THE HONORABLE JEAN-JACQUES CROTEAU

Retired Justice of the Superior Court

Final Report of the Honorable Jean-Jacques Croteau Retired Judge of the Superior Court Regarding the Allegations Concerning the Slaughter of Inuit Sled Dogs in Nunavik (1950 – 1970)

(Photo: Father André Chauvel, O.M.I., 1954 – La Collection Bélangé Inc.)

March 3, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MANDATE

At the Makivik Corporation annual general meeting of March 1999, the delegates adopted Resolution No. 1999. The preamble to this resolution indicated that there had been a systematic elimination of Inuit sled dogs in the 1950s and the 1960s by government and police officials. They carried out the slaughter of dogs without consulting the population of Nunavik nor the parties most concerned, the dog-owners.

One of the preamble's clauses also emphasized that the owners of the slaughtered dogs were never able to obtain explanations from the government and police officials. In some communities, the entire sled-dog population had been eliminated.

It also alleged that slaughtering the dogs caused the owners to lose their means of transportation, resulting in the disappearance of their way of life (hunting, fishing and trapping), which consequently prevented them from earning a livelihood.

It also emphasized that slaughtering sled dogs was a source of tension with and resentment by the Inuit towards non-Inuit.

Based on the foregoing, the delegates decided as follows:

> THAT the present AGM delegates hereby mandate the Executives to take all actions necessary to investigate the circumstances surrounding the slaughters and to seek explanations, an apology and compensation for Nunavimmiut (inhabitants of Nunavik).

The members of the Board of Directors as well as the Member of Parliament representing their constituency, Mr. Guy St-Julien, undertook actions that yielded no concrete results.

After hearing witnesses and representations by interested parties, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development adopted a motion in 2005 urging the federal government to name a judge to undertake an inquiry into the

allegations concerning the slaughter of sled dogs. The federal government did not follow up on the request from the Standing Committee.

The same Committee adopted another resolution criticizing the government's inaction. Ms. Anne McLellan, then Minister responsible for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), responded by asking the force to conduct its own inquiry.

The RCMP review team published an interim report in October 2005 and submitted its final report the following year, in December 2006. It concluded that members of the RCMP bore no responsibility. According to the review team, dogs had been killed by the RCMP but solely for health and safety reasons and in accordance with the law.

This final report of the RCMP did not put and end to the ongoing controversy as to the motives and actions of government and police officials in carrying out the elimination of the dogs. In fact, there were two very different perceptions of the events that unfolded in northern Quebec in the 1950s and 1960s.

In November 2007, Mr. Benoît Pelletier, the Quebec Minister responsible for Native Affairs, and Mr. Pita Aatami, President of Makivik Corporation, mandated me to review the Inuit's allegations concerning the slaughter of sled dogs in Nunavik. They asked me to submit a report containing my comments and conclusions, and if needed, my recommendations.

On April 15, 2009, my interim report was submitted to the parties. Following this submission, neither of the parties asked to be heard.

With respect to the present final report, the parties also asked me to provide "a description of the condition of sled dogs and their use by the Inuit and the relationship of the Inuit population with the dogs in the 1950s and 1960s." They also requested my opinion on: the reasons or grounds that the authorities might have had for wanting to eliminate the sled dogs; the manner in which local authorities carried out the dog

slaughter; the number of dogs killed; and, finally, the losses or damages, if any, that owners and their families suffered.

To fulfill my mandate, I visited the 14 communities or villages of Nunavik. I questioned dog-owners, their children, and witnesses who had had first-hand knowledge of the events recounted by the members of the last generation of nomads in Nunavik. During my investigation, carried out both in Nunavik and Montreal, I gathered the testimony of 179 individuals.

Prior to undertaking my field investigation, I received a very large number of documents from Makivik Corporation for my consideration: more than 75 transcripts of testimonies by sled-dog owners (many of whom are deceased), their children and other witnesses of past events. Makivik Corporation also forwarded to me documents from the National Archives of Canada, from the Hudson's Bay Company (Winnipeg), from the provincial police (Sûreté du Québec or QPP) in Quebec City and Montreal, as well as photocopies of articles published in various newspapers and magazines. Makivik Corporation also provided me with its briefs to the federal government, presenting excerpts of Inuit testimony, copies of correspondence exchanged at the time between the federal and provincial authorities, and a copy of the agreement on the transfer of the administration of Northern Quebec from the federal government to the Government of Quebec, which was concluded in 1964 and ratified in 1970 (by 1965, Quebec had already changed the names of certain villages).

I also had in hand the final report of the RCMP (771 pp.). It includes archival documents, reports by administrators at the time, correspondence exchanged between them, police reports and correspondence, anthropologists' opinions, and testimony and representations made by certain parties before the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development. The numerous documents appended to the final report of the RCMP enabled me to understand the context to the elimination of sled dogs in various Inuit campsites and communities. I also read the positions taken by certain administrators

and several members of the police forces (RCMP and QPP) with respect to the behavior and attitudes of the Inuit.

Therefore, prior to undertaking my visit to the 14 communities, I had read the above-mentioned documents and had an overview of the historical context to the events which had allegedly taken place. I knew the importance of the dog (*qimmid*) to Inuit society and its usefulness (transportation, hunting) to the Inuit way of life (their culture). It seemed to me that the parties were interpreting the events from diametrically-opposed points of view, based on forms of logic and analysis which were mutually exclusive.

HISTORICAL AND LEGAL BACKGROUND

I mentioned in my interim report that the RCMP review team adopted an approach in its final report which was essentially based on "law and order". According to this report, the evidence showed that sled dogs had been put down by police officers for reasons of health, public safety and the eradication of epidemics of canine diseases. It concluded that the police officers had acted in accordance with the law.

In my opinion, the constitutional framework inherent in the Inuit's allegations cannot be ignored in this case. Indeed, the federal and provincial governmental organizations were subject to the obligations in the *Order of Her Majesty in Council admitting Rupert's Land and the North-Western territory into the Union of 1870*, to which were appended the speeches and resolutions of the two Canadian chambers (Senate and House of Commons) and the Deed of Surrender of Rupert's Land to Canada (Maître Renée Dupuis, *Le statut juridique des peuples autochtones en droit canadien*, Scarborough: Éditions Carswell, 1999, pp. 29, 30).

When Rupert's Land was transferred to Canada, the extent of the obligations of the Government of Canada was defined:

> …It will be the duty of the Government to make adequate provision for the protection of the Indian [Eskimo] tribes whose interest and well-being are involved in the matter. (Schedule B)

Under the *Quebec Boundaries Extension Act* (S.C. 1912, 2 Geo, Ch. 45) and the *Act respecting the extension of the province of Quebec by the annexation of Ungava* (S.Q. 1912, 2 Geo V, Ch. 7), following the transfer of the territory known as "Nouveau-Québec", the Government of Quebec was to assume the same obligations as Canada. Quebec was obligated to provide protection to the "Eskimos", whose interests and well-being were at stake. In my opinion, the objective of all aforementioned statues and instruments was to protect the natural and material basis for Aboriginal life in relation to their culture and traditions.

On the basis of the same instruments, the Supreme Court of Canada decided that the Inuit people benefit from an explicit constitutional protection (see: *R. v. Sparrow*, [1990] S.C.R. 1075).

To determine the legal status of the Inuit of northern Quebec, the Supreme Court first established the historical and legal context and the constitutional obligations of the federal government and of the Government of Québec (see: *In the matter of a reference as to whether the term Indians in head 24 of Section 91 of the British North America Act, 1867, includes Eskimo inhabitants of the Province of Quebec*, [1939] S.C.R. 104, usually cited as *Re: Eskimos*).

The Honourable Justice Albert H. Malouf also referred to the historical and legal context in order to establish the obligations of the two levels of government in regard to the rights of the Eskimos (Inuit) and the Cree when he rendered another decision concerning the legal status and living conditions of the Inuit and the Cree. His judgment led indirectly to the parties signing the *James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement* in 1975; he based his decision on *Re: Eskimos*. See: *Gros Louis* v. *Société de Développement de la Baie James*, [1974] R.P. 38 (C.S.).

NATURAL RIGHTS NOW REFERRED TO AS "ABORIGINAL RIGHTS"

Approximately 5,000 years ago, the Paleo-Eskimos populated the Canadian High Arctic. Archeological evidence reveals that men and women from Siberia crossed the Bering Strait by boat or even on foot over the ice. In all probability, they were hunters attracted by caribou herds.

Around 1000 A.D., their descendants, the Thule, who were the ancestors of the Nunavik Inuit, traveled from Alaska to Eastern Canada. They settled on the coast of Hudson Strait and the east coast of Hudson Bay, which had been partly occupied for 2,000 years by the Dorset Eskimos, another group descended from the Paleo-Eskimos.

The Thule were nomads who lived by hunting and gathering, hunters who used sleds pulled by dogs to their use (I.K. MacRury, "The Inuit Dog: Its Provenance, Environment and History", Master's thesis, Scott Polar Research Institute, Cambridge University, June 1991).

In this study, the author wrote and cited authority for the proposition that (p. 39): "A hunter without dogs can be considered a half hunter."

Elsewhere, he wrote:

> Dogs are the only domestic animal of the Inuit and have been essential to their survival since at least the beginning of the Thule period and perhaps for much longer. 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, being superior to fox or wolf for mitts and socks; it was also used to make trousers, particularly for men, and as trimming on Parka hoods.

The climate has shaped Inuit culture, characterized by the difficult search for means of subsistence and mutual community assistance. Long before the arrival of the Europeans, the Inuit were a community whose way of life, even survival, depended on sled dogs.

They survived using the natural resources that they found on the territory of northern Quebec (Nunavik), in rivers and lakes, in the waters of Hudson Strait, Hudson Bay and Ungava Bay, and on the offshore islands.

Prior to the arrival of the Europeans, through the passage of time beyond memory, the Inuit had become the possessors of rights to land that included the above-mentioned waters, offshore islands and islets.

In the period from 1950 to 1970 studied here, before and after the arrival of Europeans, the owners of sled dogs still earned their livelihoods from hunting, trapping and fishing. Sled dogs were essential to practicing these activities, to their survival and to that of their families.

Hence, since time immemorial, the use of sled dogs to hunt, trap and fish as well as to travel was always an integral part of the distinct culture of the Inuit.

The Government of Canada and the Government of Québec, their officials and police forces knew or should have known and understood the central place that dogs occupied in Inuit culture in the 1950s and 1960s.

THE EVIDENCE

A) **The Parties**

Prior to the period from the 1950s to the 1970s, over several decades, the federal government administered Nunavik, the territory acquired by Quebec in 1912. (Dussault

and Borgeat, *Traité de Droit administratif*, 2nd ed., vol. I, Ste-Foy : Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1984, p. 270).

In 1955, the federal government appointed the first permanent administrator designated as a Northern Service Officer (NSO).

It was only in the early 1960s that the Government of Quebec began take an interest in this territory. It took over its administration unofficially in 1965, and definitively in the early 1970s.

Already in 1960, the Provincial Police (the Sûreté du Québec of today) was replacing the RCMP as a police force, a fact confirmed by several witnesses. The federal minister responsible for Indian and Northern Affairs from 1963 to 1967, the Honourable Arthur Laing, confirmed as much in a memo (NAC RG 22, Vol. 546).

The RCMP closed its divisions in Great Whale River (Kuujjuaraapik) on July 14, 1959, in Fort Chimo (Kuujjuaq) on January 20, 1961 and in Port Harrison (Inukjuak) on October 31, 1961.

Notwithstanding the presence of the Provincial Police in Nunavik, the federal civil servants were to stay in place until the end of 1964.

Before and in the early 1950s, sled-dog owners lived with their families in camps (in igloos in winter, in tents in summer). They were, therefore, nomads who were not required to follow precise rules, as "southerners" might. In their view, nothing could force them to adapt to the culture of southern society.

There was no television, no media, and no advertising. They could neither read nor write. The Inuit oral tradition was based on experience, beliefs, myths, and legends of the elders. They respectfully deferred to nature, animals, objects, limitless horizons and to the harshness of their land. Their way of life was inextricably linked to sled dogs (hunting, trapping, fishing, transportation, etc.).

During the period at issue, the years from 1950 to 1970, the Inuit were still living in a society where conflict resolution was delegated to the elders, the wise men and women of the communities. They knew nothing of repression. In this respect, their world would be turned upside down by the Whites. They simply did not understand why they should change their customs to satisfy the Whites who were only passing through their territory, the Whites who advocated a society organized according to laws and regulations adapted to southern culture and values.

B) **The Villages or Communities**

In October 2008, I began my tour of the 14 Inuit villages in Nunavik, to examine witnesses concerning the events that occurred in the 1950s and 1960s. On this first trip, I visited Kuujjuaraapik, Umiujaq, Inukjuak, Akulivik and Puvirnituq. The following month, in November, I continued my inquiry in Quaqtaq, Kangirsuk, Aupaluk and Kuujjuaq. In February 2009, I completed my tour by going to Ivujivik, Salluit, Kangiqsujuaq, Kangiqsualujjuaq and Tasiujaq.

1. **Kuujjuaraapik (Grande Baleine / Great Whale River / Poste de la Baleine)**

This area is located south-east of Hudson Bay at the mouth of the Great Whale River. The Hudson's Bay Company has operated a trading post at that location since 1857. This was where the Inuit and the Cree traded furs for various imported goods. Located at the edge of the boreal forest, it was also the place that supplied the Inuit with wood.

Around 1955, the American government established a military base (radar station), which was taken over by Canadian Forces in the mid-1960s.

In 1957, the federal government built a school: attendance was mandatory for children of school age. This important event led many families to settle in Kuujjuaraapik. Some see this as evidence of an assimilationist intent on the part of the federal government. It was in this community that the Inuit of the region discovered the world of the *Qallunaat* (the Whites*)*, at least as it was represented by the employees of the Hudson's Bay Company, military personnel, missionaries, teachers, health professionals and others.

Above all, they would learn of the Qallunaat's legalistic approach, developed in the south, to settling the issue of the sled dogs.

According to the documentary evidence and the interviews, since school attendance was mandatory for children of school age, it was from 1957 to 1958 that the Inuit began living in settlements, while still wanting to preserve what until then had been a nomadic way of life. For most of the families, sled dogs were an integral part of a way of life based on hunting and trapping. The dogs were always left untied in the village.

Already at this time, the Whites and the Crees were beginning to complain about roaming dogs belonging to the Inuit. They maintained that a dog had attacked and bitten two young children and asked the authorities to force the Inuit to tie up their dogs. Dog-owners maintained they had to let them roam free so they could maintain their conditioning. In their opinion, once dogs were tied up, they would stop performing and become unsociable, even aggressive towards people. Even when tied up, the animals could get loose. Inuit dogs were not accustomed to being tied up.

In April 1957, Reverend Marsh, the Anglican Bishop, wrote to the authorities asking them to force the Inuit to keep their dogs tied up at all times. He informed them that roaming dogs had attacked the daughter of the Anglican missionary to the village, as well as a young Cree girl.

The authorities answered, informing him that under the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* (ss. 11 and 12), the Inuit were not required to tie up their dogs during the winter period from December 15th to May 1st.

In September 1957, stray dogs attacked and destroyed the American radar station's food depot. All of them (more than ten) were killed.

The same month, the authorities convened the Inuit to a meeting to warn them that their dogs had to be tied up from May 1st to December 15th, as required under the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture*, failing which any stray dog would be killed.

But most of the nomadic Inuit knew nothing of this statute requiring them to tie up their dogs. They did not understand why the Whites would want to kill their dogs, their only mode of transportation and hunting, without their consent. In their view, this defied all logic.

The report of Sergeant J.H. Wilson (No. 16257) of the RCMP, posted to the Great Whale River detachment, dated October 8, 1958 and addressed to the commanding officer in Ottawa, reads as follows:

> Re: Control of dogs running loose in Northern Quebec Agricultural Abuses Act of the Province of Quebec:
>
> Previous correspondence in the above connection would seem to indicate that "G" Div. H.Q. [Division Headquarters] is fully conversant with the problem of Eskimo dogs running at large in this area.
>
> Although this matter is a continuing problem, it has been particularly apparent by the attack of Eskimo dogs on Rosie SHESHAMUSH (Indian – Band # 35 – born 26-8-47) on 29-3-57 and again when they attacked Dinah SAPPA E9-585 (Eskimo – Born 22-5-55) on 26-9-58.
>
> As indicated in previous correspondence, many meetings have been held in an effort to educate the Eskimos regarding proper care and control of their dogs with the hope that there would be no serious accidents as listed above. These meetings apparently met with mixed feelings amongst the Eskimos and although they did make limited efforts to control their dogs the effect was usually short lived.
>
> Since this member arrived at this post in June 1957, continued efforts have been made to enforce control of the Eskimo dogs. On June 28 1957, this member attended a meeting of the Eskimo men in company with the N.S.O. R.L. [Northern Service Officer] KENNEDY and Q.P.P. [Quebec Provincial Police] Det. Paul Emile TOURVILLE, at which time TOURVILLE told the natives of the provisions of the Agricultural Abuses Act and that if their dogs were not tied, they would be shot. TOURVILLE left Gt. Whale River on July 5/57, so did not have much time to enforce the Act in question. Some of the Eskimos did attempt to keep their dogs tied, but other showed little interest in the matter.
>
> During the summer of 1957, the dogs continued to be a considerable problem on and about the RCAF [Royal Canadian Air Force] Station here. The Eskimos were warned several times during the month of August 1957, that if their dogs continued to run at large about the RCA Camp, they would be shot. Early in Sept. 1957, dogs tore a whole into one of the camp buildings causing damage and destroying foodstuffs, so subsequently many of the dogs about the camp

were shot. The Commanding officer of the Station, S/L DOBSON and Bell Telephone Section Plant Superintendent Mr. G.J. SCHETANGE were active in destroying dogs about the camp on Sept. 9th requested the assistance of this member as well, during which time the writer killed 8 dogs. In all approx. 30 – 35 dogs were destroyed on the camp proper during the first half of Sept. 1957.

On Sept. 14/57, N.S.O. R.L. KENNEDY and this member called another meeting with the Eskimo men to discuss further the control of dogs. During this meeting the men wanted to know why Eskimo dogs had been shot as they were required for hunting purposes. At this time all those who complained of having had dogs destroyed readily admitted they had been told to keep their dogs tied or they would be shot, but in spite of this, certain individuals were displeased that their dogs had been shot.

The fact that Eskimo dogs are a problem during the Winter Season as well, is borne out by report from this office (File # GWR57-1-2) dated 23-12-57 in which it was outlined that dogs broke into an outdoor meat storable locker at the Dorval Air Transport Hotel taking $150.00 worth of meat.

On Jan. 10/58, this member attended a meeting with the N.S.O. R. HODGKINSON Federal Day School teacher Barry Gunn, Anglican Missionary Rev. S. WILKINSON & I & NHS Nurse W. COWLEY, during which the local problems were discussed with the Eskimo men. The dog problem was brought up and some Eskimos were still bewailing the fact that some of their dogs had been shot in Sept. 1957. Some men even suggested they could not hunt due to the shortage of dogs, which in fact is not correct as there has always been many more dogs here than are needed.

While there are a few inveterate hunters who do tie and care for their dogs properly, it would seem that most of the Eskimos cannot resist the temptation to let their dogs run loose with the hope that they will survive on the garbage from the RCAF Stn. Then, when they want dogs for hunting, they round up what dogs they need for the trip. The writer does not wish to create the impression that the RCAF Stn. is careless regarding the disposal of garbage, as the camp authorities make a genuine effort to burn all garbage that would tend to attract the dogs.

On 29-9-58 a meeting attended by N.S.O. J.G. WALTON, Commanding Officer of RCAF Stn. Gt. Whale River S/L J. HICKS, Bell Telephone Co. Section Plant Superintendent D. McLEAN, the Federal Day School teaching staff and this member, was held to further discuss the dog problem and suggest possible control methods. It was suggested that possible the best solution would be the construction of a large communal dog corral, where all who desired could keep their dogs. It was proposed that one Eskimo might be employed to take charge of such a corral and that sufficient garbage could be supplied the corral from the RCAF Stn. To feed all the dogs kept therein. The N.S.O. was of the opinion that his Department might consider such a program and that possibly construction might commence next year. It was the general feeling at the meeting that there were too many dogs in this area, many of which would not be used; however indiscriminate shooting of these dogs was not encouraged.

A meeting was called for Eskimo men on the evening of Oct. 1/58. This meeting was very well attended & the natives agreed to keep all their dogs that were wanted for use, tied and under control. A good number showed keen interest in the corral method and stated if the corral is built, they would keep their dogs therein. A few of the men stated they would prefer to be looking after their own dogs independently. The native men agreed that there were several dogs which were of no use for hunting and they were encouraged to destroy any such dogs. There was also one Eskimo volunteered to shoot the dogs on the RCAF Camp which were not claimed by anyone.

Since the meeting of Oct. 1/58, a considerable improvement in the dog situation has been noted. There are still some dogs loose, but nearly all dogs have been tied. Some of the native men have also reported having shot dogs which are not good for hunting.

No guarantee can of course be given at this time, but it is hoped that the continued efforts and instructions given in this connection will prevent any further accidents.

(s)

(J.H. Wilson) # 16257

I/c Gt. Whale River Detachment

The following month, on November 17, 1958, Alvin Hamilton, Minister of Northern Development and National Resources, wrote to the Premier of Québec, Maurice Duplessis. He informed him about the attacks made by loose dogs and asked the Quebec government to amend the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* (letter cited in the RCMP final report, pp. 51 – 52).

Minister Hamilton cited certain incidents as the basis for his request:

> During this past year, there have been many incidents of attacks by loose dogs on persons in northern Quebec, especially on children, for example, at Great Whale River, an Indian child was so severely bitten on September 26 that she died of the injuries. Another child and two women, only barely escaped a similar disaster. There have been similar incidents in Port Harrison, Fort Chimo and Sugluk.

In his letter, Minister Hamilton recognized the usefulness of dogs to the Inuit, in pursuit of food from the land.

However, he added:

> We have tried every means of educating the Eskimos to the dangers of loose dogs but we have regretfully concluded that there is no possibility of solving the problem without legal sanctions.

The Government of Québec did not follow through on the request for an amendment allowing the act to be enforced 12 months a year, which would have compelled the owners to keep their dogs tied up continuously.

I have reviewed a memo the federal administrator, W.G. Kerr, sent to his superior, Mr. A. Stevenson, on June 3, 1960 (cited in the final report of the RCMP, pp. 224 – 225).

Mr. W.G. Kerr wanted to know who would be mandated to enforce the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture*, the statute which prohibited

dogs from running loose between May 1st and December 15th of each year. The administrator noted an ambiguity in the statute:

> It does not specifically state that the dogs must be tied. Obviously a dog would have to be restrained by some means to prevent "wandering" but it is strictly inference and not a stated fact in the dog ordinance.

In his experience, stray dogs were not any more dangerous than automobiles on the road in the south. It was simply a matter of educating children about the dangers and establishing preventive measures. Although he showed an understanding of the native reality, Mr. Kerr concluded:

> However, the Law poorly worded as it is…. And ignoring the Eskimos and Indians right to an accepted (by them) traditional customs in their own Land, should be enforced on the ground that it is the Law.

