals managed to keep a number of dogs safe from the slaughters. However, Peter Nassak of Kangirsuk explained *"When a team loses that many members they will lose their motivation to pull sleds properly. And when my dogs were killed by a Qallunaak it devastated my mind and weakened my spirit as they were the only things I was working with."*

"The Qimmiit were healthy at the time they were killed whereas today's dogs will tire after running for 2 to 3 miles, which did not happen to our dogs. At that time the dogs would not tire easily as they were real sled Qimmiit." (David Oouvaut, Quaqtqaq)

Mitigation

The Inuit of Nunavik have undertaken steps to mitigate the problem of the near extinction of the pure bred Qimmik. In particular, since 2001, Makivik Corporation has sponsored an annual dog sled race, the Ivakkak, to promote the traditional way of dog sledding and the return of pure bred Qimmiit in Nunavik.

³⁸ MacRury, *Supra*, note 5 at p. 40.

³⁹ MacRury, *Supra*, note 5 at p. 47.

III. GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE NUNAVIK QIMMIIT KILLINGS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

"It's not the role of the government to destroy it's people." (Silas Berthe, Tasiujaq)

"Those that killed our dogs just abandoned us and left us to fend for ourselves without aiding us to recuperate from our loss of livelihood with the Qimmiit." (Peter Anautaq, Akulivik)

Though some of governments' stated objectives in killing the Qimmiit may have been in the interest of public safety and disease control, it is Makivik's contention that the governments were negligent in the course of action taken to deal with what they alleged to be problems with Nunavik Qimmiit, negligent in the manner in which these measures were undertaken and negligent in not providing remedial measures to mitigate the consequences of the dog killings.

It is important to underline the fact that authorities had witnessed over the years the hardship endured and suffered by the Inuit when they lost their dogs in difficult times or in periods of starvation. For that reason it is very difficult for Inuit to understand the insensitive and arbitrary approach used by persons in authority in the 1950's and 1960's when the massive killing of dogs took place. When decisions were made to kill the Qimmiit, almost to the point of extinction, the authorities could not have been unaware that the massive and brutal slaughtering of dogs would cause great hardship to the Inuit hunters and their families.

There also seemed to be a lack of understanding of the profound attachment of the Inuit hunters to their dogs, their companions of expeditions and in survival. The Arctic is a harsh environment and for that reason Inuit and their dogs were an inseparable team.

The issue of loose Qimmiit in Nunavik communities required a much more delicate and culturally appropriate approach if indeed there was any problem to begin with. Such an approach would of course have had to be developed in collaboration with the Inuit.

There is very little evidence of community consultations that would have been conducted prior to the dog killings. As a result, Inuit did not perceive the Qimmik killing policy as a consequence of a community consensus, but rather as an enforcement of governments' views and policies regarding the Qimmiit. The impact on Inuit culture was not taken into account, considering the absence of policies regarding the preservation of Qimmiit following the killings.

At best, the dog killings were an *ad hoc* response to what the government considered to be a problem, with little policy direction and little or no consultation with the Inuit communities.

Alternatives to simply killing the dogs should have been sought. For example, the Governments could have studied and applied policies similar to those in place in Greenland, where large populations of pure Qimmiit continue to flourish.

IV. DEMANDS

Makivik Corporation requests the following:

- Governments undertake a public inquiry into the dog slaughters that occurred in Nunavik during the 1950's and 1960's. Makivik must be involved in the drafting of the terms of reference for such an inquiry.
- Governments reimburse the costs, including past and future costs, incurred by Makivik or its representatives in attempting to resolve the complaints by the victims of the dog slaughters.
- In the short term, Governments provide remedial measures for appropriate and affordable transportation to allow Nunavik Inuit to maintain their traditional harvesting practices.

Makivik Corporation expects that as a consequence of a public inquiry into the dog slaughters that occurred in Nunavik during the 1950's and 1960's, Governments would:

- Acknowledge the wrongs done and apologize to the Inuit of Nunavik; and
- Compensate the victims of the dog slaughters, in the amount and form agreed to between Makivik and governments.

ANNEXES

- Annex 1 Letter from Pita Aatami, President, Makivik Corporation, to The Honourable Guy Chevrette, Ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones, Gouvernement du Québec (March 28 2000).
- Annex 2 Letter from Pita Aatami, President, Makivik Corporation and Pauloosie Keyootak, President, Qikiqtani Inuit Association, to The Honourable Robert Nault, Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, Canada (March 29 2000).
- Annex 3 Letter from Guy Chevrette, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones, Gouvernement du Québec to Pita Aatami, President, Makivik Corporation dated June 21 2000 and letter from Serge Ménard, ministre de la Sécurité publique to Pita Aatami, President, Makivik Corporation (September 5 2000).
- Annex 4 Letter from Lawrence MacAulay, Solicitor General of Canada to Pita Aatami, President, Makivik Corporation and Pauloosie Keyootak, President, Qikiqtani Inuit Association (December 1 2000).
- Annex 5 Arthur Laing, Minister, Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, Draft Memorandum to Cabinet: “Eskimo Administration in Northern Quebec”.
- Annex 6 Letter from Premier Jean Lesage to Prime Minister John Diefenbaker (December 27 1962).
- Annex 7 Extract from *An Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture*, R.S.Q. 1941, c. 139.
- Annex 8 Letter from Alvin Hamilton to Maurice Duplessis, (November 17 1958).
- Annex 9 Memo from W.G. Kerr, Northern Service Officer, to Mr. Stevenson, Northern Affairs (June 3 1960).
- Annex 10 Letter from F. de Miffonis, Inspecteur chef to Le Commandant, Subdivision de Hull, SQ, (October 26 1964).
- Annex 11 Letter from G.W. Rowley to Mr. Gordon, (March 5 1965).
- Annex 12 Letter from G.W. Rowley to Mr. Gordon (August 19 1966).