There was also another memo from the administrator, Mr. J.G.Walton, Northern Service Officer, dated April 14, 1959, which revealed much of the attitude of the Provincial Police at the time:

> Great Whale River, P.Q.
>
> 14 April 1959
>
> MEMORANDUM FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ARCTIC (1006-8-1 C1)
>
> Dog Control
>
> D/Sgt. [Detective Sergeant] Tourville of the Quebec Provincial Police recently paid a visit to Great Whale River to investigate the loose dog problem.
>
> D/Sgt. Tourville warned the Eskimos that all dogs not tied within 24 hours would be shot and when his ultimatum expired, shot two loose dogs. The lesson seems to have been learnt as all dogs are now tied. If the problem should again arise, D/Sgt. Tourville said he would return to Great Whale River and shoot all loose dogs without warning and the Eskimos have been advised accordingly.

> It is unfortunate that such stringent measures have had to be adopted but the lack of co-operation from certain Eskimos left no alternative. On numerous occasions, the subject of dog control has been discussed with the local Eskimos: some have co-operated and a few have not been so helpful. As mentioned in my report dated 3 October, 1958 I made arrangements with the base authorities to have the kitchen waste turned over to the Eskimos for dog feed in the hope that this would prevent the dogs being turned loose to forage for food but apparently certain dog-owners did not appreciate this gesture. Therefore, I cannot see that the police have no alternative but to destroy loose dogs.
>
> (s)
>
> J.G. Walton
>
> Northern Service Officer

Even though the Detective Sergeant of the Provincial Police, Paul-Émile Tourville, made good on his threat by killing two dogs, the animals continued to roam the village, which raised tensions between the Whites and the Inuit.

In the events surrounding the dog slaughter, one well-documented incident concerned William Shackelton, the radar station comptroller. On July 22, 1959 Mr. Shackelton, a resident of Great Whale River, killed two stray dogs. In his memo dated September 4, 1959, Administrator Walton wrote:

> … I learned that Mr. Shackelton had indeed shot two loose dogs but the Eskimos were alarmed that Mr. Shackelton had fired in the direction of the native village and some of the shots went through some tents. I spoke to the Eskimos and advised them against taking reprisals….

Administrator J.G. Walton reported that Mr. Shackelton had also lodged a complaint and that Detective Sergeant Edgar Anderson of the Provincial Police had been to the community to investigate. The police officer also killed dogs.

> … about the dog menace and on the 14 August, D/Sgt. [Detective Sergeant] Anderson of the Quebec Provincial

> Police arrived at Great Whale River to investigate the complaint. From the 14 to 18 August, Sgt. Anderson stayed at Great Whale River and shot six loose dogs.

It should be noted that Mr. Shackelton had lost his daughter Patricia, who had been fatally bitten by two stray dogs when she was only five-and-a-half years old. The tragedy occurred a few years earlier, on February 26, 1955, in another community.

Answering J.G. Walton on September 1st, 1959 (1006-8-1), his superior, Mr. G.M Bolger, lamented the situation and characterized reports published on August 19, 1959 by the Montreal newspaper *The Gazette* as exaggerations The article in question is reproduced below:

> MAD DOGS TERRORIZE NORTH: POLICE TO PROBE SHOOTING
>
> A D/SGT [Detective Sergeant] EDGAR ANDERSON is scheduled to fly to Quebec's North County tomorrow morning to investigate reports that wild dogs are terrorizing the area and residents who have shot have been threatened by armed ESKIMOS
>
> The report which came to QPP headquarters here from Churchill, Great Whale River, claims two girls and a boy have been killed by roaming dogs in recent years.
>
> DET/SGT Anderson said he will investigate the situation there and, if necessary, warn ESKIMOS a provincial law requires all dogs be tied or leashed between May 1st and December 15 in organized territory. It is estimated that between 500 and 550 dogs are loose in the district SGT Anderson said last night and the population is 352- the dogs apparently have turned loose and ran short of food in the summer months.
>
> The complaint was received from a resident who said his daughter was killed by wild dogs in 1955. He said he had shot and killed seven of them recently and was threatened by riffle-carrying Eskimos as a result.

Mr. G.M. Bolger said he understood the aggressive attitudes of the parties towards one another. He wrote, among other things:

> … some Eskimos however, seem to accept dogs running loose as a normal hazard of life. Dogs are an important part of their culture, both as a means of transportation and as a symbol of prestige and success. As you know, Eskimos feel the same way about their dogs as southern whites feel about "their cars".

He then asked Mr. J.C. Walton to remain neutral as between the two opposing groups, using the following terms:

> The long-term solution to the problem of dogs running loose is to convince their owners to keep them tied up. Indiscriminate shooting reduces the number of dogs, but will certainly increase hostility toward the person who does the shooting and any group he is identified with. It will also make it more difficult to convince the dog-owners that dogs should be tied up.

In relation to the Shackelton case, on September 10, 1959, the Administrator Mr. R.A.J. Philips, sent a memo to his director, Mr. F.J.G. Cunninghan, lamenting the existing situation at Great Whale River and expressing his point of view. He attributed the dogs running loose to the fact that the Inuit did not have the financial means to feed them.

He also commented on the attitude and approach of the Provincial Police officers:

> The Provincial Police authorities regard the dog problem as a Police matter. They have not delegated authority to deal with it, and they themselves did not remain in Great Whale River long enough to be effective…
>
> (File 1006-8-1)

There is also the case of Dinah Suppa, an Inuit child who died from dog bites. In a memo addressed on October 3, 1958 to his Division Director, Administrator J. G. Walton expressed his disappointment regarding the attitude of the Provincial Police:

> The Provincial authorities at Val d'Or have shown no interest in our problems. The Quebec Provincial Police

> promised to come to Great Whale to investigate Dinah's death but Cst. [Constable] Wilson has now been informed that assistance will not be forth coming. Apparently the inquest has already been held at Val d'Or and, as far as the Quebec Provincial Police are concerned, the matter is closed. It is very surprising that the inquest was held without any witnesses being called. It seems therefore, that we will have to make our own arrangement for the control of loose dogs in this settlement.

According to documents that were provided to me and other documents appended to the RCMP final report, at the end of 1961 and during 1962 and 1963, numerous dogs were afflicted with such canine diseases as rabies, distemper and canine infectious hepatitis. Approximately 50 dogs were killed.

The federal authorities then took steps to launch a dog vaccination campaign. Dr. Toupin, a veterinarian, visited Great Whale River and vaccinated 150 dogs. In 1963, the Department of Northern Affairs sent 2,350 doses of vaccine against rabies, and 550 more the following year, in 1964.

In a letter dated February 19, 1966, Officer Richard Dubé (personnel number 2437) of the Provincial Police, informed his commanding officer at the Montreal Division that since September 1965, numerous cases of rabies were detected at Great Whale River. The dogs were killed since no vaccine could be obtained.

In his letter of February 16, 1966, Chief Inspector Miffonis indicated that Mr. Edmond Bernier of the Department of Natural Resources had not followed up on the request from Corporal Dubé (personnel number 2437) to have the dogs vaccinated against rabies. Consequently, several dogs infected with rabies had to be put down.

On November 23, 1963, in a memo sent to the Regional Administrator of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, Administrator D.C. Neve informed the Regional Administrator that the child Zacharias Niviaxi had been attacked by two dogs and sent outside the region for treatment. The two

dogs in question were killed and their heads were sent out for expert examination.

During my visit to the community, I was able to interview 15 witnesses, including eight children and grandchildren of dog-owners, four owners, the wife of an owner who had had two dogs teams and two witnesses.

Samwillie Quarak, a 65 year-old dog-owner, remembered that an epidemic of canine diseases occurred in the early 1960s. He remembered that the federal government had sent vaccine doses in 1963 and 1964. In 1963, his dogs had been vaccinated.

He testified, however, that his five dogs were killed over a three-year period:

> The slaughtering was not at the same time. There were times that they were slaughtered during the years of 1967, 1968, 1969. They would kill them if they get loose because even…. Although we would tie them up, some dogs would loose by themselves. (translation)

Louisa Fleming, the 82-year old wife of a dog-owner, said that in 1954 no Inuit were living in Great Whale River. She recalled that when she arrived in the village with her husband and their two children, the Americans were beginning to build their base.

Louisa Fleming explained that she succeeded in preventing two police officers from killing her dogs when visiting her parents-in-law. It was in 1959, and they were going to kill the animals that were not tied up:

> Don't you dare shoot my dogs because they're our only form of transportation. And that's when they didn't shoot the dogs. She told them we're only here for two days and we need to go back to our camp. Please don't shoot my dogs, so they didn't shoot the dogs. (translation)

After her parents and parents-in-laws died, she went back to living on the land with her family. They would go to Great Whale River (Kuujjuaraapik) only to sell their furs at the trading post. In her opinion, the slaughter of dogs began mostly in the late 1950s, therefore, after the establishment of the school. They returned to settle in the community in 1962.

Each night, she explained, one of their dogs was poisoned. Once, she saw three Whites feed the dogs poisoned food.

After these events, she said their lives had been upset:

> They only had two dogs left which wasn't enough for the family to move back to their winter camp which was inside the tree line. (translation)

For Martha Shauk, 67 years of age, the dog slaughter began after the Anglican bishop, Reverend Marsh, asked the authorities to force the Inuit to tie up their dogs, failing which the dogs would be put down.

According to most of the witnesses heard, dogs were also killed during the 1960s. It was always the same scenario: police officers arrived on the premises without warning, without giving their reasons, killed the dogs and left.

Willie Tooktoo, 74 years of age, on the land with his family. He maintained that he was never informed that his dogs had to be tied up.

He said that he had gone hunting during the summer of 1957. When he returned, his seven dogs left behind at the camp had been poisoned. He had not tied them up. He reported that his dogs were neither vicious nor violent. Later, around 1959, his five other dogs were killed in the same way.

Asked whether he had been warned or whether reasons for eliminating his dogs had been offered, Mr. Tooktoo answered:

> No, I did not have the opportunity to go ask or inquire or debate or discuss as to why they killed my dogs. In those days it was almost fearful to even try to speak because of the language barrier one, and because we just couldn't communicate with them. (translation)

The same questions were put to the other witnesses. In no case was there any discussion, nor were any reasons or grounds given by the authorities for slaughtering the dogs.

Mary Ittoshat, 71 years of age, explained that she was visiting a neighbor when eight of her dogs were killed.

There was also Nellie Nutaraaluk, 71 years of age, who lived in Inukjuak at the time. She said that her father owned 12 sled dogs when her family was relocated to Grise Fjord in the High Arctic. Ten of the 12 dogs owned by her father were killed by officers of the RCMP. She said she wanted to testify:

> Not just about the dogs issue, it's about the fact that they were not treated humanely. (translation)

Some witnesses, not all, recalled incidents of dogs attacking the missionary's child and a Cree child, Dinah Suppa. As for the canine disease epidemic that occurred in the 1960s, some remembered it.

2. **Umiujaq**

This community is located north of Kuujjuaraapik, close to Richmond Gulf. It was founded in 1986. Its first inhabitants were Inuit from Kuujjuaraapik. According to the testimony of Robbie Tookalak, 64 years of age, the Inuit living in the area of Kuujjuaraapik began living in the Umiujaq region in 1975. They lived in tents on the shore, then in "matchbox houses". He said: "It was small, we thought we lived in a huge house" (translation).

Even though this village did not exist at the time of the dog slaughter, I have gathered the testimonies of 15 persons who, at the relevant time, lived in

Kuujjuaraapik. They confirmed that dogs that were stray or came loose were systematically killed by the law enforcement authorities.

The testimony revealed it was not only the Provincial Police officers who killed dogs, but also Whites who poisoned both stray dogs and those that were tied up by giving them poisoned meat. According to some, Whites would even untie dogs that then became stray dogs and were eliminated by the police.

During the summer, dog-owners who had gone hunting would come back home to find their dogs had been killed. This was the case for Juanie Cookie, 67 years of age, who testified that though they were tied up, his eight dogs had been killed while he was away hunting.

He also mentioned:

> I worked very closely with non Inuit and I experienced how they behaved with dogs and I even experienced some that would just ride, run over dogs. It was regular workers that were doing there, they were ordered not to harass dogs but they found it like it was pleasure to hurt dogs. (translation)

Isaac Tumic, 62 years of age, testified to having seen dogs on the side of the road that had been run over by motor vehicles:

> I don't recall the peoples' names who killed the dogs but at that time, we would notice the dogs on the side of the road where it was obvious they had been ran over with a vehicle, actually literally running over the dogs. (translation)

Other witnesses mentioned that dogs would get loose and go to the dump, where people had left poisoned meat.

Some witnesses, including Robbie Tookalak, 64 years of age, indicated they could not buy chains with which to tie up the dogs and that other means to tie them up were of no use. Robbie Tookalak said:

> …when the policies started to be enforced to tie our dogs, the chains to tie our dogs were not even available at the store. When they would tie the dogs, they would use the skin that the dogs can bite through and get loose…
>
> It was difficult and almost impossible with the merchandise that was available at the Hudson's Bay Company. We had only the Hudson's Bay Company with limited stock of flour, sugar, etc. (translation)

He added:

> The government played a fast one on us. That's how people ended with no dogs. (translation)

Jack Anowak, 76 years of age, corroborated his statement:

> Chains were not for sale for some time, we were not even aware that chains were specific used to tie dogs. (translation)

Every time dogs were killed, the owners were deprived of their means of transportation and could no longer go hunting. In no case did they receive an offer of help from the government authorities to compensate them for the inconvenience and losses caused by the slaughter.

3. **Inukjuak (Inoucdjouac – Port Harrison)**

This community is located east of Hudson Bay and Hopewell Strait. In 1909, the French company Revillon Frères established a fur-trading post there. Its competitor, the Hudson's Bay Company, established a trading post in 1921. By the 1950s, only the Hudson Bay Company post remained.

In 1936, the RCMP established a detachment. As discussed above, it was closed on October 31, 1961.

An Anglican Mission was established in 1927. The community also had a nursing station, established by the federal government in 1947.

Jacob Weetaluktuk, hereinafter Mr. Jacob, born in 1937, grew up in a camp located five miles from Inukjuak. He acted as an interpreter for the RCMP officers.

Mr. Jacob mentioned that in the 1950s, the community was small, including fewer than 15 families. He provided a list of names of heads of family: (1) Tommy Palliser; (2) George Palliser; (3) Tommy Palliser Jr.; (4) Lazurrose Maina; (5) Willia Nineiuk; (6) Davidee Ningiuk; (7) Willia Weetaluktuk; (8) Josie Nowra; (9) Josipi Flaherty; (10) Adamie Anailuk; (11) Samisa Samisack; (12) Lazarusie Epoo; (13) Salli Epoo; (14) Lucassie Rakallak.

According to his testimony, many members of these families worked for the Whites. About ten families had dogs. The canine population consisted of 70 dogs.

Those Inuit families living in Port Harrison represented ten per cent of the entire Inuit population living in camps to the north and south of the village, as well as on the coast, some offshore islands and islets.

Mr. Jacob, 71 years of age, recalled that in 1953, there was an epidemic of canine diseases at Port Harrison. Of the 70 dogs living in the community, the mortality rate was about 50 per cent.

Another major event marked the lives of the Inukjuak Inuit. Five families were relocated to Grise Fjord, on Ellesmere Island. Witnesses reported that all their dogs were killed, that each family was left with only two dogs. Canada relocated the Inuit families to ensure its territorial sovereignty in the High Arctic.

Mr. Jacob explained that, as an interpreter, he worked closely with the RCMP officers. These were based at Port Harrison. They were responsible for the entire Hudson Bay and Hudson Strait coast, that is from Kuujjuaraapik to Salluit.

He mentioned that the issue of stray dogs was raised by the RCMP in August 1952. Indeed, he said:

> … That in August 1952, the RCMP made a decision, ruling a new law, a law that Inuit were not aware of. The only laws that they were aware of is from the church. Inuit were not aware of a new law which was… Controlling of dogs and that particular law specifically applied to the community, or to Port Harrison. It did not apply to the outskirts community, people in camps, so for himself, he could say it did not affect his family even though they were just five miles away. (translation)

In 1957, the federal government built a school. The Inuit children had to enroll. Some witnesses remembered that they were compelled to do so at the risk of being deprived of family allowances and old age pensions and they settled in the village of Port Harrison, now known as Inukjuak.

In September 1958, a child was attacked and killed by two stray dogs. The animals were put down by two RCMP officers (RCMP Report, p. 538).

The same report submitted by Corporal Jack Decker also stated:

> They had the occasion to rescue 76 natives who were starving to death from the Sleeper Island (100 miles off the coast of Port Harrison and north of the Belcher Islands). They rescued them in a Peterhead boat, assisted by canoes, and brought all families, goods and dogs with them. Those dogs [which] could not fit in the boat were shot by their owners and the skins saved for clothing. These natives formed a settlement about 15 miles south of Port Harrison.
>
> All natives were encouraged to live on the land, away from the built up settlements. While they had a school in Port Harrison at the time very few children attended as their families did not live in the settlement. The only time that they came into major settlements was during Christmas and to trade at the HBC store. There were small settlements all along the coast and they lived well in their traditional ways.

There is a report from Sergeant Bernie MacDonald corroborating what Mr. Jacob said:

> Those Eskimos who lived in the settlements were mainly government workers who did not rely on native food or hunting and trapping. They had very little rabies in the Port Harrison detachment area, although over 2,000 dogs were inoculated during the summer of 1959 for that purpose. (RCMP, p. 576)

According to the Whites, cooperation on the part of the Inuit was lacking. In 1959, an Inuit Committee was established. The witness, Mr. Jacob, was a member and Lazurusie Epoo was in charge of the committee. The teacher, Colding, sent a telegram to Administrator Bolger on October 29th asking him to protect the children. A stray dog had just killed a child. In his view, the situation was extremely serious:

> After four months of patrolling and asking for loose dogs to be fastened, I had to shoot a dog today for the safety of my children and the Eskimo children. (NAC, R.G. 85, Vol. 1959, File A-1006-8-1, Pt 1).

As was the case in Kuujjuaraapik, some Inuit dog-owners explained that it was impossible to tie up the dogs due to the lack of chains and collars. The HBC store did not sell them, and the police never provided them.

That dilemma could have been easily solved had there been a will to help the Inuit who depended on their dogs for transportation and their livelihood.

In 1960, the RCMP was replaced by the Quebec Provincial Police.

A report dated September 13, 1964, says a great deal about the situation at the end of the 1950s and in the early 1960s. This report from federal Administrator A.P. Wight is cited in the final report of the RCMP (at pp. 248, 249 and 250). A copy was sent to Sergeant Arsenault of the Provincial Police with a note asking: "Promise you will take concrete steps" (translation).

Before citing this report, it should be noted that Mr. Wight mentioned the Inuit were to be threatened with having their dogs killed if they did not tie them up. There was also another problem: some Whites refused to tie up their dogs

because they believed the dogs were not dangerous. It was a difficult issue for him to settle.

In Port Harrison, as opposed to in the camps, stray dogs also represented another dilemma for Wight. He did not have the legal authority to ask dog-owners to tie up their dogs all year long. It is also noteworthy that he was looking for a means to delegate his responsibility. Nevertheless, he decided to control stray dogs in order to protect the children.

His report read as follows:

> Dog Control: Port Harrison, P.Q.
>
> Over the past few days, I have been approached by several of the residents of this community for action concerning loose dogs, owned not only by the Eskimo but by whites also.
>
> Knowing in detail the reputation I have already earned from my own attitude towards loose dogs, I naturally hesitate to bring a distasteful subject up again, but since the people of this community feel as Administrator, that I am responsible for enforcement of rules against loose dogs, I feel that I must approach your office either to get the necessary enforcement privileges, or a good excuse to place the responsibility elsewhere.
>
> At a recent informal meeting of the Eskimo Council, Jacob Oweetaltuk informed me that within a few weeks, all dogs at present left on an island near the settlement, will be brought in to the settlement, and some protection must be arranged for, for the protection of children attending school.
>
> I stated in return that the solution was quite simple, the dogs must be tied, or loose dogs roaming in the vicinity of school or play areas would be shot. All members of the Council with the exception of one, agreed that this was a very good idea, and with which they fully agreed. The one who dissented stated quite directly that he was not going to tie up his dogs, because the white men wouldn't tie theirs.
>
> In digging into the reasons for this feeling, I found that last year, when this subject was raised, a rather peculiar situation had developed, one in which no satisfactory solution was ever made. It appears that some dogs, in whom legal

ownership rests with Jacob Oweetaltuk, had become pets by some of the white men in the settlement, being hand fed, and allowed their complete freedom. Jacob had tied up the dogs, and they had been promptly turned loose by the white men who had made pets of them. The persons concerned had been approached to ensure that the dogs would be tied, and they refused, on the grounds that their pets would never hurt anyone, and were not vicious, and that anyone who shot one of these loose dogs would be shot himself. I found that this was rather had to believe, and made a full investigation, to find that not only had the report been accurate, but that the statements were well known in the community, and considerable hard feeling had developed about it, most of the whites in particular having very young children, who the parents felt were in danger. In fact, two children have been molested by these dogs in particular, and still the dogs are loose.

I would gather from information received that reasoning with the people concerned is going to be next to impossible, as they consider these huskies practically as part of their family, having no children. It means that without some definite enforcement powers, I, as the Administrator, and the responsible party, am going to have to have some pretty strong arguments before I can even approach these people to request their co-operation, and some means available to effect this co-operation if it is not given voluntarily.

Québec law states dogs must be tied or secured between the months of May and September [sic], the period when dogs are normally put on an island far from the settlement, and when the smallest amount of children are in the community. In September when the children are brought in to school, the dogs are also brought in, placing the greatest number of dogs in the community at a time when the largest population of small children exists. The two situations are just not compatible, and the risk of injury from loose dogs increases out of all proportion.

It poses a problem for my office, which I am extremely reluctant to take on my shoulders. I know that I would be the man expected to enforce the law, there being no one else to do so, and the community believing quite strongly that it is my responsibility. I am very reluctant to do so, knowing as I does the fact that I not only have no authority to do so, but that no legal right to do so exists. Frankly, my own intention was to warn dog-owners that allowed dogs to run at large in school play areas, and then destroy the dog if it is repeated too often. This is intended for the protection of the children

under departmental care, and the protection of my own child and those belonging to staff members. This while I realize is necessary, is still not legal nor really acceptable, because of the legal ramifications should a dog-owner care to make issue about the destruction of a dog.

We must have a positive approach to the problem, a negative approach, is just no solution at all, and it is a problem that is becoming increasingly difficult as time goes on.

As you are probably aware, I have raised this subject in every settlement in which I have been posted. No satisfactory solution has ever been devised. I have been told that injuries to my own child were considered one of who hazards of my employment, and that we should expect to consider the possibility of injuries as a calculated risk. These statements are not amusing to the other whites, nor acceptable, nor would I care to repeat them to them. For myself, I have accepted these "risks and take my own steps to reduce them, at least to my own satisfaction. Without legal support, I am extremely reluctant to take the responsibilities of looking after the children of others, it being as stated in my own case, a matter of individual responsibility.

So the problem basically is this; the Eskimo will tie their dogs, if white men owning huskies tie theirs, a perfectly reasonable request in my opinion. Therefore, in the event that the white man refuses to tie his, the official appointed to enforce any regulations made, must be empowered to destroy the dogs that are loose regardless of ownership, after giving suitable warning, of course.

I can tell Jacob Oweetaltuk, who owns the dogs in question, to tie them up, and this he will do; however if again turned loose by the white men who have more or less adopted the dogs as pets, I cannot feel easy about destroying Jacob's dogs, or place him between having to decide which white man he is going to listen to, as he will naturally follow the lead of the stronger, or at least the man who makes his interest stick. In this case the Administrator's position suffers.

I realize that by going behind an individual's back, through your office to his employer, would probably solve the problem for the time being, but this is not a solution but expediency, to be repeated again and again with each individual as the problem arises. I feel, and all feel, that the real solution is a regulation made, with enforcement powers granted to some member of this community, to ensure that

> the problem does not arise. Strangely enough, the Eskimo feel quite strongly on this subject also, and are quite expressive in their remarks. To quote the most outspoken Eskimo, he says "All dogs should be tied, or shot if loose; or no dogs be tied. Just because a husky is owned by a white man doesn't make him less dangerous than an Eskimo Dog"
>
> To show the feelings of the white community, Mr. McGirl INHS [Indian and Northern Health Services] Nurse, Rev. W. Graham, Anglican Mission, Mr. D. Coles, HB, & Mr. McArthur our Community Teacher have brought this subject up, to which I add my own voice. The D.O.T. [Department of Transport] staffs have several very young pre-school children in their group, and while they have no approached me directly, appear to have the same feelings. Mr. McGirl informed me that in the past five years, more than seven children have been killed and more than nine injured by dogs, and one woman is in hospital suffering major surgery from damage caused by dogs. This speaks for itself for the need for positive action, if similar incidents are to be reduced. Some of the statements made by these people in discussing the situation are a little too strong to be repeated here, but they are quite definite in their opinions that our Department is the responsible agency for any effective measures to be taken, as the senior administrative department, in the absence of alternative law enforcement agencies. Right or wrong, this is their feeling, and I expect that if we take no positive action, it will not be long before they take action themselves, and frankly I do not care to be involved in a situation such as could take place here, over what may be considered a minor matter.
>
> (s)
>
> A.P. Wight
>
> Northern Administrator

The stray dog issue continued to fester at Port Harrison. On October 26, 1964, the Quebec Provincial Police Chief Inspector, F. de Miffonis, wrote a letter to the Commander of the Hull Subdivision. He asked him to instruct Mr. Elbecque, on post at Port Harrison, to apply the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* (R.S.Q. 1941, Ch. 139) if he did not obtain the collaboration of all citizens, both native and white (NAC, R.G. 85, Vol. 1959, File A-1006-8-1-Pt. 1). The order was clear: all stray dogs had to be killed.

During my visit to Inukjuak, I interviewed 27 individuals: children of dog-owners, owners, and wives of dog-owners.

The majority of witnesses interviewed were living on the land during the period under study. It was only following the establishment of the school that they gave up their nomadic way of life and settled in the village.

For example, Noah Aculiak, 67 years of age, lived 22 miles north of Inukjuak. He said that when the school opened, his parents moved to the village, while he stayed two more years at the camp with his wife.

He moved to Port Harrison (now Inukjuak) with his nine sled dogs. Noah Aculiak stated that they were eliminated by poisoning, one after the other. He testified as follows:

> As an Inuk hunter depending on country food, relying on our survival for country food was very prominent and when my dogs got slaughtered or when they were killed, I was not able to go hunting anymore. (translation)

His sister, Alacie Aculiak, 70 years of age, also testified. She spoke of her father, brother and husband, who were all sled-dog owners.

She mentioned that in the camps, they did not tie up their dogs, but in the village, they tried to do so: “They would try to tie them up with what they had” (translation).

During their testimony, an Inuk was identified who had worked for the Provincial Police, killing any stray dog found at any time of year, therefore outside the period provided for in the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture*.

I questioned this Inuk, 71 years of age, who shall remain anonymous. He said that when he lived as a nomad, north of Inukjuak, he had seven or eight dogs.

He moved to Inukjuak with his wife and child:

> Initially, I came here for medical reasons and as a result, we ended up by living here in Inukjuak and shortly after I was hired by the government. (translation)

He pointed out that he had been employed by the Government of Quebec in 1960:

> We were based out of Port Harrison at the time when I was employed by the government. The government told me to shoot my dogs that were tied up so I'd shot my dogs but then, I was the one that was hired by the government to shoot loose dogs so I'm the man that was shooting loose dogs in Port Harrison. (translation)

He said that he worked with another Inuk who had been employed by the federal government: "So both governments were working together" (translation).

When the RCMP officers left the area in 1960, they were not replaced right away by the Provincial Police:

> There was no police.
>
> It appears that when RCMP left, there was no law enforcement here from three years to five years in total. So they joined forces and they collaborated together, the Eskimo Council and the federal government representatives. (translation)

The Inuit who lived in Port Harrison (now Inukjuak) knew that they were to keep their dogs tied up all year round. If they did not put them to use in summer, they had to put them on an island.

The nomadic Inuit who came to the post to trade, or to the nursing station, had to obey the order to tie up their dogs. Many of them knew nothing about it. One of them stated:

> Arrived in Inukjuak, we used to camp near the community and our dogs would be killed whenever they got loose and couldn't catch them up. And they were our only means to get back home. (translation)

I asked the Inuk employed by the provincial government whether he notified the owners prior to killing their dogs. His answer was categorical:

> No, we didn't.
>
> I was advised to kill any loose dog, just kill the dogs without informing them. That was the ruling. I was advised to shoot the dogs without informing the owners. (translation)
>
> Question:
>
> After the dogs got killed, did you know the consequences for the Inuit people?
>
> Answer:
>
> It's twofold people. When we shot their dogs, it was very hard to them to directly come to us. They didn't directly come to us but they complained about us. We sensed that they were, they had…… their attitudes toward us changed when we would shoot their dogs but they didn't directly confront us because our role was basically just to shoot loose dogs.
>
> Question:
>
> But did you know the dogs are [of] symbolic importance in the Inuit culture?
>
> Answer:
>
> Yes, I understood how important they were because that was the only form of transportation for the Inuit.
>
> Question:
>
> Did you tell that to the federal authorities and to the provincial authorities, like police?
>
> Answer:

I was not able to give my opinion, it was not my role to give opinion.

Question:

Did they communicate with you in Inuit, in Inuktitut?

Answer:

We had an interpreter.

Question:

But could you explain to them why it is so important, the dogs for the Inuit people?

Answer:

I couldn't. I was not able to.

Question:

You were too impressed by the white people, or what?

Answer:

Cause I worked for them. I worked for them, I couldn't overstep my authority. I was under them.

Question:

You're a respectful man?

Answer:

Yes. The government, it was impossible to say anything to confront the government.

At the end of his testimony, he said:

I just want to say that it was hard to be put in a position between my own people and the white. It was hard because both of them, I didn't have any way to maneuver. I was stuck trying to cater to both world[s].

A witness mentioned that the two officers from the two levels of government patrolled the village, looking for stray dogs, even in the early hours of the morning.

Another witness, Daniel Inukpuk, 66 years of age, explained that if one of the dogs got loose at his camp and that he could not catch it, the dog would systematically be killed. The death of his dogs caused him significant inconvenience because they were his means of transportation. He remembered that at the time, he often woke up at night to ensure that his dogs had not gotten loose.

> To get up at night checking if our dogs got loose, this was devastating to our minds. (translation)

He stated that in the period between 1965 and 1966, nine of his dogs were killed after getting loose.

Peter Angatookalook, 70 years of age, spoke of an incident he was victim to in 1967. He had owned eight Husky dogs for two years, while he lived in a camp two miles from Umiujaq. That day, he had gone hunting and had stopped to eat, when he untied his dogs. Five of his dogs saw a fox and ran after it.

> They ran after the fox so I got….. I lost the touch with my dogs. I had to wait for them because they knew where I was at in a particular spot. Instead of having them back to myself, I learned that they were killed by the police officers so I ended up having only three with me. So I had to walk back to the campsite with no food to provide for my family. (translation)

Obviously, based on his testimony, the dogs could not have represented a threat to public safety.

Eli Elisjassiapik, 73 years of age, the owner of seven dogs, was living on an island to the north of Inukjuak. In 1960, he said, he went to the village nursing

station with a child and the child's mother. While he was inside, his "first dog" (the lead) broke loose. It was killed:

> … Just that one first dog being killed did have an impact on me when I was trying to go back to the north camp. (translation)

Paulusie Qautsiaq Weetaluktuk, 70 years of age, was living in a camp located 25 miles from Port Harrison (now Inukjuak) at the time. When his father died in 1958, Paulusie became the owner of 12 dogs.

He went to the Hudson's Bay Company trading post to trade his furs. He knew that he had to tie up his dogs, which he did within view of police officers who were on surveillance duty. When two of his dogs broke loose, the policemen killed them.

> They started shooting the dogs right away so there was no leeway to adapt. We didn't get a chance to work with them…. We were also not given the reason why they were going to shoot the dogs. (translation)

Noah Paulosie, 70 years of age, lived five miles away from Inukjuak. In winter, as soon as his dogs broke loose and reached Inukjuak, they would be killed.

The bulk of the testimony revealed that dogs which broke loose and stray dogs were killed. Due to certain unfortunate incidents, government authorities imposed an obligation on dog-owners to tie up their dogs year-round, even though the authorities knew that they had no legal authority to do so.

4. **Puvirnituq (Povungnituk)**

This community is located close to the eastern shore of Hudson Bay. In 1951, the Hudson's Bay Company established a post that led many nomadic Inuit living in the area to settle at Puvirnituq.

In his report dated June 11, 1954 (final report of the RCMP, p. 345), Corporal A. Webster of the RCMP described the arrival of nomadic families.

> Yet a large percentage of the population is concentrated around the post. Last fall the whites counted 30 tents at Povungnituk. The winter patrol found as many or more natives around the post.

According to another report dated August 21, 1958, signed by Constable Rost Gibson (RCMP, p. 375), 350 Inuit were living within a one-mile radius of Povungnituk.

At the same time, the federal government established a school, making it mandatory for children to attend. I interviewed Mick Mallon, 75 years of age, former teacher and principal of the school, in Montreal in January 2009: he mentioned that when children were absent, he went to get them.

> If children weren't in school, I'd leave the school and go to their igloos and bring them. (translation)

Later, he said:

> So, yes, I was an aggressive school principal, but at the same time I'd like to think that I did work… which many parents didn't do.

The obligation for children to attend school led many families to settle in Puvirnituq. The situation was not unique to this community: it was the same in others that I visited.

In the 1950s, there was the Hudson's Bay Company post, a nursing station, a school, and the Roman Catholic mission with Father Steinmann. There were Whites, including Anita and Frank Vallée, an anthropologist about whom I will say more later.

In the late 1950s, Father Steinmann encouraged the Inuit of Puvirnituq and the region to practice the art of stone-carving with soapstone in order to depict their way of life, their traditions and their view of the world.

In the early 1960s, more than 500 people lived in this village.

In the above-mentioned report dated August 21, 1958, Mr. Gibson mentioned:

> During the winter (1954), diseases destroyed a very large percentage of the natives' dogs…. late in the winter, some camps were without dogs and some had only one, two or three.

In his report dated May 13, 1955 (final report of the RCMP, pp. 355-356), Constable W. Parsons wrote:

> There was no dog food or fat whatsoever at Povungnetuk and it is felt this is the fault of the natives as they made no effort to store fish when there were plentiful last fall.

His report explains that a Mr. N.J. Jones was the manager of the Hudson's Bay Company post.

Mick Mallon, 75 years of age, taught in Puvirnituq from December 1959 to July 1963. He testified about the events of that period. In fact, his comments on the dog controversy were published in *Nunatsiaq News* under the title, "The teacher, the dogs, and the anthropologist". The anthropologist was Frank Vallée, while the teacher was Mr. Mallon himself.

In the late winter of 1962, in the absence of police services and the federal administrator, Mallon took the initiative of convening an initial meeting to discuss the large number of dogs:

> The dogs outnumbered the rest of us…. In the absence of the police, the dogs roamed free. Actually, they did their own policing. Trespassers were bitten.

Those present at that first meeting included a few hundred Inuit, individuals from the Hudson's Bay Company and the nursing station, Father Steinman of the Roman Catholic mission, as well as the anthropologist, Frank Vallée, and his wife.

After several meetings, it was decided to form a dog patrol.

Mallon recounted:

> The Inuit suggested that the young nursing interpreter (an Inuk) be one of the two "dog officers", since he didn't go out on the land, and therefore, didn't need to rely on the help of his neighbors to the same extent as everyone else.

Those at the meeting proposed that Mallon fill the role of second dog officer, but he refused, and the name of the anthropologist, Frank Vallée, was then proposed. The latter accepted after meeting with Mr. Mallon.

The next day, Mr. Mallon changed his mind:

> But then I blew it. I had been a school prefect [head boy] in my Northern Irish Boarding School, imbued with a sense of responsibility, a kind of "prefectus oblige" [duty to act in a manner consistent with a prefect's position]. So the next morning, I took my pathetic single-shot 22, and joined the two slaughterers.

During his interview, I put before Mr. Mallon a newsletter signed by Frank and Anita Vallée (reprinted in the final report of the RCMP, pp. 474-476). He did not deny the facts reported by the Vallées.

In that letter dated February15, 1963 and signed by them, the Vallées explained what was happening in the village:

> In Povungnituk there are as many dogs as there are people. Imagine more than four hundred Eskimo dogs inhabiting a village about 700 yards long by about 300 wide, within whose boundaries they run, fight, play, sleep, defecate, urinate, bark and growl and their garbage, most of which is,

> fortunately, in a frozen state. Such minor inconvenience is hardly worth mentioning, however, when one considers the great value of dogs to the Eskimos in getting a living.
>
> What is worth mentioning is the problem of disease. Because of the crowded conditions, there is much mixing among the dogs….

Later, they confirmed what Mallon had said:

> At an Eskimo Council meeting last week, it was agreed that any dog found untied and wandering about the community should be shot. The problem was to persuade someone to do the shooting, for there is no policeman here and Pat Furneaux, one of whose roles it is to enforce community rules, was again away from the community…. It was instructive for anyone interested in social organization to observe how the Eskimos dealt with this problem. Because no Eskimo with dogs of his own would consent to shoot anothers' dogs, they sought out one who had no dogs. This one agreed to patrol the community provided that at least one "kabloona" (white man) patrolled with him and accepted responsibility for decisions about which dog should be shot. The person chosen for this unusual task was none other than Frank G. Vallée…. So every morning at about nine-thirty, Frank and Johnny Angituguk, POV, the Eskimo member of the patrol, shoulder their rifles…. The patrol has destroyed four dogs, two of these were clearly rabid and were easy to hit because they were chained, but the other two were mavericks which had broken loose and led the puffing posse on a crazy chase among the shacks and igloos where it is too dangerous to fire rifles before they were finally brought down at the edge of the village.

In the early 1960s, two people were treated for dog bites. According to the documentary evidence, there were no significant incidents. The Inuit of Puvirnituq also participated in the meetings and gave their consent to the creation of a dog patrol.

However, the evidence shows that in the winter of 1963, there was an outbreak of canine disease, mentioned in the final report of the RCMP (pp. 491, 475, 202, 244).

According to the Vallées, about 70 sick dogs were eliminated. According to Administrator J.D. Furneaux, there were between 60 and 100 dogs.

> The recent rabies in Povungnituk resulted in the loss [of] between sixty to one hundred dogs, some hunters losing their entire teams. Furthermore, in this decimated state, several men are finding it difficult to arrange their hunting trips and soapstone quarrying expedition.
>
> (his report of May 14, 1963, RCMP, p. 244)

In his memo dated June 19, 1963, Mr. Furneaux requested help from Ottawa so the Inuit could get other sled dogs in order to pursue their activities.

There would be no answer to Administrator J. D. Furneaux's request, which read as follows:

> It occurs to me that it might be possible to import one or two pairs of good dogs from elsewhere along the coast.

Among the eight witnesses interviewed, Nunga Kuananack, 74 years of age, stated that he had lost a whole dog team to the epidemic during the 1960s. He had six other dogs. They were all in good health, but died after having been vaccinated.

Saima Makkimaq, 69 years of age, also said that his father had lost all his dogs because of the epidemic in 1962. In his case, he lost the dogs he had in Inukjuak.

During my visit, five of the witnesses heard told of what they had witnessed or experienced.

The epidemic that occurred in 1962 and 1963 was mentioned; several families lost their dogs at that time. They also mentioned stray dogs that were killed. The owners of the dogs lived in camps. All this had an impact on their means of

subsistence and transportation. After 1965, police officers applied the law without warning, killing any stray dog.

Order-in-Council No. 332, adopted by the Lieutenant Governor in Council (Quebec) on February 23, 1965 was based on section 24 of the *Territorial Division Act* (R.S.Q. 1941, Ch. 3), which prohibited leaving dogs to run at large in certain communities in northern Quebec, including Puvirnituq.

In January 2009, I also interviewed Lisa Koperqualuk, 45 years old. She was born at Puvirnituq to parents who lived on the land. She had just begun a master's degree in anthropology at Laval University.

Her thesis topic was whether religion, in particular Pentecostalism, has any influence on decisions taken by organizations or other social structures in Nunavik. She said that Pentecostalism has similarities with shamanism, characterized by a veneration for nature and a belief in spirits. She testified:

> That is why Pentecostalism has a great influence in the Inuit communities.

During her testimony, she talked about her grandfather, a nomad whose dogs had been killed. An introvert, he did not speak about it. He was sad. He could no longer go hunting, leave, enjoy mobility or feed his family.

Based on the traditions and customs she knew of from her childhood, she believed dogs were companions. They transported families to their camps, carried things. They hunted with the elders. To become independent, to take a wife, to feed his family, a man necessarily had to have a dog team.

Before being allowed to look for a wife, he had to own a *qajaq*, a *panak* (a knife), had to have learned all the techniques of hunting and had to have a dog team. Inuit dogs needed a great deal of space.

In Lisa Koperqualuk's view, many Inuit were too vulnerable to be capable of expressing their frustrations. They did not understand why the Whites decide to eliminate their dogs; if they accepted it, in her opinion, it was out of a spirit of submission to the Whites. Many were weakened by tuberculosis and had no choice but to bend to the will of the Whites.

5. Akulivik (Qikirtajuaq or Smith Island)

This community is a peninsula in Hudson Bay. To the south, it borders on the mouth of the Illukotat River, and to the north, by a deep bay. Nearby is Smith Island, known to the Inuit at the time as Qikirtajuaq, a traditional hunting location.

Akulivik was legally constituted as a Northern Village in 1976.

The Hudson's Bay Company opened a trading post at Akulivik in 1922. In 1926, the post was moved to Smith Island. In 1933, 140 Inuit lived on the island. The trading post closed in 1952. The Inuit, who had become sedentary while on the island, left and settled in Puvirnituq, located 100 kilometers to the south, as well as in the vicinity. Puvirnituq already had a trading post and people wanted to move closer in order to trade.

From 1922 to 1955, the Inuit camped at the Akulivik hunting grounds in summer. In 1972, some of the families living in Puvirnituq returned to live in Akulivik.

The final report of the RCMP (p. 356) did not mention the dog issue at Akulivik. Constable W. Parson reported what he had seen on February 24, 1955 on Cape Smith:

> …the patrol arrived at Cape Smith where inquiries were made relevant to the natives adrift and their general welfare.

> The game situation had been very poor at this point, however, it was improving and there seemed no cause for alarm.

There is no documentation, Inuit interview or testimony to indicate that sled dogs were eliminated in this community during the period under study.

The nine witnesses heard at Akulivik reported events which for the most part occurred in the 1960s at Puvirnituq and at Kujjuaraapik, discussed above at length.

6. Ivujivik (Ivuyivik)

This community is located on Hudson Strait, close to Cape Wolstenholme (30 kilometers to the north-east) and at the bottom of a bay surrounded by imposing cliffs that plunge into the waters of Digges Sound. It is also a place where the strong currents of Hudson Bay meet those of the Hudson Strait.

The Hudson's Bay Company established a trading post in 1909. A Roman Catholic mission was opened in 1938. It was only after 1947 that Inuit started to settle around these two establishments. The Roman Catholic mission closed in 1960, the federal government took charge of delivering services. At the same time, the federal government built a school and attendance became mandatory for children of school age.

In 1967, the Inuit established a co-operative store.

The reports of the federal Administrator made no mention of canine disease epidemics or safety issues caused by stray dogs.

Game was abundant according to Corporal A.A. Webster's report, dated June 11, 1954. The Inuit, however, had a serious problem obtaining goods of all sorts. The Administrator wrote:

> The HBC [Hudson's Bay Company] have [sic] greatly underestimated the fur catch for this year… This is no doubt one cause of the shortage of goods. It is apparent however that the HBC did not put in sufficient stock to even cover their own fur forecast…. The winter patrol to Povungnituk, Ivuyivik, Sugluk and Wakeham Bay revealed that the same conditions prevailed there....
>
> (RCMP, p. 344 (3))

The report of Constable W. Parsons, dated February 24, 1955, observed that five Inuit were affected with trichinosis and that the dogs' food supply seemed insufficient because of the poor walrus hunt. He concluded:

> Dog food and patrol rations were supplied by father Mascaret, gratis, although the writer offered to pay for same. (RCMP, p. 355 (4))

In the 1960s, however, the situation changed. The RCMP left northern Quebec and were replaced by the Provincial Police. On balance, the evidence (nine witnesses heard), shows that when provincial officers patrolled Ivujivik and its vicinity, they eliminated any stray dog they saw.

Matitusi Ivaituk, 58 years of age, testified to this. He said that his brother had seven dogs:

> He was a trapper and he used to go fox trapping and seal hunting with his dog team.

The witness indicated that when he was 12 years old, he would "borrow" his brother's dog team.

> I used to borrow my brother's dog team when he was not using it. (translation)

In 1964, at the end of the winter, Matitusi Ivaituk recalled that a Quebec civil servant or an officer from the Provincial Police named André Huot (to him, "it sounded like that") would chase and shoot all stray dogs, even those which

sought shelter under houses, even at the risk of injuring the inhabitants. This Huot apparently killed all of his brother's eight dogs.

Another witness who also spoke about André Huot was Moses Naluiyuk, 64 years old: he lived in Ivujivik in the period from 1950 to 1970. I interviewed him during my visit to Salluit.

He said that his family owned a team of seven to nine dogs, used for seal-hunting and fishing.

He said the dogs were killed by a man named André Huot. Moses Naluiyuk explained:

> Question:
>
> Were you present when the dogs got killed?
>
> Answer:
>
> Yes, I had not just once but I did observe him, the Quebec agent killing dogs. His name was André Huot.
>
> Question:
>
> So, Quebec agent. You mean Quebec, Quebec police killed your dogs?
>
> Answer:
>
> No, it wasn't the police. It was a Quebec government agent, André Huot. There was someone prior to André Huot that was there. That was, that initiated killing the dogs and his name was Rod McGregor.
>
> Question:
>
> He was working for the police?
>
> Answer:

He was also an agent that was there before André Huot arrived….and André's the one that did the majority of the killing.

Question:

When did that happen?

Answer:

It was around 1965, 1966. It was initiated around November and it lasted till the month of December. That's where we become quite immobile. When December came around, more or less, we didn't have any more dogs.

Question:

How did they kill the dogs?

Answer:

Shooting them. He does recall at that time, they were getting shot by guns. In fact, they were, they started moving into matchboxes, wooden houses, and in fact, the agent was shooting dogs that were underneath the houses. He specifically remembers one incident where Um, this agent was shooting dogs underneath their house and his father went out and he says: "Um, ulurii", which is a form of saying, "Um, "don't shoot", like you're aiming too close to us.

Question:

Were the dogs tied up or loose?

Answer:

At that time, when the dogs were being killed, they were not tied. It was our custom not to tie our dogs. So we didn't tie our dogs back then. This whole form of being told our dogs was very new to us. Not only new to us, but new to the dogs, so the dogs always used to find ways to get loose.

Question:

Were you ever told to tie up your dogs?

Answer:

> Yes, we were told to start tying up our dogs but they didn't indicate to us that if they don't, if we don't tie up our dogs, the consequence that our dogs were to be killed. So that what was odd about it, we were told to tie our dogs but they didn't inform us that if the dogs are not tied, that they're gonna get killed.
>
> Question:
>
> I want to know when this happened. When the killing happened? It was between May and December?
>
> Answer:
>
> It was more or less in November, December and even January that the killings were taking place. I remember distinctly because I was a teenager back then. So I was, I utilized the dogs a lot so I vividly remember when the months when it occurred during those months. (translation)

In Salluit, I also interviewed Lucassie Qavavauk, 77 years of age. He had also lived in Ivujivik between the 1950s and the 1970s. He saw his eight sled dogs being slaughtered. I told him about the provision of the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture*, more precisely with respect to the prohibition on stray dogs from May 1st to December 15, pointing out that if they were not tied up they would be killed.

> Section 12:
>
> Any person may destroy a dog found wandering.

He answered:

> I find that very hard to accept. I find it very. I would, as an Inuk man, back then to just kill someone's that would be hard to do so he doesn't believe that this goes well with his culture.

Quitsak Tarriasuk, 74 years of age, stated that six of his dogs were killed by the Provincial Police in 1963. In this case as well, the dogs were not tied up.

Paulusie Qaunnaluk, 82 years of age, recalled that in the early 1960s, two people, a woman and a child, were attacked by dogs. Later, for safety reasons, the teachers and the Quebec police officer started killing all stray dogs in the village, even at the risk of injuring people.

> They were shooting dogs that were underneath the houses, endangering people that were inside the houses.

He also testified as follows:

> It was hard to try to argue. Like I mean their primary reason was that it was for security reasons. You can't argue with that. But my understanding from everything that has happened, my observations, I believe that it was a way of the Federal Government trying to eradicate or to assimilate us to one way of life. (translation)

Prior to 1960, the stray dogs were not an issue:

> White people didn't seem to have any problems prior to 1954 to 1960, 1950. In fact, white people used to even own dogs. (translation)

Surusituk Ainalik, 55 years of age, said that her family lived in a camp when her father's ten dogs were killed in the late 1960s, or in the early 1970s.

Asked whether he knew that there was a law obliging dog-owners to tie up their dogs from May 1st to December 15, the witness said that he never knew of the existence of such a law: "Never, never saw, seen this. Just now after 55 years."

To him, the elimination of dogs was a form of genocide aimed at Inuit assimilation: "Of one way of culture" (translation).

Martha Ainalik, 55 years of age, came in order to testify in a very emotional way about the elimination of her dog:

> I owned a dog, as a little girl, and the dog was killed. (translation)

This happened in the early 1960s. To her, the dog was a companion:

> Her best friend, when it was killed, she was very, very affected by it. (translation)

Another woman, Mary Mangiuk, 73 years of age, wanted to testify: not in order to complain about dogs that had attacked and bitten her so badly that she had had to be hospitalized in Toronto, but because people would mock and tease her for being disfigured by dog bites.

Mary Mangiuk testified:

> She says that she doesn't have any resentment for the dogs, for the dogs that attacked her. (translation)

Later, she said:

> She was attacked by dogs and there is a consequence where people make fun of how she looks today. She's got scars, she's got scars here, she's got scars on her arms and people have the audacity to make fun of her. And as you see, it hurts her because that's what she has been struggling will all her life, is people that don't understand or that mock her for what she looks like today and she says that those people that mock her are people that actually don't do, can't do the things she can do today.
>
> So she, her advice, she wanted to come here today to advise people not to mock people that have physical handicap or have been disfigured because of being attacked by any thing. (translation)

According to the report of Administrator A.B. Roberts, dated February 25, 1964, a few sick dogs were vaccinated. He maintained that the dog-owners were very co-operative and that he could rely on them to inform him about their dogs' conditions (RCMP, p. 247).

7. **Salluit (Sugluk – Saglouc)**

This community is located at the bottom of the Salluit Fjord, at 108 kilometers from Hudson Strait and halfway between the communities of the Hudson Bay coast and those of the Ungava Bay coast. On several occasions, Salluit was chosen as a meeting place for representatives of the 14 communities of Nunavik.

In 1903, the Revillon Frères Company opened a fur trading post in Salluit. In 1927, the Hudson's Bay Company established its own trading post there.

A Roman Catholic mission was established in 1930, but ceased all activity in 1950. In 1955, an Anglican mission was established there.

In 1957, the federal government established a school with mandatory attendance. In 1959, construction of residential housing began. In 1979, Salluit was legally constituted as a Northern Village municipality.

In Salluit, as elsewhere, the culture shock was obvious.

In the letter of November 15, 1958 to Quebec Premier Maurice Duplessis cited above, Minister Hamilton explained that as in Sugluk (cited above), dialogue with the Inuit concerning stray dogs was difficult:

> … we have regretfully concluded that there is no possibility of solving the problem without legal sanctions. (RCMP, p. 52)

In 1958, an individual was attacked by dogs. Kaudja Tarkirq, interviewed in 1999 at the age of 64, stated:

> There was a child attacked here in Salluit but was saved by my father and I think the child may have not survived the attack had not my father intervened. (translation)

In the late 1950s, more and more Inuit took up a sedentary lifestyle. As a result, more and more dogs were running loose. However, they do not appear to have fallen prey to canine diseases.

In 1961, 260 Inuit and eight Whites were living in Salluit (RCMP, p. 395). The Inuit were hostile to the Whites's desire to control their dogs.

In his report dated August 8, 1961, Constable T.C. Jenkin of the RCMP, during a visit to the various villages on the *C.D. Howe*, mentioned:

> (a) The Quebec Dog Regulations. What are they; who shall enforce same; and who shall carry on inoculations for rabies?
>
> It is commented that the people of this community have found difficulty in enforcing any rules regarding the Eskimos' dogs running loose within the limits of the settlement. The Eskimos themselves appear quite hostile to any of the whites taking any action. (RCMP, p. 394)

In his response to Officer Jenkin, Inspector E.R. Lysyk clarified who was responsible for the problem of stray dogs:

> This is the responsibility of the Provincial authorities. (RCMP, p. 395)

He concluded his report as follows:

> This matter has been referred to the Director, Northern Administration Branch, Dept. of N.A. & N.R. [Northern Affairs and National Resources], copy of our letter attached, and it would seem that through him his representatives in the Sugluk area could surely take the proper action in establishing liaison with the provincial authorities. No further action is being taken here. (RCMP, p. 395)

In another report dated February 25, 1964, Administrator A.B. Roberts reported that the dogs in Salluit had been dealt with in 1963 (RCMP, p. 247).

On balance, the evidence and the witnesses heard and interviewed show that the elimination of sled dogs by the provincial authorities occurred in 1963, 1964 and 1965, even in winter, and the main reason given was "dogs running loose". Some had simply broken loose without their owner being aware of it.

As was the case in the other villages I visited, the loss of their dogs was devastating to the owners. They lost a companion, their means of transportation and their livelihood, that is to say, their hunting and fishing.

To them, it was incomprehensible that the Whites would demand that their dogs be tied up.

Paulie Padlayat, 72 years of age, was of the opinion that when government representatives settled in Salluit, they did not take the time to learn about Inuit culture before taking decisions about their lives. Following the elimination of his eight dogs, neither he nor the other owners ever received help or an offer of help from either of the two levels of government.

Several owners stated that their dog teams had been eliminated gradually. Some mentioned that the Provincial Police officer was accompanied by an Inuit assistant and that the two of them killed their dogs.

While interviewing the witnesses, I noted that they had been and, in some cases, were still resentful towards the Whites. They did not accept the grounds of safety relied upon by the authorities.

Timmiaq Payungie, 60 years of age, gave his opinion of the Whites' behavior in a mocking tone:

> I remember two kinds of dogs in my life. There's a hunter dog and qallunaats' dog. Today, I understand that the qallunaats always want to be competitive to anyone in the world and they want to be little greater than anybody else. So, their dogs were the same. They were hunting dogs but they're not as professional dogs as Eskimo dogs. They

> always want to compete the other dogs, the other hunters' dog… they will also compete the other dogs… until mating days ["laughs"], you know?

8. **<u>Kangiqsujuaq (Wakeham Bay – Ste-Anne-de Maricourt)</u>**

Kangiqsujuaq is located 10 kilometers from Hudson Strait on the southeastern shore of Wakeham Bay, at the bottom of a valley surrounded by mountains. The village was first called Wakeham Bay in honor of Captain William Wakeham who explored the area in 1897 to check the navigability of Hudson Strait.

In 1961, the Government of Quebec changed the name of the village to Ste-Anne-de-Maricourt. After the signing of the *James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement*, its name was changed again. Legally constituted as a Northern Village, it is now known as Kangiqsujuaq, its Inuit name. Southeast of that community (15 kilometers away) are Qajartalik and Qikertasiuk Island, where I was shown petroglyphs dating from about 1,200 years ago. These petroglyphs are believed to date back to the late Dorset period.

In 1910, the French fur-trading company Revillon Frères opened a trading post. In 1914, the Hudson's Bay Company established its own post.

In 1936, Oblate of priests established a Roman Catholic mission in the village. Father Jules Dion carried out his ministry there until 1964. Prior to that date, he had served as pastor in Quartaq from the time of his arrival in northern Quebec in July 1955 (see his biography: Raymonde Haché, *Jules Dion – Cinquante ans au-dessous de zéro*, Montréal: Éditions Anne Sigier, 2005).

In 1950, Inuit families lived in igloos in winter and in tents in the spring and summer. They also began to receive their family allowances and old age pensions for the first time.

In 1960, the federal government opened a school. In 1961, a nursing station was established. In 1961 and 1962, small prefabricated houses were built and Inuit settled in the village. A Protestant mission was established in 1963.

The final report of the RCMP mentioned that federal Administrator A.B. Roberts requested 250 doses of dog vaccines on January 31, 1964 (p. 247).

But another memo, dated April 1, 1964, and signed by Administrator L.G. Beauchamp, mentions that the vaccines requested were not delivered to Wakeham Bay (p. 247).

The same memo gave an account of a meeting between teachers from Wakeham Bay, Payne Bay (Kangirsuk) and Koartak which seems to confirm reports by several dog-owners:

> Their dogs were healthy, after they were vaccinated they died. (translation)

Referring to teachers from the three villages, Mr. Beauchamp wrote:

> The subject was discussed with all the teachers in these settlements and it seems that the problem was due to the fact that no one had warned the Eskimos that some of their dogs might be sick or die after receiving the inoculation and it therefore came as a shock to them when some of their dogs did die.
>
> We have now explained to Messrs. Cassidy, Baldwin and Little that in Chimo, two men were sent to make a dog count as well as to explain to the Eskimos the risk involved. No one here refused the vaccine and less then ten dogs died after inoculation.

In several villages, some of the dog-owners refused to have their dogs inoculated. They were skeptical. They had their traditional methods for treating sick dogs, but if they noticed their dogs were rabid, they would kill them immediately. They did not trust the Whites.

Researchers hired by Makivik Corporation found nothing in the archives of the Sûreté du Québec with respect to the numerous occasions when dogs were killed in the mid-1960s by an officer of the Provincial Police, helped by an Inuit assistant from Fort Chimo (Kuujjuaq). The work required to eliminate the dogs apparently lasted three days.

The final report of the RCMP never mentions the involvement of federal civil servants or policemen in the mass slaughter of sled dogs in Kangiqsujuaq.

The only evidence I had to assess were the 18 interviews transcribed in 1999 and the ten depositions by witnesses heard during my visit to Kangiqsujuaq.

As was the case in the other villages, the dog issue arose once the school opened because mandatory attendance led families who has been nomadic to settle in the village. Never before, that is to say, not since time immemorial, had outsiders attempted to exert control over the dogs, which seemed so strict to members of the community. To the Inuit, the Whites' attitude was a threat to their culture, their way of life. They could not understand how a provincial statute, of which most were unaware, could give an officer discretion to determine the fate of their sled dogs. Tying up dogs that used to roam freely was not an easy task for owners, especially since many of them did not have adequate collars and chains.

On balance, the evidence shows that the principal events which led to the slaughter of more than 200 dogs over a three-day period occurred around 1965, 1966 or 1967. More than half of the canine population of Kangiqsujuaq appears to have been killed at that time.

Witnesses mentioned that the Provincial Police officer and his assistant, Elijah Itsayak Johannes of Kuujjuaq, arrived by plane, bringing with them a snowmobile which they used to chase dogs in order to kill them. (Adamie Alaku, 54 years of age: "… skidoos so they could chase the dogs.")

They met with some of the dog-owners. Luukasi Nappaaluk, 50 years of age, then an adolescent, stated that he was present at the meeting. He reported that dog-owners asked the police officer why he wanted to kill their dogs:

> They wanted to know why the dogs wanted to be killed. We were told that they have been attacking in some communities and the government wants to reduce the number of their dogs, even though they were not forced to kill all of the dogs, 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.

Mrs. Livi Arnaituq, 63 years of age, whose husband was a dog-owner, indicated that they had been living in a camp at Quaqtaq and that they had moved into another camp at Kangirsujuaq: "We came here specifically to go to school."

She mentioned that the Provincial Police officer and Elijah Johannes each had three to four rifles ("guns") and that they killed more than 200 dogs, including the nine dogs belonging to her husband:

> It was very traumatic to see all the dogs gathered down at the bay and burned all at once. It was very very ugly scene. And she's always wondered why they do that, why did they gather all the dogs and burn them where everyone can see. What was the significance behind that? (translation)

For his part, Naalak Nappaaluk, 72 years of age, indicated in July 1999, that he had not objected to the killing of his eight dogs: "I agreed to them because I no longer have use for them."

He had just bought a snowmobile.

> But for myself, I voluntarily had my dogs killed because I no longer value them as I have been saying. I preferred my snowmobile, if I did not have a snowmobile, I would not want to have them killed.

According to the evidence, he and Amaamak Jaaka, 78 years of age, were the only dog-owners to have snowmobiles at the time.

Mr. Jaaka, even though he had a snowmobile, did not want to have his 11 dogs killed:

> It was very painful because they weren't just my dogs, my children were co-owners of the dogs, so the children were very attached to the dogs.

In speaking of the meeting with the Provincial Police officer and his Inuit assistant, he described his state of mind, which was essentially the same as that of others members of his community:

> It was all our dogs, everyone here, it was one shot deal where all our dogs were killed, it was such an ordeal that we became very passive, we just allow it to happen because we were so traumatized. (translation)

Appik Tuniq, 67 years of age, stated in July 1999:

> … We had no choice, it was said that there will be killing of the dogs, and we just obeyed them because we were very respectful in those days so we just listened, even though we were not given anything for transportation.

Uppigaq Ilimasault, 69 years of age, recounted in 1999:

> …We were told that the dogs will be killed, so we just accepted that, we didn't seem to have choice but to accept it… (translation)

Several owners interviewed said that no-one had asked them whether they agreed that their dogs should be killed. There was never a reason put forward, nor any discussion held with them.

Oppigak Ilimasault, 80 years of age, stated that no meeting took place:

> They arrived and they started ordering us to bring down the dogs to get killed.

All were dependent on their dogs for hunting, trapping and transportation.

As for the Inuit assistant, Elijah Johannes, he claimed he had assumed he had the owners' consent to slaughter their dogs, since they were bringing their dogs to be killed.

> People brought their dogs. I guess they wanted them that way because they were bringing us the dogs. I was shooting so many dogs, the ones we were going to burn on the ice. People brought dogs that they didn't want. All those dead dogs that piled up. I will never forget that in Kangiqsujuaq. (emphasis added)

However, the rest of his testimony demonstrated that by his own admission, people did not really consent ("I guess").

> I was even shot at. We were shot at. People shot at us.
>
> Question:
>
> Because you were shooting dogs?
>
> Answer:
>
> Yes. We got shot at when we just finished shooting dogs.

At this point, I am reminded of what R.A.J. Phillips wrote in a memo to Mr. Cunninghan on September 10, 1959 (cited above):

> The Provincial Police authorities regard the dog problem as a police matter, they have not delegate authority to deal with it….

It must be understood that the Inuit experienced an unbelievable social and cultural upheaval when, in the space of a few years, they abandoned their nomadic way of life in small camps for a sedentary lifestyle. Their contact with the Whites was demanding. Against their will, they were forced to submit to "southern" ideas and values that changed their culture and traditions.

9. **Quaqtaq (Koartak)**

This community is located on the eastern shore of Diana Bay, called Tuvaaluk ("the great ice pack") in Inuktitut, on a peninsula that advances to where Hudson Strait and Ungava Bay meet.

In contrast to other communities, there was no fur-trading post. Witnesses interviewed mentioned they had traded their furs for food and manufactured goods in Kangirsuk.

In 1947, a Roman Catholic mission was opened by Father André Steinmann of the Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate (O.M.I.). He was its director until 1952, when he was replaced by his colleague, Father Joseph Antoine, O.M.I., who was posted there until 1958. Father Jules Dion, O.M.I., joined Father Antoine in July 1955 and stayed until August 1964, when he was replaced by Father Joseph Meeus, O.M.I.

In the early 1950s, approximately 100 Inuit lived in the region, living in igloos and tents in the summer. Father Dion's biography (p. 71, cited above) contains a photograph of igloos in the village, a woman named Louisa with a child and, in the foreground, dogs in harness.

Father Dion describes what he saw during this period in Chapter Five of his biography, entitled “Life in Igloos”:

> In each camp, there can be from one to four families living in small units. A camp of 30 people is a large camp. The Inuit settle in specific locations where they know game is abundant.
>
> The Inuit usually build their igloos by the ocean where they prefer to live. However, I have also seen camps inland. These people live mostly from hunting and, depending on the season, they live along bays or on the edge of capes and peninsulas. At the end of winter, they choose places that are close to the water and free of ice.

> Building an igloo for the family is an art requiring two or three days' work. The Inuit first build the actual igloo, then porchways: doors which serve as an entrance. The first porchway, totally empty is used as a windbreak. A wall of snow is built in front of the entrance to keep the wind from blowing in. It changes direction every day, depending on the wind. Then, another porchway is added to store everything that has to be kept out of reach of the dogs: meat, oil and ropes for harnesses.
>
> To enter the igloo itself, where the family lives, requires going up one step. The floor is made of snow. The Inuit build small platforms on each side of the entrance on which they place seal oil lamps and kitchen utensils. Above them, they puncture the sides of the igloo with two sticks in order to hang the teapot over the lamp which is placed on the snow. This lamp is used for light, to reheat the teapot and to heat the igloo.
>
> No-one stands on the floor. They sit on the platform which is used as a bed. This platform is covered with caribou skins and alder branches gathered along the rivers. They lay these branches, which have been tied up with string, on the platform. Then caribou skins are piled on top of the branches to protect the occupants from the cold. Sometimes the skins are covered with sheets or blankets to keep the caribou hair from spreading.
>
> Above the entrance to the main igloo, part of the wall of snow is replaced with a block of ice to allow daylight to come in. Every morning, the women use a fan-shaped knife, called an "ulu", to remove the frost that forms on the ice. On the outside, they add a block of snow which reflects the sunlight onto the ice window. This is a lot of work.
>
> Outside, all around and halfway up the height of the main igloo, they build a wall of snow blocks to protect it from the wind. The holes in the roof are filled in with other blocks of ice.

Elsewhere, he recounts:

> The woman has to look after the igloo, fetch water, and make bannock and tea. The man hunts and fishes. He brings in the food.
>
> An igloo is used as a dwelling place for about a month and a half. When it becomes too dirty or icy it no longer offers

> protection from the cold; it becomes icebox. That is when the Inuit build another one. (pp. 70-71)
>
> Aside from families living in igloos or in tents in the summer, some families live in square houses (matchboxes).
>
> In 1955 the government built a few prefabricated houses for the Inuit. (p. 115)

Father Dion mentions that in May 1962, civil servants from the Department of Indian Affairs came by plane in a DC3 to announce that the federal government was going to build a school.

According to the evidence heard in the various villages I visited, sedentarization of the Inuit began after the establishment of schools with mandatory attendance. Whites were already living in most of the settlements.

This version of events is corroborated by Father Dion in his biography. Here is what he says on the topic and what federal civil servants said:

> The Villages began when schools were built. The federal government agent told them: "We are going to build boarding schools. You have to send your children to school. You can stay in the hunting camps, but the children have to go to school. You will be able to see them whenever you want. They will come back to you in the camps at Christmas, Easter and during the summer holidays. In this way, no family will be forced to move." (p. 118)

Elsewhere, Father Dion recounted:

> They experimented with this in Kangirsuk, where there was what they called a hostel. This was not a hotel, but a building in which students lived as boarders. White people looked after them, but the children were not happy there. They missed their parents.
>
> One winter's night, a few children aged 10 to 12 attending the elementary school ran away from the hostel, unnoticed by their supervisors. They crossed the Payne River (five to six kilometres away) in order to join their parents who were camping on the other side.

> What the government minister did not know is that an Inuk never separates himself from his children. So this new lifestyle did not last very long. People never wanted to adopt this new system. In spite of opposition by the Hudson Bay's Company Manager, the parents decided to move to Kangirsuk. They were opposed because if the Inuit remained near by, they would not hunt. The manager would buy fewer furs and less fur means less profit. (p. 118)

He added that, at the time, people at the trading posts were in favour of Inuit living in camps so they could engage in hunting and trapping consistently, that is, for economic reasons.

With respect to Quaqtaq, Eva Tukkiapik, 73 years of age, reported that mandatory school attendance for children was the main reason for their sedentarization.

> …Since 1959 [*sic*], when the education system was put into place, that's when we had no choice but to segregate into Quaqtaq here.

In Quaqtaq, prior to the federal government opening the school, the children attended the Roman Catholic mission. Father Joseph Antoine, the director, was fluent in Inuktitut and provided them with schooling.

Father Dion recounted:

> Father Antoine and I teach 19 children, 13 in the first grade and six in the second grade. I teach syllabics (writing in symbols) and Inuktitut (language) mainly to the grade two students. One half of the blackboard is for them and the other half for me. I learn as much as they do.
>
> Before 1960, there was no school as such. That is why the children come to the mission and enjoy it. The federal government sent us school supplies: scribblers, pencils, erasers and books. We do not use the books because they are in English and are not adapted to our teaching program. (p. 116)

In his biography, Father Dion condemned the fact that English was imposed as the sole language of instruction in the federal schools:

> … At the federal school there is no possibility to teach Inuktitut. The students are even forbidden to speak in their own mother tongue. (p. 142)

In August 1964, when he left Quaqtaq for Kangiqsujuaq, Father Dion said:

> That year, most of the Inuit were living in square houses, in a matchbox style, pre-fabricated by the government. About 100 people lived in the village. Everyone had come back from the various camps. (p. 136)

By 1964, a federal agent and a Quebec provincial agent were working in the village (p. 142). There was also a nursing station for health care.

According to the witnesses heard, their way of live changed abruptly in 1965-1966, as had happened in Kangiqsujuaq, when representatives from both levels of government began eliminating dogs.

Inuit witnesses report having been intimidated and forced to act against their will. They recalled that Whites exercised authority on their territory without consulting the people by ordering that all stray dogs should be killed. This was contrary to Inuit traditions and culture.

Susie Aloupa, 66 years of age, testified in July 1999:

> Question:
>
> When did your dogs get killed?
>
> Answer:
>
> I think it happened in 1965 or 1964. I'm not sure but I think it was in 1965.
>
> Question:
>
> Who killed your dogs?
>
> Answer:

> Our men were not even given a choice and ordered to kill all of their dogs. There was a report of someone having been attached and eaten by dogs. Given no choice but to agree with the ultimatum they started slaughtering their dogs. They slaughtered almost all their dogs. I can recall of the men (Matiusie Kulula, Putulik Kulula, Aloupa Itigaituk, Jobie Tukkiapik, Etua Puttayuk) going after their dogs and killing them as the dogs were never tied up.
>
> Question:
>
> Who ordered your dogs killed?
>
> Answer:
>
> The teachers were given a message by the police, either by correspondence or radio contact, which was an order to have all of the dogs killed. Although it was the teachers relaying the order – given by the police – the missionaries were trying to be more helpful to us, indicated that not all the dogs should be killed (I recall overhearing them when I was their housemaid).

Tivi Okpik, 75 years of age, identified one of the teachers as John Little.

> The teacher asked me:
>
> Do you want to give away your dogs for shoot?
>
> I said: No.
>
> The teacher:
>
> You have a skidoo and dogs at the same time. How do you want to handle them?
>
> I said: I want to handle them by my own, both skidoo and dogs.
>
> But he tried to persuade me.

Interviewed in July 1999, Charlie Okpik, 57 years of age, reported that ten of his dogs were killed without explanation:

> Question:

> Were your dogs tied up or loose during the killing?
>
> Answer:
>
> They were loose as was our customs to let our dogs loose as soon as they became free from their harnesses. Nobody used to tie their dogs up at that time. (translation)

Later, he also mentioned that no-one had been attacked by dogs in the community of Quaqtaq.

In answer to the question, "Could you say anything when your dogs were being killed?", his reply reflected a deep antipathy towards Whites:

> No, it happened at the time whites were considered supreme people and we were shameful of them.

Tivi Oovaut, 82 years of age, worked for the federal government, operating a weather station at Cape Hopes Advance, near Quaqtaq. He reported that he grew up on the land. He moved to Quaqtaq in 1959 or 1960. In 1964, there were 150 to 200 dogs in the village:

> At that time, they were trained in a way where they would stay within the vicinity of the tent within the houses. So he didn't need to tie his dogs up. They knew their territory. It's not like the dogs today where you see dogs roaming between houses. The way they were trained is they were so well-trained that they lived and dwelled in and where their master dwelled. (translation)

The witness also estimated that about 100 dogs were put down: "When they were killed, they were brought to the sea ice." In answer to the question, "Why dogs are valuable to Inuit people?", he replied:

> I believe dogs were very very valuable because they were our form of transportation. The Hudson's Bay Company has benefited from our dogs because they allowed us to have trap lines and we brought furs and traded furs to the Hudson's Bay Company. So it wasn't just within our own culture but it benefited even outside. With the fox furs, without our dog teams, we wouldn't have gone as far as having long trap

> lines and sell our furs and as result, Hudson's Bay Company wouldn't be able to purchase furs.

A publication from the National Museum of Man, in the Mercury Series, sets out the opinion of Milton Freeman, an ethnologist who is well known in the Canadian Arctic (National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service, Paper No. 47 (ISSN 0316-1862), p. 108):

> 45. Milton Freeman (personal communication) argues that in the traditional hunting economy an individual without dogs was actually relieved of a considerable burden, and could manage to fend for himself quite nicely. This would appear to be a valid argument since the size of teams during the traditional period was often one-fifth or one-fourth that of teams during the trapping period. The argument presented here may thus be more characteristic of the period of time during which fur trapping was the main economic focus, for it was during this period that large dog teams were essential to operating trap lines.

Elsewhere, the same publication stated (p. 59):

> The most crucial problem is the dog team. It takes a minimum of three years to establish an effective team from 'scratch' and often one or two years more. While the dog team is being formed the hunter must have access to others' dogs in order to feed himself and to nourish his growing team of young dogs. In order to do this he must establish himself with a family.

The evidence leads to the conclusion that the situation in Quaqtaq seems similar to events in Kangiqsujuaq. Police officers and teachers insisted that dog-owners have their dogs killed, against their will. A Provincial Police officer and his Inuit assistant came from Kuujjuaq to put down stray dogs in operations carried out under the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture*. A Provincial Police officers also intervened, after 1966, exercising their powers in an arbitrary fashion. They decided to kill dogs without any investigation or any information about the danger posed by the dogs; what is more, they also put down dogs belonging to snowmobile-owners, in the belief that their animals would no longer be useful to them.

10. **<u>Kangirsuk (Payne Bay, Bellin)</u>**

This community is located on the north shore of Payne River, 13 kilometers (8 miles) inland from Ungava Bay, 118 kilometers (74 miles) south of Quaqtaq and 230 kilometers (143 miles) north of Kuujjuaq.

In 1921, the French company Revillon Frères opened a fur-trading post and, in 1925, the Hudson's Bay Company established one of its own.

In 1959, the federal school opened its doors. Following this event, many nomadic families came to Kangirsuk to settle permanently, first in traditional shelters and later in matchbox houses, as mentioned by Father Dion, cited above.

Lizzie Inugaluak Lucassie, 70 years of age, confirmed that they moved when the school was opened and added:

> She does recall that when they were, when they did gather, there was a lot of dogs. A lot untied dogs at that time. There was no system in place to tie the dogs down.

Lasa Kotak, 60 years of age, also testified about the move:

> Question:
>
> Is it true the majority of the population living in the region started to gather here in Kangirsuk after the school was open?
>
> Answer:
>
> I believe when the federal school was building schools in each of the communities, I think majority of the communities today, majority of the people that were in their permanent camp grounds, moved to these segregated.

Tamisa Augiak, 75 years of age, stated that he and his family came to the village after the school was opened and, referring to other nomadic families, made a point which confirmed what Father Dion said in his biography:

> Because their children were being brought for residential school, a lot of parents were concerned and didn't want to be far away from their children, so a lot of them ended having no choice but to segregate here.

As the evidence cited above demonstrated to me, school attendance was mandatory for children of school age. If parents or families did not obey this order from the federal government, parents would lose their right to family allowances and the elders their right to old-age pensions.

Tamisa Augiak spoke of the residential schools. Father Dion, cited above, mentioned that they were described as hostels, that is, boarding schools.

Joseph Nassak, 71 years of age, testified that he came to settle in the community after the school was opened. The same went for the family of Joanasie Kudluk, 62 years of age.

David Pinguapik, 65 years of age, testified:

> Eh, we lived mainly across the bay from here, uh, we lived in igloos in the winter time and we lived in tents in the fall to spring time…

Then, he added:

> But after 1959, when the federal school was built, is when his family permanently moved to Kangirsuk (translation)

Peter Niki Airo, 75 years of age, testified:

> I more or less grew up the river all my life, so I've been around the vicinity of Kangirsuk all my life.

> We moved here around 1960-1961, when the school, when our children had to go to school. (translation)
>
> Question:
>
> After the Federal Government opened the school?
>
> Answer:
>
> Yes.
>
> Question:
>
> So at that time, is it true the majority of the population living in the region started to gather here in Kangirsuk after the federal school was opened?
>
> Answer:
>
> Yes, majority of them moved here after the federal school was built.

The same happened with the families of Elijah Simionie, 49 years of age, and Willie Thomassie, 63 years of age. Previously nomadic, both families settled in Kangirsuk after the school was opened.

Once they moved there, the families lived in igloos or tents in the village and earned their livelihood by hunting, fishing and trapping.

In 1961, the federal government established a nursing station and built small matchbox houses. This form of construction reflected the Inuit families' way of life, mid-way between a nomadic and a sedentary lifestyle.

In 1965, an Anglican mission was established and a church was built.

In 1966, a co-operative store opened its doors.

In 1981, Kangirsuk, which means "the bay" in Inuktitut, was constituted as a Northern Village municipality.

In 1963, according to reports from regional administrators, many dogs were infected with canine diseases. Several died, and others were inoculated:

> Apparently, some dogs at Payne Bay were already sick when they received their shot and they died.
>
> (Final report of the RCMP, p. 247)

As mentioned earlier, the dog-owners were not informed of the risk of losing theirs dogs, even healthy ones, as a result of vaccination. (Report of L.G. Beauchamp, RCMP, p. 247).

The report of the Administrator posted in Fort Chimo, Mr. Laviolette, dated April 8, 1964, confirms that vaccinations took place:

> Payne Bay one hundred and forty-four of which one hundred vaccinated. (RCMP, p. 248)

To determine what happened in the 1960s, when nomadic families living in the area were settling permanently at Payne Bay, I obtained from Makivik Corporation the transcripts of 12 interviews and one statement; I also heard the testimony of 19 people whom I was able to interview during my visit to Kangirsuk.

On balance, the evidence demonstrates that the majority of nomadic families brought their dogs with them and refused to tie them up. The Inuit held to their ancestral traditions that had allowed them to survive for millennia. For dog-owners, it was a form of culture shock to be asked to tie up their dogs, as was demonstrated to me during my tour of the Nunavik communities. Kangirsuk was no exception.

Sammy Putulik, 50 years of age, stated that his father, the owner of five or six dogs, was able to obtain a permanent job at the Hudson's Bay Company store.

He got rid of his dogs. He was one of the first among the Inuit to be able to buy a snowmobile.

He said:

> Although many of my parents' relatives were still using dog teams as a means to get some food, for a while, we were one of the few who did have a real dog team anymore.

In his view, there were two kinds of dogs:

> One must understand that the behavior of dogs depended on the owner's character or in other words, how the owner treated his dogs. The ones that treated their dogs most fairly had dogs that were not aggressive, even friendly ones. However, the ones that treated their dogs as if they were slaves had dogs that tend to become aggressive to anything that approached them.

Sammy Putulik recognized that some dogs became aggressive when their owners did not feed them. The dogs then would go wandering in search of food:

> They started to break into people's homes (usually the porch area where the meat was stored because of having no freezer or fridge), and their shacks (to store hunting and fishing equipment as well as food).

He stated as follows:

> So the more the dogs became more numerous and hungrier, the more we became aggressed, bitten, growled at, snarled at, stalked at and even attacked. Whenever we played outside, we were always on a lookout for aggressive dogs and when they would show up, we had to run to any nearby shelter until they went away. The problem of rabies, distemper and other diseases that infected the dogs should not also be overlooked.
>
> Before the slaughters occurred, <u>we lost two of our children in the community in a span of a few years, including my own sister who was 2 or 3 years old at the time she was killed by hungry dogs.</u>

As an aside, the evidence reveals that in the mid-1960s, the Provincial Police (SQ) put down approximately 100 dogs at Kangiqsujuaq and at Quaqtaq for so-called safety reasons, relying on the fact that two children had been attacked and killed by dogs. These are the children to whom Sammy Putulik referred: his sister and a young boy, Iqaluk Airo.

As mentioned above, tradition serves to maintain the past, the customs, habits and methods of the past, their reasoning and logic, all based on the past, the past which belongs to the elders. By definition, for many Inuit, tradition could not be changed: changing it meant losing it.

Here is what Sammy Putulik said:

> This was a problem that the community, by itself, couldn't put under control as it was still customary, at that time, to keep the dogs loose and the owners were reluctant to put them on leash even when complaints were being expressed. So we ended up having over 50-100 dogs running loose in the community causing havoc to anyone who had food in or near his house.

Having lost his sister to a starving stray dog early in 1960, he said he could appreciate dog control:

> I was thankful when a dog control program was finally begun, which, unfortunately to many people, was an eradication program and a mass slaughtering of dogs was started.
>
> Although this dog control program was appreciated, the way it was carried out was too unilateral when other measures could have been initiated by well-meaning people.

He went on to raise a fundamental problem which arises from much of the oral evidence collected during my tour of Nunavik. The Inuit criticized the Whites for their uncompromising attitudes towards them, their lack of respect for the Inuit culture and way of life, their lack of flexibility and dialogue. The language barrier was a partial explanation for this problem.

Despite the death of his sister and his support for dog control, Sammy Putulik remains critical:

> The thing that bothers me about the matter of the dog slaughters is that this outside intervention was too unilateral in that people felt part of their property was taken away from them without compensation or some sort of an exchange to alleviate what was becoming an economic turndown for many of them.

Tommy Lasa Kotak, 60 years of age, indicated that his people had problems adapting after nomadic families gathered in communities:

> At that time, Inuit were just learning how to tie down their dogs. It was not enough time for them to adapt to this new way of living in segregated communities. (translation)

The death of the child Iqaluk Airo, attacked and killed by dogs, led to a number of important events.

First, there is no consensus on the exact date of his death. His father, Johnny Airo, indicated that the incident happened in April 1964. Other witnesses maintained that it happened three years later, in April 1967.

Elijah Simionie, 50 years of age, reported that he was present when Igaluk was attacked in April 1967. He described the child's horrible death in detail.

Mary Thomassie, 57 years of age, corroborated this testimony. She said she had also seen the incident which, in her opinion, happened in April 1967.

She also reported on an ancestral Inuit custom: when a dog killed a human being, it had to be put down because it became a threat to the whole community, since a dog that had tasted human blood would want more. If no-one knew which dog had killed, then they all had to be put down.

Mary Thomassie explained why 350 dogs were put down after the death of the child:

Question:

Why did they kill so many dogs, they didn't have a custom when a child or somebody is killed by the dogs?

Answer:

It's a custom when someone or somebody, any person is killed, they have to kill the dogs. (translation)

Returning to the testimony of Elijah Simionie, who reported what he had seen after the death of the child, Iqaluk:

He remembers specifically that they tried to shoot the dog that was still when the mother and Rikey went out to go check this child. So as soon as they saw this dog eating the child, they tried shooting the dog but for some reason they couldn't kill the dog right away. That time, all the dogs within the vicinity of where the child was attacked, all dogs were getting shot at by the men, it was a natural thing to start shooting the dogs.

Shortly after the men, it was an instant thing, as soon as they heard, they would go check where the child was attacked. They saw the child, how severity of the attack, so they went and any loose dogs that they saw, they decided to shoot the dogs. (translation)

Question:

How many men killed dogs?

Answer:

It was about eight to ten men were killing dogs. He even indicates that my father was one of the people that was shooting the dogs. (translation)

Question:

They were all Inuit?

Answer:

Yes, all Inuit. (translation)

He estimated that between 400 and 500 dogs were put down after the death of Iqaluk Airo.

According to Elijah Simioni, after the child's death, behaviour changed in his community:

> When there were loose dogs, after the fact, long after the fact, Inuit tended to kill loose dogs.

Tamisa Augiak, 75 years of age, provided very different evidence:

> Question:
>
> At that time, the people living in camps. Did they leave their dogs running loose?
>
> Answer:
>
> At that time, we had our own separate permanent dog station and we didn't tie our dogs. (translation)
>
> Question:
>
> And after you moved here?
>
> Answer:
>
> Umm, I do recall that, umm, at that time when we first moved here, eh, we didn't tie our dogs right away. In fact, there were two dogs, two individuals that were attacked by dogs. Even after the facts, we still did not really tie our dogs fully yet. I think that some were starting to tie their dogs down but many still didn't tie their dogs down.

Elijah Simionie described the harsh consequences of the dog slaughter for his community:

> Question:
>
> So what were the consequences for you, for the people you know, because you know the dogs got killed, for the community, they couldn't go hunting, couldn't go fishing. What were the consequences?

Answer:

> After the dogs were slaughtered, there was a period they struggled a lot, where they had to try and find ways so they would not starve, so they would go try to go fishing within the vicinity of the bay here, not too far, to lakes, they would trap close by. They realized shortly afterwards how valuable dogs are, how important they are, that they helped made them survive, they even used the dogs to go fishing in the summer time where they would have them carry on. (translation)

After the death of young Iqaluk Airo, the Provincial Police and their Inuit assistant Johannes went to Kangirsuk fairly regularly to kill any stray dog. Sometimes a teacher from the village school helped them.

As Joseph Nassak, 71 years of age, said:

> At that time, Inuit didn't have the notion to tie down their dogs that was not part of our culture.

In 1965, snowmobiles became available and a few Inuit were able to acquire one. Learning how to drive them was not always easy. The Inuit had to learn how to drive snowmobiles and how to repair them when they broke down. Several were sorry they no longer had dogs, especially when they were stuck in a blizzard or when their snowmobiles broke down far from the village; at those times, the dogs would have known how to find their way home.

Among others, Joseph Nassak, 71 years of age, had bad memories of the snowmobile's introduction:

> When he first started having his own snow machine, for example, he was really nice to have a fast machine in the beginning but they didn't realize it brought you far from distance in a short period of time, only to break down. And when it breaks down, you didn't know how to fix it because it's so new to you, it's a new form of transportation. So, they had no choice but to walk back, all the way back. So as he's walking all the way back to the town, his mind would be preoccupied, saying if only I had my dog team, if only I had

> my dog team. No matter how much slow it was, I wouldn't be in this predicament. (translation)

In short, during the 1960s, a massive elimination of dogs took place in Kangirsuk. In the first half of the decade, the Inuit themselves decimated a large part of the canine population as a response to the death of the child Iqaluk Airo. At the time of these events, it seems that there were no police in the area; later, the police began to intervene, but not on the massive scale seen in Quaqtaq and Kangiqsujuaq. The evidence shows that the police and administrative authorities in place did not participate in the events following the death of Iqaluk Airo.

11. **Aupaluk (Hopes Advance Bay)**

This community is located on the south shore of Hopes Advance Bay, which forms a cove on the western coast of Ungava Bay, 150 kilometers (94 miles) north of Kuujjuaq and 80 kilometers (50 miles) south of Kangirsuk.

No fur-trading post or mission was ever established in the area. From the 1950s to the 1970s, the village site and the region were hunting and fishing grounds. Caribou, fish and marine mammals were abundant. Prior to and during the period from 1950 to 1970, Inuit families traveled to and built temporary shelters only in the Aupaluk area.

No Whites lived there. As a result, no disputes arose concerning stray dogs.

The final report of the RCMP cites Constable G.J. Nazar's report of September 22, 1959 (page 385), in which he mentioned that during his visit in the summer of 1959 he noted that:

> The tents at Hopes Advance Bay appeared in very poor condition and living conditions were filthy. The writer had only the opportunity to see six of the tents, for the others

> were out at the Eskimo-fish camps and transportation was not available to these other camps in the Hopes Advance Bay area. It is not known whether the same conditions prevailed at these other camps.

It was only in 1975 that Inuit who had been living in Kangirsuk and in a few other villages decided to settle permanently at Aupaluk. They designed the village themselves. In 1980, a co-operative store was opened.

Aupaluk was constituted as a Northern Village in 1981. Its inhabitants' lives revolved mainly around traditional activities, including char fishing.

During my visit to Aupaluk, I interviewed three witnesses.

Mary Salowatseak, 63 years of age, had been living permanently in Aupaluk since 1975. Before that, she had lived in Kangirsuk with her husband and in 1968 was the owner of ten dogs.

Before they lived in Kangirsuk, they had lived at Killiniq. They arrived in Kangirsuk with their ten (10) dogs after the death of young Iqaluk Airo. She then left her dogs in the care of Mark Uneennak.

She explained: "It was under his responsibility when they were killed."

She added:

> I think our dogs may have been killed because we were still dog-owners when we moved to Kangirsuk and maybe there was a ruling to no longer have dog teams in the community?
>
> I believe that maybe we were still the only dog-owners when we moved to Kangirsuk, it appeared that no one, because already the dogs had already been eradicated in Kangirsuk when we moved there.

She did not know who had killed her ten dogs: whether it was the police, the teacher or An Inuk: "My dogs were pure Eskimo huskies at that time."

Johnny Akpahatak, 59 years of age, spoke of his father's life and work as a guide on the land. He has been living in Aupaluk since 1979. He explained what he had experienced in Kuujjuaq:

> They did not understand fully that Inuit were very dependant on their natural resources, that they relied on the land. In a way, their actions tell us otherwise that did not understand. (translation)

Mary Angutinguak, 68 years of age, has been living in Aupaluk since 1979. In 1960, her husband owned about ten dogs. In 1965, he bought a snowmobile while they were still living in Kangirsuk. He then gave his dogs to his older brother who lived in Quaqtaq. She reported:

> After he gave his dogs to his older brother in Quaqtaq, that the dogs slaughtering started to occur.
>
> How valuable dogs were for her, she wouldn't be alive today. We wouldn't see her today because she also has have had to eat dogs to survive. (translation)

12. **Tasiujaq (Qaamanialuk Paanga - Leaf Bay)**

In 1905, the French company Revillon Frères opened a fur-trading post in the vicinity of a trail used by the Inuit who traveled between Kuujjuaq and Kangirsuk on sleds pulled by dog teams. Two years later, in 1907, the Hudson's Bay Company opened its own post. In 1935, however, both companies closed their posts, since no settled population had grown up there.

In 1963, for social and economic reasons, the Government of Quebec wished to create a village on the south shore of Leaf Lake, near Deep Harbour on the Finger River. In 1966, before the government could carry out its project, Inuit families from Kuujjuaq intervened to stop the project. They decided among themselves on the site where the village should be established. One group proposed the site of the old trading post, the other suggested the place known

as Qaamanialuk Paanga. The latter was more acceptable than the former and more suitable to the majority. Indeed, it was more easily accessible by boat and since it was close to the Finger River, it was easier for the families to obtain drinking water.

The site known as Qaamanialuk Paanga was chosen to become the site of the village located 110 kilometers (68 miles) north of Kuujjuaq. Later the name of the village was changed to Tasiujaq, and the Northern Village municipality was legally constituted under that name on February 2, 1980.

Nothing in the documentation that was submitted to me, nor in the final report of the RCMP, indicates that sled dogs were slaughtered on the site of the old trading post nor on the Qaamanialuk Paanga site.

The three witnesses heard, all described events that took place in Kuujjuaq: Silas Berthe, 59 years of age; Robby Cain, 70 years of age; and Moses Munick, 75 years of age.

Silas Berthe spoke of when he was living with his family in camps around Tasiujaq. His father was the owner of at least ten sled dogs.

In 1959, however, he testified:

> See, we moved to Kuujjuaq because we had to go to school, so even though we were now based in Kuujjuaq [speaking of his father], he still owned dogs that he used frequently to go hunting.

The family went back to live in Tasiujaq in 1972.

Bobby Cain was originally from Kangirsuk. When he was 10 years old, in 1950, his family moved to the Tasiujaq area because of its abundance of wildlife for hunting. His father, his two brothers and he were the owners of 32 sled dogs. In 1965, they traveled to Kuujjuaq.

He testified:

> At that time, our dogs were not tied, in those days, we did not tie our dogs. We didn't have anything to tie our dogs as well so our dogs were not tied at that time. (translation)

He added:

> We were not advised, they did not say we're going to kill your dogs. They started killing our dogs. (translation)

Moses Munick was originally from Kuujjuaq. His father owned eight dogs when he was 17 years of age in 1951. In 1962, he was himself the owner of eight dogs. They were all killed.

He reported that he had to tie them up.

> We followed orders. We tied our dogs down, but the dogs would get loose. But as soon as they got loose, the dogs would get killed by the police. (translation)

He added:

> Question:
>
> At that time, could you get chains to tie your dogs?
>
> Answer:
>
> They did not provide us chains to start tying our dogs. We had to buy them, we had to buy what was available.
>
> Question:
>
> O.K. But it wasn't available at the Hudson's Bay store?
>
> Answer:
>
> Although they were available at the Hudson's Bay Company but the stock used to run out, then we have to try use rope to tie down our dogs but the dogs would chew on the ropes and they would get loose.
>
> Question:

Did you tell that to Johannes, the assistant?

Answer:

We use to. We used to try and advise him, yes. I used to even request if I could get chains for free from the police and the police would not give me that opportunity. They wouldn't give me the chains for free…. Our only mode of transportation was taken away from us….. (translation)

13. **<u>Kuujjuaq (Fort Chimo – Chimo – Old Chimo)</u>**

This community is located on the western shore of the Koksoak River, about 50 kilometers (30 miles) south of Ungava Bay.

Around 1811, the Moravian missionaries (a Protestant church from Saxony) opened a mission on the eastern shore of the river in Old Chimo, with the purpose of converting the Inuit to Christianity. Music was at the heart of religious and community activities. Receiving instruction in their own language, Inuktitut, the Inuit learned to sing hymns.

In 1830, the Hudson's Bay Company established a trading post on the lower part of the Koksoak River. In the early 1940s, the United States built landing strips and an army base called Crystal 1. The American Army occupied the base from 1941 to 1945. After the end of the Second World War, the American government ceded the base and the airport to the Canadian government.

In 1942, the Government of Canada assigned RCMP officers to Old Chimo.

In 1948, the Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate built a Roman Catholic mission in Old Chimo.

In 1955, the federal government named the first permanent Administrator with the title of Northern Service Officer (NSO). The same year, the RCMP

established its detachment near the base on the western shore of the Koksoak River.

In 1958, the Hudson's Bay Company also moved its store closer to the base.

During the 1950s, the federal government built a weather station, a nursing station and an elementary school in the vicinity of the base, on the western shore of the Koksoak River.

At the end of the 1950s, Inuit families were living on the eastern shore of the river, in Old Chimo. Several began to move to the western shore, closer to the school.

Johnny Watt, 82 years of age, grew up in Old Chimo and moved to Fort Chimo on the other site of the river in 1960. He stated that after the federal Department of Transport became responsible for the airstrip, families began to move.

Early in 1961, the RCMP left Fort Chimo (RCMP, p. 292) and the Provincial Police (SQ) took over its premises.

David Koneak, 68 years of age, stated:

> At that time when the RCMP left, the Quebec police took over some of the buildings that the RCMP resided in before, so he recalls it was the beginning of when the Quebec police first started coming here, where they were occupying the old RCMP buildings. (translation)

It should be noted, however, that according to the evidence and the memo from the federal Minister Arthur Laing, responsible for Indian Affairs and Northern Development (cited above), the Provincial Police (Sûreté du Québec) had already been operating in Fort Chimo and Old Chimo (Kuujjuaq) since 1960.

In 1961, a co-operative store was opened.

Kuujjuaq ("the large river") was legally constituted as a Northern Village on December 29, 1979.

In 1956, the population of Fort Chimo and Old Chimo was approximately 359 (320 Inuit and 29 Whites).

In the early 1960s, the population at Fort Chimo had reached about 500 (400 Inuit and 95 White men).

In his report dated January 5, 1952, RCMP Constable G. Komelson reported on the Inuit's vulnerable situation and the bad trapping season:

> 2) …. This reason, up to the present date, the best trappers in the Fort Chimo area, have not caught as many as ten white foxes. This would indicate that the Trappers are not to blame but that there simply is no abundance of fur in the area. The price of all fur, this year, is very low, a white fox averaging approx. $ 6.00. The Family Allowance which the natives receive, would appear to be quite a help but in actual buying power with prevailing prices, it does not amount to a great deal per child per month…
>
> … The habitations of the Fort Chimo natives are in fairly good condition. A few of the natives here have permanent houses made of wood but most of them live in tents made of heavy "duck" which are in fairly good condition. Most of the dwellings in this area are kept reasonably clean and neat. (RCMP, p. 334.)

Later, he mentioned an epidemic of canine diseases:

> Although a large number of dogs were lost a year ago due to the disease which swept the area, most families now have a fairly good dog team again and by next year, without mishaps, there should be an abundance of dogs in the Ungava area. (RCMP, p. 335 (5))

Joseph Ross and his wife both worked in nursing at Fort Chimo from 1956 to 1964. Mr. Ross explained that the RCMP officers had put down the dogs:

> Without very good cause.

> In the summer the Eskimos came to post, they turned their dogs loose as they had no use for them and most of [the] time, the dogs were not fed. There were bunches of half starved dogs wandering about [the] village. (RCMP, p. 511)

On March 18, 1963, Keith Crowe, the Administrator stationed at Pangnirtung, an isolated village in the Canadian Arctic, now Nunavut, wrote to his Regional Administrator, R.J. Orange, in Frobisher to express his views about the Inuit in his community. This passage is interesting since it demonstrates not only the differences between Whites and Inuit, but also the radical change in this Northern people's way of live which had occurred since the arrival of the Whites.

> Compared with the Eskimos I know around Ungava Bay, the local people are surprisingly naïve in their conception of the whitemans [sic] world – for many years their life has turned on the fairly simple establishments of the R.C.M.P., the H.B. [Hudson's Bay] Co., and the Mission, the increasing role of the Government, the relative power and duties of Govt [government] personnel, the differences betweem [sic] private and Government agencies, the use of money, the idea of organization beyond the camp level, the disciplining of children or large community life, the obvious disparity of living standards, the lack of spoken English – all these are new to the area, and since change is painful, we must do our best to minimize [sic] further confusion. (RCMP, p. 243)

In 1962 and 1963, many dogs were infected with canine diseases. In 1963, 120 doses of vaccines were sent to Fort Chimo and 350 more a year later (RCMP, p. 245).

> All dogs in Chimo vaccinated for rabies distemper and hepatitis. (RCMP, p. 248)

The February and March 1963 report by the federal Administrator stationed at Fort Chimo mentioned that the five-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Bédard had been bitten on March 14. More particularly, the report stated:

> On March 20, Constable Belley of the Q.P.P. called a meeting of all the Chimo residents to discuss the dog situation. Little discussion took place. Constable Belley told

> the Eskimos that he was "making a new law" and that all dogs not tied would be shot. Most of the Eskimos resented this. The next day, Constable Belley called on the Northern Administrator and said that because of the Eskimos' reactions to his remarks he would not attempt to shoot any dogs. (RCMP, p. 243) (emphasis added)

The evidence, however, showed that the slaughter of dogs continued, as will be discussed below.

Returning to the events themselves, the Provincial Police published a public notice in the Fort Chimo newspaper, *Northern Star*, informing Inuit dog-owners of the application of the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* (R.S.Q. 1941, Ch. 139) on April 27, 1963, during the month following the attack on the Bédards' daughter.

It should be noted that, at that time, dog-owners were illiterate, could not read or write and, for the most part, understood very little English, if any (NAC, R.G. 85, Vol. 1959, File A-1000-8-1).

The notice read as follows:

> The residents of Fort Chimo are reminded that on the first of May in the Province of Quebec all loose dogs must be tied up by their owners.
>
> It is suggested that the dogs should be either placed in Kennels or tied by stout chains. Ropes are not adequate as the dogs are all adept at chewing through them.
>
> All dog-owners are requested also to take good care of their dogs feeding and watering them well for the whole summer while they cannot be used for working.
>
> You are reminded that as in the past year stray dogs will be disposed of. It is suggested that if your dog gets loose that you take immediate steps to catch it. When necessary police assistance may be requested to catch loose dogs.
>
> This regulation regarding dogs is in effect till Dec. 15, 1963.

The letter of October 26, 1964, mentioned above, from the Chief Inspector of the Provincial Police, F. de Miffonis, to the Hull Division Commander, claimed that the stray dog problem had been solved through the application of the provincial statute, that is, the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* (R.S.Q. 1941, Ch. 139).

For many years, the authorities had been attempting to impose the statutes and regulations in force in the south. For instance, the memo from the officer in charge, J.G. Walton, NSO, dated April 14, 1959, cited above in the part of this report concerning Kuujjaraapik, mentioned that Sergeant Tourville of the Provincial Police came to visit him in Great Whale River and warned "the Eskimos that all dogs not tied within 24 hours would be shot."

Mr. Walton indicated that Sergeant Tourville was asking the Inuit to tie up their dogs beyond the periods set out in the statute, which provided that dog-owners did not have to tie up their dogs before May 1st.

The authorities also relied on the Order-in-Council mentioned above, issued on February 23, 1965, by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, which prohibited owners from letting their dogs roam at any time, subject to a fine, and provided that anyone could kill them without incurring liability (Quebec Gazette, March 13, 1965, no. 1).

Even though the Provincial Police authorities believed that they had settled the dog issue by applying the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* and the Order-in-Council, tensions with the Inuit worsened as shown in the letter of Northern Administrator A. Stevenson, dated October 17, 1967, to the Director of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (the notice in the local newspaper had been published in April 1963).

Mr. Stevenson wrote, among other things:

> Mr. R. Joscelyn, the Northern Administrator, has reported that the Provincial Police at Fort Chimo, in accordance with the Provincial legislation on control of dogs did carry out the destruction of stray dogs until some months ago. The practice ceased on instructions received from Quebec City. It is indicated that the reason behind this order was to prevent antagonizing the Eskimos. Mr. Joscelyn further reports that during the last ten years there was one fatal accident involving an Eskimo child by dog mauling. This occurred in 1964 and the child was the boy of Matthew Saunders…. (A. 1006-8-1)

Mr. Stevenson's report is food for thought. One should stop and ask: if law and order, the hard line taken for years by the federal and provincial authorities with the Inuit, a people who lived according to their traditions had not worked in Fort Chimo, nor in the other villages since the beginning of Inuit settlement in the years from 1957 to 1960, should the authorities have changed their approach, which had not worked from the start, especially not at Great Whale River, Port Harrison, Fort Chimo and Sugluk? (I refer here to the letter that the Minister of Indian Affairs, Mr. Hamilton, addressed to the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Duplessis, on November 17, 1958 (Kuujjuaraapik).)

During my visit to Kuujjuaq, I was able to interview 14 witnesses. Prior to these interviews, I also read eight interview transcripts.

On balance, the evidence shows that the shift towards a settled lifestyle began in the late 1950s and the dog issue became contentious at that time. It escalated in the early 1960s with the arrival of new families in Kuujjuaq.

The police's assistant, Elijah Itsayak Johannes, stated:

> First time I worked in 1957, I went to work for RCMP for 3 years. Everything was fine then. They used dog teams, nothing happened then. I also had dogs. They had over ten dogs and then the Provincial Police came in 1960 and I got thrown to them to work for them. (translation)

Further, he reported:

> Like I said, with the RCMP in the beginning of 1960, we sometimes had to shoot dogs but it really started in 1961. We started then, 1960, 1961. It just started accelerating. (translation)

Johnny Munick, 71 years of age, said that he moved from Old Chimo to Fort Chimo to a house built after 1959:

> At that time, I had my own set of dog team because I had a wife…. And we used our dog team for transportations, to go fishing, to go hunting. (translation)

Further, he mentioned the circumstances in which his seven dogs were eliminated:

> At that time, there was an incident where his dogs still had their harness on and they accidentally ran away. And at that time, there was a local dump and the dogs went to the local dump and because the dump was not far away, he was trying to go get them, but before he was able to retrieve all his dogs, the dogs that were in the dump were already killed.
>
> It was in the winter time.
>
> At that time, it was two policemen, a QPP police, as well as his assistant, Elijah Johannes. Back then, that was their overall mandate they used to walk around with guns looking for loose dogs. (translation)

He remembered that rules had been imposed:

> Prior to coming to Kuujjuaq, after 1959… we didn't tie our dogs. But when we moved to Kuujjuaq…. we had to tie our dogs. (translation)
>
> Question:
>
> All the year round?
>
> Answer:
>
> Yes. (translation)

George Koneak, 77 years of age, spoke of the loss of his dogs in similar circumstances:

> I was at a feeding that time. Feeding them, I loosen' em. While I was giving them scramble – cut up the meat…
>
> So, I was too late to tie them up. Policemen came along with the gun, with the Inuk Elijah Johannes […]

Later, he reiterated his anger:

> If I had a weapon, then I will have used.
>
> Question:
>
> You were very mad? I think
>
> Answer:
>
> Very mad.

Johnny Watt, 82 years of age, settled in Kuujjuaq in early 1960. He worked for the Hudson's Bay Company. He said he had seen certain incidents: hunters from Tasiujaq had seen their dogs killed before their eyes. One in particular ended up in jail, detained by the Provincial Police:

> …. There was one hunter where they tried shooting the dogs but he took the gun himself and tried to stop them from shooting his dogs. As a result, he was detained overnight, because he was trying to save his dogs. (translation)

Mark Elijaapik, 60 years of age, said that his father became aggressive when his dogs were killed; he was arrested and sent to the south where he spent the whole winter of 1964 awaiting judgment:

> All I remember is that we ended up having no father. He was put sent away and it disturbed our family so much that he couldn't never go to school anymore.
>
> …We were affected because we had no more dogs and we had no more father. My father was sent away. (translation)

David Koneak, 68 years of age, had seven dogs that were killed in the 1960s. He was furious.

> He was working for the meteorology group. They had a restaurant or a place to go eat and he remembers he did bring a rifle with him to the restaurant. It didn't have any bullet inside but he brought the rifle just to scare them…. It made him in a rage.

Poasie Segualuk, 72 years of age, stated:

> Every man had a set of dogs, so I could estimate that maybe even over a thousand dogs were killed all together by the Quebec Police.

It should be recalled that among this number, 300 sick dogs died in the early1960s at Fort Chimo.

According to Johnny Gordon, 68 years of age, if the sick dogs are excluded, between 200 and 300 dogs may have been slaughtered: "I am probably underestimating the numbers."

Mr. Gordon indicated that it was not only the police who put down dogs but also the manager of the Hudson's Bay Company.

He ended his testimony by giving the following account about a Provincial Police officer:

> There was one particular officer I did not like, he would kill the dogs with carbon [mon]oxide. He would gather the dogs to this particular place, a chamber room where they would use the vehicle exhaust to poison them. This is one of the activities I particularly remember as well.
>
> … It was the old jail house, a small one, its still stands.
>
> Question:
>
> But who did that?
>
> Answer:

> The police that were present, the Quebec police. Elijah Johannes was also participating.
>
> … As soon as they got a hold of a loose dog, they would bring it to the chamber shack.

The Inuk Elijah Johannes, who worked for the Provincial Police, confirmed this information during his interview:

> Question:
>
> You killed dogs with guns?
>
> Answer:
>
> Yes, sometime we used a gas chamber. From Germany, that is bad. Gas chamber. No noise and would just fall asleep. The dog would be down there and the truck that is running and would just fall asleep. I would always say that this is just like Germany. Gas chamber, this is what really happened.

Siasi Angnatuk, 63 years of age, said that while her father and brother were alive, they did not tie up their dogs. They each had ten dogs: "When we arrived to Kuujjuaq, however, they were tied."

The police officer and Elijah Johannes, the assistant and interpreter also known as Itsayak, killed her father's dogs.

> They used to be shot at although they knew we would stay in Kuujjuaq for long. They had an interest in particular with his dogs and would go after them anyway. My father would try and stop them but they ended up getting all our dogs.
>
> Question:
>
> Did they give your father a reason why they killed the dogs?
>
> Answer:
>
> No, not to my knowledge.
>
> Question:
>
> Were you present when someone killed the dogs?

Answer:

I do recall my father trying to insist to not kill the dogs.

Question:

So, you saw someone shooting dogs?

Answer:

They used to walk around with guns with interest towards father's tied dogs.

Question:

Was it the police or the Inuit assistant?

Answer:

The police as well as Itsayak, the interpreter for the police.

The elimination of dogs led to a great deal of resentment and some acts of retribution on the part of the Inuit, according to Elijah Itsayak Johannes:

> … For revenge, the police dogs were killed when they were in a large fence. More than one got killed. They had poison that caused them to bleed. Someone must have fed them something, maybe a broken bottle. We blamed it on someone's revenge. It was up on the police hill. We also had a fence to keep our dogs where Makivik buildings are now. They would be killed. We didn't know who, but they would die by bleeding. Nobody ever said that they were taking revenge. The cause of the death was no doubt based on revenge.

As was the case in several other villages, the permanent settlement of a large number of families took place over a very short period of time. The authorities had decided to control and to kill all stray dogs and on a year-round basis, which was beyond what was allowed by the Quebec statute on agricultural abuses. Several owners' dogs were killed in winter, a period which was crucial for them to earn their livelihoods.

The way of life the Inuit had known for millennia was radically altered with the arrival of the Whiteman: “Our dogs were our only means of hunting.”

14. **Kangiqsualujjuaq (Port Nouveau-Québec – George River)**

This community is located at the bottom of an inlet on the George River, 25 kilometers (16 miles) from Ungava Bay. The tides reach the village and the waters recede almost completely at low tide. Unlike the other villages, Kangiqsualujjuaq is in a landscape covered with vegetation.

In the 1960s, a sawmill was operating to cut spruce logs (see photo in Jobie Weetaluktuk / Robyn Bryant eds., *Le Monde de/The World of Tivi Etok*, Québec: Éditions Multimondes, 2008, p. 127).

The village began to develop at the end of 1959 and in the early 1960s. The Hudson’s Bay Company had operated a trading post located south of the village from 1838 to 1842, from 1876 to 1915, and then from 1923 to 1932.

In Kangiqsualujjuaq, I interviewed 12 people and read five transcripts of interviews carried out in 1999. The biography of Tivi Etok cited above was also informative about the life of the Inuit in this village in the 1950s and 1960s.

In 1959, the Inuit founded their first co-operative to market arctic char. In accordance with their traditions, it was created only after lengthy discussions.

In his biography, Tivi Etok, born in 1929, told of the participation by federal officials in this project (pp. 194-196):

> We started working on the Co-op concept in 1959. Two men from the Department of Indian Affairs (as it was then called) came to Kangiqsualujjuaq to facilitate the discussion and the establishment of a local co-operative. At the time, we were

> scattered in many small camps. My family was at Kuurujjuaq. There were other camps including Tasikallak, Tuunullimuit, Tuututuumiut, and Maqralimmiut. Kangiqsualujjuaq had only two families, Willie Emudlak and Josephie Sammy Annanack....
>
> During our meetings in a long tent, we were told that we would have to congregate at Kangiqsualujjuaq. We would have to leave our camps. It was a difficult thing to do, but we did it that same winter. Families arrived at Kangiqsualujjuaq at the end of winter, probably in the month of March. We were often hungry then. Life was hard and we had to work hard. We were moving to a place where there was even less in the way of game, and we risked being even hungrier, but we were prepared to work hard. We used to do things quickly back then. When something was decided, people took action very quickly.
>
> We had many meetings about the Co-op which went all night long. A number of families went upriver to test the feasibility of harvesting timber, my brother, Thomassie, included. The trees upriver were large, large enough to harvest commercially. We lived in tents, but with the timber that was going to be harvested, we would eventually have log houses. The plywood, insulation, chimneys etc., had to be imported.
>
> When we moved to Kangiqsualujjuaq, we lived in tents across the river. That summer, a tent school was set up and the children were sent to school. We learned later how the children had wanted to be with their parents, but they had to be in school. School was a new thing, and difficult for many families to accept.
>
> A log cabin we called *Illukallak* (stout building) was the only solid structure at the Kangiqsualujjuaq site then. We had our meetings there. This was the location of the first formal election we ever held. George Annanack was elected the chairman of the board of the Co-op.

As Tivi Etok explained, the construction of houses began in 1962 and, a few years later, all the village's inhabitants were living in houses.

In 1963, the school opened its doors. At the same time, the Inuit community established a co-operative, and the Canadian government erected buildings for its administrative offices.

The following passage reflects the personal views held by the author of a federal administrative report dated February 1964 (NAC RG 85, Vol. 1931, File A-160-1-6, Pt 1):

> Most of the Eskimos live in their own house. Almost all the men in the community belong to the Co-op and are therefore able to support themselves and their families.
>
> They take pride in their independence, and do not consider it the government's duty to support them.
>
> They have formed a Community Council that deals with such problem as garbage disposal, keeping the community clean, etc.
>
> The people of George River are friendly, generous, honest and enthusiastic about their new community.
>
> They back the school program whole heartedly and the children are a pleasure to teach.
>
> … The Department of National Health and Welfare provides medical inspection services through the medium of the annual visit of the medical team aboard the ch. C.G.S. [Canadian Coast Guard Ship] "C.D. Howe", supplemented by visits from the resident nurse at Fort Chimo…. Fort Chimo is only an hour away by airplane, so medical emergency cases can usually be removed quickly.
>
> Population
>
> The population of George River consists of about one hundred and forty Eskimos…. And one kabloona (white) family.
>
> Dogs
>
> In the past the dogs have not been chained as they have been in other northern communities. Until the white family moved in, the Eskimos have not seen the need to chain their dogs. However, Quebec law states that dogs are to be chained from April 1 [sic] to December 15. This law has not been enforced in George River due to the fact that only one white family resided there. It may have to be enforced in the future.

> The difficulty is that the Eskimo people may be unable to afford the chains. The solution to this problem has not yet been decided.
>
> Newcomers to this area should be aware of this situation particularly if they have children. They should be prepared to have an adult or teenager accompany their child at all times when the child is outside. Even when the child is playing outside the window of the house, he should be protected. A dog team attacking a child does it so quickly and quietly that severe injuries can be inflicted before the parents can get to the child.
>
> Housing
>
> Construction was started in 1962.
>
> Size and condition of the school
>
> The new one-room school was completed in January 1963.

In December 1962, Brian Pruden, the five-year old son of the only White family in George River was attacked by dogs. He was seriously injured. He was evacuated to Fort Chimo and then transferred to Iqaluit to be treated there before returning home.

Lucina Etok, 60 years of age, said she recalled that Brian, the son of Mr. and Mrs. D. Pruden, had been attacked by dogs on December 19, 1962 precisely:

> I do remember, because it was my brother's dog that attacked the boy. (translation)

The memo dated December 26, 1962 and signed by the Regional Administrator, D.W. Trent, confirmed the event (NAC, R.G. 85, Vol. 1959 File A-1006-8-1, Pt 1).

Seven months earlier, on May 23, 1962, the same federal administrator, D.W. Trent, sent a note to Administrator Bolger informing him that 13 or 14 dogs had died of disease:

> (5) The George River Eskimos refused to touch the lead dogs and no heads or carcasses were obtained for pathological examination.
>
> (6) As soon as we let Mr. Doods know the diagnosis, he promises to approach Cst. [Constable] Thibeault for hepatitis or distemper serum required and ask him to request vaccine needs to the Quebec Provincial Police. (A-1006-8-1)

In 1963 and 1964, 175 doses of vaccine were sent. At this time, the dog population was estimated at more than 280.

It was in 1965 that the Provincial Police officers began to come to the community and kill stray dogs and, according to certain witnesses, even dogs that were tied up.

Mary Etok, 65 years of age, whose husband owned seven dogs, maintained that they had not been notified that their animals had to be tied up.

> In those days, we were not advised or informed that we were to tie our dogs. So most men didn't tie their dogs at that time. Including themselves, the dogs were not tied. (translation)

A White man accompanied by an interpreter came by plane from Kuujjuaq to kill all her husband's dogs:

> So from her understanding, they just arrived, left. They would, they were totally taken back, cause they left on the plane. They didn't burn the dogs on the ice. They burned it near where the farm tanks are. Where the big oil tanks are, is where they burned the dogs…. (translation)

Later, she reported:

> After our dogs were killed, are only means of transportation to try and maintain having country food. After the dogs were killed, we didn't have access to our country food any more. It's only afterward when we started earning money that we were able to purchase a snowmobile and then once again, be able to have access to country food. (translation)

Mary Etok knew Tivi Etok: “It’s my late husband’s older brother” (translation).

As mentioned above, it was with the opening of the school in 1963 and the construction of the federal government's administrative office that Whites began to settle in the community.

David Etok, born in 1928, reported that the Whites did everything they could to control the Inuit's lives.

> We never realized how much we were going to be under the control of the qallunaaks as we were very ashamed of them. It angered me and all my shame went away when we were told not to have dogs anymore and that all dogs had to be tied up without any prior discussion. If it should be that way, this was in forced me, the police which came from either the federal or the provincial force. We did not bother whether they were from either force as we were living our own lives. Only at the time when I had children did the qallunaaks start to control our lives by introducing education in our society. At that time, the respect for the dogs was disintegrating. In the end, all of my dogs were killed. I am not sure in what year they were killed, but I think it happened at the time when I had two children.

Johnny Etok, 68 years of age, recalled the time when he lived in snow houses or igloos:

> He more or less grew up in Korak River, which is north from here, which is Kuururjuaq in Inuktitut, where they spent their winters and passed of their summers there, where they used to live in snow houses. But they moved here to Kangiqsualujjuaq around 1961. (translation)

He recalled the episode in 1967 or 1968 when the Provincial Police came by plane to carry out what amounted to a slaughter:

> At that time, his father was preparing to go trapping. This was in the morning, he was harnessing some of the dogs, while some of the dogs were not harnessed yet, father was at the house, at the matchbox, while his mother was going to the Co-op to go buy food for his trip…. Father preparing to go trapping with the dogs. Police came on a plane, they arrived, and they, I guess, came to the house.

> My father was inside, I guess, taking a little break, when some dogs were harnessed, some of them will still not harnessed and they started shooting the dogs with a shotgun and with a pistol and some of the dogs were going underneath the house, they were still shooting the dogs, even though they were underneath the house. He remembers two of the dogs didn't die. But the police probably thought they were dead. So the police went to the agent's home for a little while and then after that, they went from the agent's home back on the plane and they took off. His father had to finish the two dogs that were wounded after. (translation)

Leter, he testified:

> At that time, when he met up with his mother and his father, they got together and they had a good cry. Because, you know, they didn't want to cry but that was their only means of transportation and they were, like, in such trauma that they… they… they… they… they just cried. (translation)

Johnny Etok explained that the slaughter was carried out without showing any respect.

> … The dead dogs were left behind. They shot and they just left behind. So me and my family we had no choice but to put them on a komatik, on a sled, bring them somewhere else and burn them. We had to complete what they started. (translation)

He also recalled another slaughter operation that occurred four weeks later. Once again, police officers arrived by plane.

> It was the St-Felicien Airlines on the ice. He remembers hearing the plane, dogs killed, next thing, they take off. (translation)

Johnny Etok reported that on this occasion, it was Inuit from his community who were the victims. Gone to hunt caribou, they had left their dogs behind to search for game in the forest. When they returned, they found their dogs dead, killed by the police.

David Etok recalled with bitterness another police raid carried out in the community in order to kill all the dogs, when he was incapable of expressing his anger in the language of the Whites:

> I was told that they just systematically started to shoot dogs that were either loose or tied up. My brother […] and I were given five gallons of gasoline to cremate the dogs. We weren't even asked which dog should be killed and which one should not. As they were shooting the dogs my brother and I were putting the dead dogs on the sled as they went from one dog after another. It was ironic to see the dead dogs being pulled on the sled by dogs to the place of cremation when the slaughter was still going on. What was done to us at that time is unspeakable. We weren't even informed beforehand or offered anything in return for having to sacrifice our dogs when they killed all of our dogs, even the ones that were tied up. […] We weren't even asked if our dogs should be killed. I was angered when they started to kill my best lead dogs that I had and when they killed the last of the breeding females. When I witnessed the killing I got angry and I couldn't speak the quallunaak language and there wasn't anyone available to interpret for me and there four policemen that were doing the killing. I could only wish that I could speak their language and that was hard on the mind. I then tried my best to tell the quallunaak that it was going to cost fifty dollars to have my breeding female dog killed. One of the officers heard what I was trying to tell them as I was loading the sleds with dead dogs and suddenly came over near me. I was talking to him without looking at him as I was tying up the dead dogs on the sleds. He just stood there without saying anything and I believe he might have understood what I was meaning to say and then just walked away. Right after that we had to transport them by dog team to the plane that was awaiting for their departure.

In his testimony cited above, Johnny Etok mentioned that after his father' sled dogs had been slaughtered, the police officers went to the house of "the agent".

I deduced that he was referring to a federal civil servant and asked him the following question.

> Question:
>
> Were there any qallunaaks or "white" people living in your settlement close to your house?

> Answer:
>
> At that time, yes, there were agents. There were agents from the Department of Northern Affairs – DNA – that were based out of here. I was working for them, so I know that there was [sic] man [sic] living here.
>
> Question:
>
> Did they seem to know anything about the dogs?
>
> Answer:
>
> I'm sure… probably maybe they were aware of it, but they didn't share the information.

The evidence indicates that the more Whites came to live in a community, the more difficult and irritating the dog issue became for them and the more quickly it needed to be settled. I concur with what the civil servant stated in the February 1964 report (cited above).

There were no police in the community, which had only 140 inhabitants in 1962-1963. There was no reason to eliminate stray dogs, but with the arrival of the Whites, the situation changed to the disadvantage of the Inuit.

SÛRETÉ DU QUÉBEC (Provincial Police)

Makivik Corporation asked Joan Homes & Associates Inc. to undertake research in the Quebec City and Montreal archives of the Sûreté du Québec, but nothing was found in relation to the control of sled dogs during the period from 1950 to 1970.

In its final report, the RCMP review team stated that it asked the Sûreté du Québec for historical information, complaints, or any records related to the alleged slaughter of sled dogs during the same period.

The report states that the Sûreté du Québec answered the RCMP's request on August 22, 2005, by providing a few documents. Moreover, it reported:

> The documentation did note that the S.Q. destroyed dogs that posed a threat to public health or safety. Sled dogs were killed by S.Q. police officers at the request of the local council, at the request of the dogs owners, or when a complaint.
>
> In addition, loose dogs were killed to protect public safety.
>
> The reports confirmed the S.Q. members were aware of the importance of the sled dogs to the Inuit.
>
> It was also noted that the S.Q. records were not complete for the S.Q. detachments and time period in question. (RCMP, p. 471)

The RCMP review team also indicated it had interviewed a retired Sûreté du Québec officer, Marcel Vigeant, who had been posted to Kuujjuaraapik from 1967 to 1970.

His testimony was summarized as follows:

> He noted that it was the local authorities who directed the S.Q. to kill loose dogs in the interest of public safety.
>
> He also stated that radio announcements were made to warn people to tie up their dogs and that dog-owners could come to the local S.Q. detachment office and obtain chains with which to secure their dogs.
>
> The former S.Q. member noted that in the spring some dogs were taken by the Inuit to l'Ile Merry, an island about five miles from Kuujjuarapik, by boat, where they were left until the winter. When the dogs returned to the community, they were so starved, aggressive, and in such pitiful state, that it was often necessary to kill them.
>
> He stated that the bodies were then taken to the dump and burned to prevent the transmission of disease.
>
> Mr. Vigeant indicated as well that during his time in Kuujjuarapik, he personally killed about 15 dogs.

The report also describes an interview with Donald Vigneault, director of the Municipality of James Bay, who apparently sent two officers to Chisasibi in

1972 or 1973. These officers killed between 100 and 150 dogs that presumably posed a threat.

It should be noted that, according to the evidence, the Provincial Police was present in Kuujjuaraapik as early as 1958 (Tourville).

Below, this report discusses the changes brought to the Inuit oral tradition by sedentarization, their integration into a legal system put in force by Whites, the use made by Whites of a statute that was inapplicable in Nunavik and also by arbitrary decisions and actions by the Provincial Police with respect to the slaughter of dogs. A dog did not necessarily represent a danger to the public just because it was loose.

DISCUSSION

A) Introduction

The Supreme Court of Canada ruled that Inuit rights benefitted from explicit constitutional protection (*Sparrow*, cited above). As a result, I am entitled to treat the Deed of Surrender Rupert's Land to Canada as implemented by Parliament, the Quebec Boundaries Extension Acts of 1912 and the expansion of the province's territory as having constitutional significance, both today and particularly during the period with which we are concerned.

In order to carry out my mandate, it was essential for me to acquire a general knowledge of the Inuit people's history, their values and traditions, and their social organization.

The constitutional context to this matter called for a relaxation of the traditional rules of evidence, especially since I had to go back in time to the early 1950s in order to understand their history, their beliefs, their values, their social

organization, what happened at the time and why many Inuit were so resentful toward Whites who passed through the region between 1950 and 1970.

I had to put myself in the context of the time to understand events according to the criteria applied at the time. At the time of the surrender of Rupert's Land, the British Crown required that a particularly vulnerable people receive protection. Canada was duty-bound to help protect the rights and well-being of the Inuit. Canada was to act in order to protect the rights and the interests of the Inuit people.

Canada therefore had fiduciary obligations, which imposed a strict standard of conduct.

In *Guerin* v. *The Queen*, [1984] 2 S.C.R., pp. 335-384, Mr. Justice Dickson wrote:

> Where by statute, by agreement or perhaps by unilateral undertaking, one party has an obligation to act for the benefit of another, and that obligation carries with it a discretionary power, the party thus empowered becomes a fiduciary. Equity will then supervise the relationship by holding him to the fiduciary's strict standard of conduct.

Quebec assumed the same duty to protect and assist the Inuit people, therefore also the same fiduciary obligations.

The Government of Canada and the Government of Quebec are deemed to have known the law, their respective obligations and the vulnerability of the Inuit people when they made the decision to take over the administration of Northern Quebec, known today as Nunavik. (For the province, this occurred by virtue of the transitional agreement between Prime Minister L. B. Pearson and Premier Jean Lesage, by which Eric Gourdeau was appointed to be the province's Director General of Nouveau-Québec in 1964. Source: *Historique du Nouveau-Québec*.)

Throughout the history of the villages provided above, I referred to: documents stating or referring to material facts; explicit memorandums from local administrators to senior officials of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development; reports exchanged between local administrators; reports from police officers based in or passing through the villages; letters, opinions, comments or remarks; in some cases, legislation and judicial decisions. The vast majority of these documents are contained in the final report of the RCMP.

All these documents, opinions, comments, and so on were written and provided to others at the time the events actually took place, in the 1950s and 1960s. The same applies to the documents provided by Makivik Corporation.

All this evidence will be considered and will be assessed according to its probative value or weight.

Consideration will also be given to the biographies of two men, Dion and Etok, born at the end of the 1920s and well known in their respective communities. The same applies to the study conducted by the Cambridge University Research Institute and opinions published in the magazine of the National Museum's Canadian Ethnology Service concerning the importance of sled dogs, the number of dogs required on trap lines and the time required to build or rebuild sled-dog teams.

The interviews conducted in 1999 and the testimony heard in Montreal and during my visits to the 14 Nunavik communities are admissible as a whole, to be evaluated, assessed and placed in the context of the events as they occurred. Based on their memories, the witnesses relived events of the past. They provided the context to the elimination of the dogs and explained the consequences for them, as well as the importance of sled dogs at the time. In the interviews, sled dogs were described as part of the history and traditions of the Inuit and they experienced the death of their dogs like the loss of a loved one.

Several witnesses asked me to understand the fundamental importance of sled dogs in the nomadic lifestyle. They recounted events that occurred mainly in the 1960s and explained the socio-cultural upheaval they experienced due to the attitudes and behaviour of the Whites.

B) **Analysis**

The controversy concerning dogs did not occur unexpectedly, did not come "out of the blue" to use an English expression. The dispute arose mainly during and after the sedentarization of the Inuit people. This is not to say that sedentarization caused the problem, but it at least created an occasion for the dispute.

This is why it was important to establish the context for the slaughter of the sled dogs, to describe events, people's attitudes, reports, memoranda, etc., that arose during the creation of villages in Nunavik in the late 1950s and early 1960s. When referring to a written document or a specific event below, the name of the village concerned will be indicated in parentheses.

The history of each of the villages (with the exception of four of them) has a recurring theme. Schools were established with mandatory attendance for children of school age, residential schools in several villages, as well as nursing stations. What followed in short order was the sedentarization of nomadic people, a significant increase in the dog population and then the emergence of the stray dog problem.

The presence of Whites contributed to the problem. Police operations and administrative measures were then taken to eliminate dogs. Resistance on the part of dog-owners was followed by a reinforcement of coercive measures, reprisals such as those that took place in Kuujjuaq and, ultimately, the abandonment of coercive measures.

The following issues are addressed below:

- Were the federal government's noble goals developed and implemented with a knowledge of Inuit culture?

- Were they developed and implemented so as to be accepted slowly and gradually by Inuit society in accordance with its culture, beliefs and traditions?

- Did the Government of Canada have a duty to protect and assist the Inuit after the slaughter of sled dogs?

- Were the attitudes of the officers and civil servants and the measures they took reasonable and justified in the circumstances, at the time when the Government of Quebec took its decision to maintain order in the territory by establishing a police presence at the end of the 1950s and by taking over the administration of the territory in the mid 1960s?

- Were coercive measures used against dog-owners and members of their families implemented with flexibility and dialogue, so that they could be adopted gradually by a nomadic and traditional society?

- When officers and civil servants implemented measures, were they likely to cause inconvenience or harm to dog-owners and prevent them from hunting, fishing and trapping and from freely exercising their aboriginal rights on the territory?

- Did the statutory provisions invoked by officers allow them to act as they did with respect to the sled dogs?

- In addition, were the measures taken by the officers and civil servants applied in the interest of and for the well-being of dog-owners and their families? If not, was the violation of legally protected rights irreversible?

For the purpose of this report, these questions must all be answered, or at least addressed.

1. Creation of a hostile climate

During the relevant period, the Inuit, whether nomadic or sedentary, had a collective relationship to the territory from which they had drawn their subsistence since time immemorial.

In their view, the Whites who were passing through or settling in their communities could not or should not, by any means, have tried to change their way of life, their customs or traditions. Sled dogs were a part of these traditions because they were essential to transportation and to hunting, fishing and trapping, since long before the arrival of the Whites.

According to the Inuit, Whites either knew nothing of Inuit views or, if they knew, they pretended to ignore them.

The Inuit could not understand why Whites who were only passing through, such as local administrators, civil servants, police officers and teachers, wanted to "educate" them and tell them what to do with their dogs.

This explains the scale of the controversy and the Inuit's resistance towards the requests made by the Whites to tie up their dogs and kill those that were no longer useful or required for daily activities.

Several Inuit witnesses said so in their testimony: the decisions and actions of Whites adversely affected their way of life, their traditions and their freedom to decide for themselves what to do about their dogs.

A long quotation from a report dated October 8, 1958 by Sergeant Wilson based in Kuujjuaraapik illustrates the approach taken by Whites in order to settle the dog issue as quickly as possible, without taking into account the location and circumstances, an approach that created a hostile climate (Kuujjuaraapik).

Sergeant Wilson mentioned that several meetings took place with the Inuit, "In an effort to educate the Eskimos regarding proper care and control of their dogs."

Later, he wrote:

> These meetings apparently met with mixed feelings amongst the Eskimos and although they did make limited efforts to control their dogs, the effect was usually short lived.

Presumably, the approach did not work.

Sergeant Wilson also referred to a meeting that took place between the Inuit and Mr. Kennedy, Northern Service Officer, on September 14, 1957:

> …During this meeting, the men (the Inuit) wanted to know why Eskimo dogs had been shot as they were required for hunting purposes.
>
> At this time, all those who complained of having had dogs destroyed readily admitted they had been told to keep their dogs tied or they would be shot, but in spite of this, certain individuals were displeased that their dogs had been shot.

Once again, the facts suggest Inuit and Whites were engaged in a dialogue of the deaf. This also meant that each party resisted actions that would interfere with their "beliefs", and that each party had set ideas about the dog issue, thus creating a deadlock.

Did the authorities try to find other approaches or answers to the problem in order to avoid being trapped in the unsuccessful approach they had adopted in the past, without results?

Unfortunately, the answer is no.

The Departmental officials and police officers are presumed to have had full knowledge of Inuit culture.

Obviously, the dog problem may have appeared acute to Whites at the time, as Sergeant Wilson explained. More time was needed. How was it possible to think that Inuit, who had been nomadic just a few years before, could in such a short period of time adopt southern ideas and values. Clearly, Inuit families needed time to adapt.

Instead, administrative authorities decided to use "law and order" solutions to solve the dog issue when faced with resistance by the Inuit. Sergeant Wilson wrote that on June 28, 1957, Detective Paul-Émile Tourville of the Provincial Police intervened to state that the dog issue would be resolved by the application of the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture*. We shall see below that this statute could not have applied in Nunavik. The legislation relied upon by the police officer gave anyone the right to kill stray dogs between May 1st and December 15th of each year. Anyone was authorized to kill stray dogs without liability, including any White who was disgruntled or simply out for fun, as the evidence shows.

Mr. Wilson quoted Detective Tourville as saying:

> Told the natives of the provisions of the Agricultural Abuses Act and that if their dogs were not tied, they would be shot.

Police officers could kill any stray dogs without having to conduct an investigation before-hand to establish whether these dogs were a real danger and without knowing whether the stray dogs were essential to their traditional activities.

- The rigid approach taken by Detective Tourville showed a lack of awareness of Inuit traditions and their way of life. It could easily prevent the dog-owners from hunting, fishing or trapping and freely exercising their aboriginal rights.
- As with the federal officers, the Provincial Police turned the Inuit against them.

- According to Inuit witnesses, the inflexible and dismissive attitude adopted by the Provincial Police prevented dog-owners from practicing the traditional activities that ensured their livelihoods.
- According to officials from the Department of Northern Affairs, the legislation enforced by the Provincial Police was deficient and had to be strengthened. This meant the "law and order" remedy was not strenuous enough and had to be increased.
- The Minister at the time, based on information and advice from civil servants in his department, wrote to the Quebec Premier:

> We have tried every means of educating of the Eskimos…. There is no possibility of solving the problem without legal sanctions.

He wanted the Quebec law to apply 12 months a year, forcing owners to tie up their dogs year-round, despite the fact that such changes would cause harm to the Inuit and prevent them from practicing their traditional activities.

The Government of Quebec did not reply to that request to modify the statute. Nevertheless, Sergeant Tourville acted outside of the set period, as though the Quebec statute applied 12 months a year, according to the note of April 14, 1959 by Administrator J.G. Walton, Northern Service Officer.

The dose of "law and order" was arbitrarily increased.

On April 14, 1959, Administrator J.G. Walton wrote:

> ... The lesson seems to have been learnt as all dogs are now tied. If the problem should again arise, D/Sgt. [Detective Sergeant] Tourville said he would return to Great Whale River and shoot all loose dogs without warning and the Eskimos have been advised accordingly….

This was the carrot or the stick. A strong intervention from the police might solve the dog problem and the authorities in place could then address other issues.

The dog issue was handled as though it were a highway safety offence or a municipal by-law violation.

But the evidence shows that the force used by the Provincial Police – the violence, which should be referred to as killing dogs – created resentment among the Nunavik Inuit that still exists today, as I noticed during my tour of the villages.

In a memo of September 10, 1959, R.A.J. Philips condemned the work of the Provincial Police officers who, instead of adopting a flexible approach encouraging dialogue: "… regard the dog problem as a police matter, they have not delegate authority to deal with…" (Kuujjuaraapik).

By 1959, officials at the Department of Northern Affairs were fully aware of: the dog issue; Provincial Police behaviour which they did not disagree with; the hostility of Inuit towards Whites; and the resentment by Whites towards Inuit. The same authorities were also aware of the inconvenience and the wrong done to dog-owners and their families through the elimination of the dogs.

Federal government authorities imposed mandatory attendance and residential schools on the children of Inuit families. They should have acted progressively, while respecting of traditions and traditional activities. They should have been flexible and allow for a gradual transition. But this did not happen and mandatory schooling led to rapid sedentarization in most of the villages, thereby giving rise to the dog issue. Several witnesses mentioned this point and confirmed the opinion Father Dion expressed in his biography about the imposition of residential schools under the supervision of Whites:

> What the Government minister did not know is that an Inuk never separates himself from his children. So this new lifestyle did not last very long. People never wanted to adopt this new regime. *(*Quaqtaq*)*

This formula or model existed in the south, at least in Quebec, as explained by Father Dion:

> The federal government agent told them: "We are going to build boarding schools. You have to send your children to school. You can stay in the hunting camps, but the children have to go to school. You will be able to see them whenever you want. They will come back to you in the camp at Christmas, Easter and during the summer holidays. In this way, no family will be forced to move.

In southern Quebec, this model of residential school existed in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. Families living outside the cities or towns sent their children to residential schools: the girls to convents and the boys to colleges.

Children would leave for boarding school at the beginning of September, taking their clothes with them in a large trunk. They would return home at the beginning of November to replenish their trunks with clean clothes and winter garments. They would spend the holidays with their families and leave again at the beginning of January. The children attending boarding schools would return home for a few days at Easter and go back to school until the end of the school year in June. While children were at school in convents or colleges, their parents could visit them on the weekends, in the parlour. During the 1950s, children who could do so, returned to their families on weekends. The system became less rigid.

Clearly, people from the south wanted to impose a model of residential schooling conceived in the south for the Whites, based on the values and culture of the time. This mandatory schooling was established without any consultation with the Inuit. The Whites were denying or ignoring Inuit culture.

The implementation of mandatory schooling by government authorities, combined with the rejection of the residential school model by the Inuit, created a movement, an urgent desire among the majority of families to settle in the communities where schools were located, in order to be close to their children. The Inuit therefore settled

in communities without any preparation and without any familiarity with the rules of good neighbourliness that apply to those who live together.

These particular circumstances created the dog issue. Most of the owners considered their dogs useful and essential to maintaining what until then had been a nomadic lifestyle or to preserving the tradition. If the dogs were taken away, the tradition would be changed and lost.

Government authorities tried to solve the problem they had created by failing to consult the Inuit and, especially, by failing to anticipate Inuit reactions to their decisions.

But how did they do so? By carrying out police operations and by attempting reinforce the statute.

In his letter to the Premier of Quebec, Minister Hamilton referred to unfortunate incidents with dogs that took place in the villages of Great Whale River, Port Harrison, Fort Chimo and Sugluk. As a matter of fact, before these incidents, the authorities had imposed mandatory school attendance that led to the settlement of many families in villages, to the increase of the canine population (required by the families to pursue subsistence activities) and to problems with dogs.

In Inukjuak, after the settlement of the Inuit families, the evidence is similar. There was the problem of stray dogs and an epidemic of canine diseases.

- The federal Administrator, M.A.P. Wight, referred to a similar scenario in Kuujjuaraapik. He was looking for a means to avoid any liability.
- Coercive measures were applied and "both governments were working together" prior to police operations, without taking into consideration the serious and difficult consequences for dog-owners and their families.

In Puvirnituq, the Vallées' letter was eloquent: a committee was created, a constructive dialogue between the Inuit and the Whites took place.

The dog issue became critical in 1963 and in 1965. Provincial Police officers eliminated all stray dogs without warning, thus creating resentment among the Inuit. The approach initiated by Detective Tourville had been continued.

In Ivujivik, problems with dogs began in the early 1960s after a school was built. Coercive measures were used by the Provincial Police and Quebec civil servants. They killed any stray dogs they saw, without enquiring whether they were dangerous or useful to their owners.

In Salluit, the dog problem became serious after following construction of the school in 1957 and the sedentarization of many Inuit families. In the view of Inspector E.R. Lysyk: "This is the responsibility of the provincial authorities."

In Kangiqsujuaq, the problems with dogs also became an important issue after the opening of the school.

The Inuit could not understand how a provincial statute gave police officers discretion to kill their dogs.

In Quaqtaq, the same scenario took place. The Inuit way of life abruptly changed when officers from both governments began eliminating dogs.

In Kangirsuk, after the opening of the school in 1959, nomadic families settled in large numbers for the same reasons as in other villages. They would be penalized if they refused to send their children to school: they would not be able to receive family allowances or old age pensions.

There was the incident of the Inuit child and the elimination of all loose dogs by the Inuit in the mid-1960s. There was also the systematic elimination of any stray dog by the police without investigation. It is interesting to note the testimony of Mary Salowatseak, 63 years of age (Aupaluk). She and her husband were the owners of ten dogs when they moved to Kangirsuk in 1968. They were the only ones who had dogs:

> We were still the only dog-owners when we moved to Kangirsuk… because already the dogs had already been eradicated in Kangirsuk when we moved there.

There is also the statement by Sammy Putulik:

> The thing that bothers me about the matter of the dog slaughters is that this outside intervention was too unilateral and that people felt part of their property....

As mentioned above, the Provincial Police operations were carried out without regard for the importance of dogs and especially the time required to build dog teams. These operations were likely to prevent Inuit from practicing their traditional activities.

In Kuujjuaq, the problems with dogs began at the end of the 1950s. Provincial Police officers were killing every loose dog without warning.

The Inuit's resentment led to confrontations. An Inuk was arrested and sent to the south to be tried, another was jailed after becoming aggressive towards police officers.

Federal civil servants must have been aware of the explosive situation related to dogs when they were informed by Constable Belley of the Provincial Police on March 20, 1963 about his approach to the Inuit:

> He was making a new law and that all dogs not tied [up] would be shot.

According to a federal civil servant, Constable Belley changed his mind as a result of their reactions.

The authorities did not react. It would have been appropriate for them as administrators to initiate a dialogue with the Inuit, to take the time to act with patience and tolerance, to appoint an experienced conciliator familiar with Inuit culture to settle the disputes with which they were confronted.

Canada had fiduciary obligations, which imposed strict standards of conduct. It had to act in order to protect the rights and interests of the Inuit.

Instead, federal public servants avoided any responsibility. They let the Provincial Police act in disproportionate manner. More than 200 dogs were slaughtered as a result of operations conducted with force but without warning or investigation. The result was reprisals and the poisoning of police dogs.

The conflict became so severe that provincial authorities decided to suspend the use of the coercive measures they had applied.

In Kangiqsualujjuaq, dogs were not a problem when only Inuit families and one non-Inuit family were living permanently in the village, as mentioned in a report from February 1964.

The problem of stray dogs emerged once many Inuit families were sedentarized and with the arrival of the Whites.

With the full knowledge of public servants from the federal government, Provincial Police officers killed dogs without any consideration for their importance to Inuit families.

David Etok testified eloquently regarding the behaviour by police officers that left him and other members of his community full of resentment.

Police operations prevented dog-owners from practicing their traditional activities.

It is unfortunate that the Canadian government did not take into account the sound advice given on September 1, 1959 by Administrator Bolger, when he wrote to J.G. Walton, Northern Service Officer:

> The long-term solution to the problem of dogs running loose is to convince their owners to keep them tied up. Indiscriminate shooting reduces the number of dogs, but

> will certainly increase hostility toward the person who does the shooting, and any group he is identified with. It will also make it more difficult to convince the dog-owners that dogs should be tied up. (Kuujjuaraapik)

To summarize:

Neither the federal nor provincial public servants provided assistance in any village to the owners following the slaughter of their dogs, leaving them unprotected, vulnerable and without resources. Several Inuit became destitute while others endured emotional hardship. The testimony by their children on this subject was very explicit.

2. **The *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* (R.S.Q 1941, Ch. 139)**

Since Quebec had exclusive jurisdiction over lands and natural resources within its boundaries pursuant to the *Constitutional Act, 1867* (British North America Act), it also had exclusive power to adopt legislation in the same field.

We can imagine the following scenario: federal civil servants faced with the dog problem contacted their counterparts from Quebec to determine whether any existing statute could solve the dog problem and relieve them of responsibility for it.

There is a principle in administrative law: coercion (tying up) and/or and penalties (killing) can only be imposed if authorized by statute or regulation.

Quebec answered that there was a statute which could solve the problem, with quick and guaranteed results: the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture*.

As discussed above, this statute forbids dog-owners from letting the animals run loose between May 1st and December 15th and if, owners do not comply, allows anyone to kill the dogs without incurring any liability.

More precisely, section 11 of the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* read as follows:

> Every owner, possessor or the 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

Section 12 read as follows:

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

3. **Inapplicability of the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture***

My conclusion that this statute was inapplicable in Nunavik is based on three grounds:

i) the statute applied in agricultural areas, not organized into municipalities, which was not the case for Nunavik;

ii) the notion of stray dogs applied in the south but could not be applied in Arctic Quebec;

iii) when the legislature adopted the statute in April 1941, it was not intended to apply in Nunavik.

a) There is no doubt in my mind, after my visits to the region, that the territory of Nunavik is not meant for agriculture. No-one would be surprised by my

conclusion that the territory of Nunavik is simply not suitable for agriculture. There are no farms such as those seen in southern regions.

In a letter addressed to Mr. Pita Aatami, President of Makivik Corporation, on June 21, 2000, the Minister of Native Affairs at the time, Mr. Guy Chevrette, stated:

> Your letter is referring to *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* that authorises the killing of stray dogs. This was not applicable in Nunavik because there are no farm animals requiring protection.

This letter from Mr. Chevrette, translated into English and cited in the Final Report of the RCMP (pp. 472-473) was not considered by the RCMP review team.

This statute is discussed at length in the text *Droit municipal: Principes généraux et contentieux* (Montréal: Éditions Hébert Denault, 1998). The authors Jean Hétu, Yvon Duplessis and Dennis Pakenbam share the view expressed by Mr. Chevrette in the above-mentioned letter. According to the authors, this statute creates a no-fault liability regime concerning stray dogs that could cause harm to sheep or other farm animals.

Based on these views, I am entitled to conclude that when the Quebec legislature enacted in section 11 of its statute that:

> 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

it referred to a territory that was not organized into municipalities, in an agricultural area, in order to protect sheep or other farm animals. As a result, the provision was not meant to apply to Nunavik.

b) In section 12, the Quebec legislature provided:

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

The *Civil Code of Quebec* and even Canadian property law define the concept of property based on the existence of individual rights to exclusive enjoyment of real property, such as land or a defined area, subdivision or parcel of land.

In Aboriginal law, the concept of property is completely different. The Indians and the Inuit have a collective relationship to the land. The land belongs to the group or nation that has occupied it from time immemorial, for their use and enjoyment. I mentioned above that prior to the arrival of the Europeans, through the passage of time out of mind, the Inuit people had become the beneficiary of rights to land. However, this does not mean that each Inuk has an exclusive right to the use and enjoyment of a defined parcel of land.

In my opinion, when an owner's dogs wandered on the territory, they could not be considered stray dogs.

In the RCMP final report, the review team often used the expression "stray dogs". The *Houghton Mifflin Canadian Dictionary of the English Language* defines the word "stray" as follows: "To wander from a given place or group or beyond established limits."

A stray dog which was wandering, as provided for in the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture,* would be a dog walking or running outside the boundaries of its master's property or parcel of land.

The *Petit Robert* French dictionary defines a stray dog as "un vagabond – une personne sans domicile fixe, qui erre, traîne à l'aventure" ("a vagabond – a person with no fixed address, who wanders or roams around").

The above-mentioned authors, Hétu, Duplessis and Pakenbam, define as "stray" ("errant"), "the dog that is found outside the limits of his master's property," relying on the judgment in *Procureur Général du Québec c. Noël* (J.E. 97-255).

This definition constitutes another basis for concluding that, as stated above, the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* could not apply in Nunavik nor, as a result, to the Inuit owners of sled dogs.

c) The *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture,* including sections 11 and 12 mentioned above, was adopted on April 12, 1941 at a time when the Government of Quebec had no interest in managing the territory of Nunavik.

The authors Dussault and Borgeat provide a brief history of the James Bay and New Quebec territories in their text *Traité de droit administratif* (2nd ed., vol. I, Ste-Foy: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1984, p. 270).

Although Quebec had full jurisdiction over the vast northern territory following the adoption of the 1898 (James Bay) and 1912 (northern Quebec) boundary extension acts, in fact, Quebec allowed the federal government to establish certain services. The authors refer to the following studies:

- The *Rapport de la commission d'étude sur l'intégralité du territoire du Québec* (Report of the Commission on the Territorial Integrity of Québec), Vol. 4, *Le domaine indien* (The Indian Domain), 1967;
- Vol. 5, *Les frontières septentrionales* (The Northern Boundaries), 1971;
- Office de Planification et de développement du Québec, *Le Nord du Québec: Profil regional*, 1983, p. 20.

Thus, for several decades, Quebec left the administration of Nunavik to the federal government. The evidence gathered for this report shows that, according to Sergeant Wilson's report (Kuujjuaraapik), it was only in 1957 that Quebec expressed its intention to exercise its jurisdiction by sending Detective Paul-Émile Tourville to the territory: the province took over administration of the territory on a provisional basis in the mid-1960s.

In the Supreme Court of Canada's judgment in *Williams v. Box* (1910), 44 S.C.R. 10, Mr. Justice Idington held:

> If we would interpret correctly the meaning of any statute or other writing, we must understand what those framing it were about and the purpose it was intended to execute.

According to the Supreme Court, therefore, legislative interpretation requires an understanding of the intention of the legislature which drafted and enacted the statute, as well as the goal it was intended to carry out. (P.A. Côté, *Interprétation des lois*, 2nd ed., Cowansville: Éditions Yvon Blais, 1982, p. 361.)

Based on the historical background provided by the authors Dussault and Borgeat, I therefore cannot believe that Nunavik was what the legislature had in mind when the statute was enacted in 1941.

In my opinion, this constitutes another basis for questioning the applicability of the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* to Nunavik.

4. **The consequences of the inapplicability of the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture***

Given the above-mentioned grounds, police officers, civil servants, teachers, administrators and other officials were wrong to rely on the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture* as a basis for killing any dog loose in Nunavik.

I am referring in this regard more generally to the role of a police officer which is to uphold:

- The provisions of the *Criminal Code* of Canada;
- Rules imposed by of provincial statute; or
- Municipal by-laws.

Outside of those rules, a police officer cannot be considered to be acting within the scope of his duties.

In this case, the police officers who shot dogs in Nunavik during the period at issue acted beyond the scope of their duties.

However, since they were not carrying out their duties, their actions must be assessed like those of government agents or employees. This is the approach recognized in the *Police Act* when it was amended in 1979 (S.Q. 1979, Ch. 67) and also by the Supreme Court of Canada in the 1950s (see Gilles Pépin et Yves Ouellette, *Principes de contentieux administratif*, 2nd ed., Cowansville: Yvon Blais, 1982, p. 495).

The traditional concept of civil fault recognized under the *Civil Code of Lower Canada* (s. 1053) applied at the time and continued to apply under the *Civil Code of Québec*, adopted in December 1991 (s. 1457) and it applies to these government agents.

An individual's conduct is an important factor to be considered in determining whether or not he caused harm to others.

In the decision *Ayotte c. Péloquin*, [1958] C.S. 286, rendered on December 13, 1957 – at the same time the Inuit's dogs were being slaughtered – the Superior Court stated:

> En principe, le fait de tuer délibérément le chien d'autrui constitue un acte illicite qui engage la responsabilité de son auteur, sauf dans les conditions prévues par l'article 406 du Code municipal et par les dispositions de la *Loi sur les abus préjudiciables à l'agriculture*.
>
> In principle, the fact of deliberately killing a dog belonging to another person constitutes an illicit act, for which the perpetrator is liable, except under the conditions set out in section 406 of the *Municipal Code* or the provisions of the *Act Respecting Certain Abuses Injurious to Agriculture.* (translation)

The Superior Court also referred to the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Matthews v. Pringle*, [1923] 35 Q.B. 443:

> La nécessité qui empêche que la destruction d'un animal ne soit délictueuse n'est pas définie par la loi; elle peut résulter de tous faits, de toutes circonstances que le juge aura à apprécier.
>
> La destruction d'un animal peut donc être considérée comme nécessaire, non seulement lorsque cet animal met une personne en péril mais encore lorsqu'il peut être un danger sérieux et actuel pour d'autres animaux.
>
> The necessity that would prevent the destruction of an animal from being wrongful is not defined in law; it can arise from any facts, any circumstances, which the judge will have to evaluate.
>
> The destruction of an animal can thus be considered necessary not only when the animal puts a person in danger, but also when it could be a serious and current threat to other animals. (translation)

Serious reasons are therefore required in order to kill a dog. A person can kill a dog in self-defence (to prevent death or injury) or when a dog represents a serious and current threat to other animals. In this case, my opinion is that the Inuit dogs had to represent a real, serious and current threat to society in general: there could be no presumption of a general risk or that all untied dogs constituted a real, serious and current threat.

Section 1053 of the *Civil Code of Lower Canada*, which applied at the time, read as follows:

> Every person capable of discerning right from wrong is responsible for the damage caused by his fault to another, whether by positive act, imprudence, neglect or want of skill.

At the time, the notion of a reasonable person, that is, a diligent, informed and careful person, was used to characterize the behaviour of a person in order to

establish whether he had acted wrongfully, whether by intent or through negligence. These standards expected of an informed, careful and diligent person could vary according to place, person, or circumstance.

In the historical and legal context of this case, sled dogs were essential to ensure the livelihoods of and provide transportation for Inuit families. The well-being, rights and interests of a traditional people were directly affected by the slaughter of dogs, for example, by the elimination of a lead dog, several dogs or even a whole dog team.

A diligent, informed and careful person should have been aware of the dog-owners' right to practice their traditional activities.

In my opinion, the police officers posted in Nunavik at the time had the obligation, as government agents, to investigate, meet and discuss, directly in Inuktitut or through an interpreter, with dog-owners or, in their absence, with members of their families, in order to inform them when their untied dogs had been threatening or dangerous, or else that their dogs were sick and had to eliminated.

By acting this way, they could have killed a dog after an investigation and after having demonstrated judgment, patience and tolerance.

Several owners said that they could not get adequate chains and/or collars to tie up their dogs. Police officers, as government agents, should have inquired about this situation and offered chains or collars free of charge to the owners. They had a duty to offer assistance because the dog-owners were vulnerable. To purchase goods such as chains or collars, dog-owners had to trade furs. Chains and collars were also not easily found in stores. Several dog-owners said they could not buy nor obtain these items because they were simply not available.

As mentioned above, Canada and Quebec had in the past accepted a duty to provide assistance in order to protect the interests and well-being of the Inuit.

Under the circumstances, the conditions to be met before government agents could take action were stricter than if they had been in the south.

5. Liability

As seen above, in the period from 1950 to 1970, sled dogs were essential for their owners' hunting, fishing and trapping, as well as for the whole community, which depended on the dogs for subsistence and transportation.

We were able to establish that the dog issue arose because:

a) the federal government had unilaterally established mandatory schooling and residential schools;
b) Inuit never allow themselves to be separated from their children;
c) Inuit families were in a hurry to settle in villages, bringing their dogs with them in order to ensure their livelihood and transportation;
d) the canine population increased in each community affected.

We also know that the transmission of traditional knowledge among Inuit depends on the oral tradition. We were able to see that the human condition was immersed in beliefs, rules and identification with form.

We noted, hearing certain testimony (Kangiqsualujjuaq), that federal schools supplanted the oral tradition.

We also noted that, according to Sergeant Wilson's report, the authorities chose confrontation over negotiation by using the services of the Provincial Police (Detective Tourville). As a result, any untied dog was killed without prior warning, while the statute relied upon allowed anyone to kill a stray dog without incurring liability (Kuujjuaraapik).

According to Minister Hamilton's letter of November 17, 1958, Canada was fully aware of the points mentioned above. The dog problem was "a situation becoming increasingly serious." As mentioned above, it arose at Great Whale River, Port Harrison, Fort Chimo and Sugluk.

The problem arose after the imposition of mandatory schooling and the sedentarization of a population that was not ready for it. The Inuit had a lifestyle involving the use of sled dogs in order to ensure their livelihood.

For reasons of public health and safety, the right of the Inuit to earn their livelihood was threatened and so too were their interests and well-being.

Canada's honour, in its capacity as a fiduciary, was at stake.

- Canadian authorities must have known that the influx of a large number of Whites to the North would significantly disturb Inuit culture and their way of life. (Numerous reports from local officials confirms this fact.)
- After the establishment of the first four schools in the above-mentioned villages, Canada should have taken charge and asked the civil servants to suspend any future project regarding the implementation of their unilateral decision to open new schools with mandatory attendance. Instead, they should have established more schools as needed, in accordance with Inuit culture and their lifestyle and after consultation with the elders.
- Moreover, Canada, in its capacity as a fiduciary, should have asked its civil servants to solve the problem in the above-mentioned villages through negotiation, instead of confrontation.

As mentioned by R.A.J. Philips in his memorandum addressed to Mr. Cunningham on September 10, 1959, the problem with dogs was not "a police matter", but required a conciliator who could inquire into the causes and the facts surrounding the problem, encouraging the Inuit and the Whites to meet in order to find a solution. If the authorities wanted to put their decision to

eliminate dogs into effect, they should have found the means to provide for the needs of the Inuit.

I know this would have required patience and tolerance. I cited Tivi Etok at length in order to demonstrate that the Inuit required understanding: just in order to establish a co-operative, numerous meetings were required that in some cases lasted all night (Kangiqsualujjuaq).

It has to be understood that as a nomadic people, the Inuit were not familiar with the types of organizations developed by the Whites.

In my opinion, Canada refrained from intervening in its capacity as fiduciary, as it would have been required to do by the commitments it made at the time of the transfer of Rupert's Land. Canada thereby incurred liability.

In the Court of Appeal's decision, *Drury c. Lambert* (1941), 71 B.R. 336, Chief Justice Sir Mathias Tellier stated the following legal rule:

> On est en faute en droit, quand on a fait quelque chose que la loi ou les règlements prohibent ou quand on a omis de faire quelque chose (abstention) qu'ils commandent ou ordonnent.
>
> There is a fault in law when something has been done that statute or regulations prohibit or when there is a failure to do something (abstention) which they command or order to be done. (translation)

Quebec

We have already seen that an individual's conduct is an important factor to be taken into account in order to determine whether or not harm had been caused to others.

We saw that the whole community depended on dogs for its livelihood and transportation and that its rights and interests were constitutionally protected.

Under the circumstances, the conduct by Quebec government agents (police officers) and civil servants had to meet high standards. They were obliged to act with proper knowledge of dog-owners' rights to practice their traditional activities. They were required to act after an investigation, exercising judgment, demonstrating patience, and tolerance and according to other criteria I set out above.

According to interviews and testimony heard in the 14 villages, the employees of the Government of Quebec arrived in the communities without prior warning and killed all loose dogs.

I asked at least 135 witnesses:

> Were you given the reasons, the motives justifying the elimination of the dogs?
>
> Was there any discussion prior to the killing?

Everyone answered in the negative.

The evidence shows that employees of the Government of Quebec addressed the dog problem as if it were a highway safety offence. They told the RCMP review team they had gone to the various communities after receiving complaints (RCMP, p. 471).

They also said that: "The S.Q. destroyed dogs that posed a threat to public health or safety."

Reviewing all the testimony heard, no witness ever mentioned that prior to the elimination of dogs, the Provincial Police conducted any investigation to determine whether or not the dogs were dangerous.

The only grounds the police officers had to shoot the dogs, without regard to their usefulness and importance to the owners, was that "they were running loose", as mentioned by some witnesses.

They also killed dogs arbitrarily because they believed the owners, who were now settled permanently in villages, no longer needed them for subsistence.

The Inuit testimony regarding the circumstances and the number of dogs killed by the Provincial Police is credible, considering the declaration by director Donald Vigneault of the Sûreté du Québec, as reported by the RCMP review team in its report:

> In an interview with Donald Vigneault, who was the director of the James Bay municipal SQ detachment, he recalled that he was asked in 1972 or 1973 by the band Council in Chisasibi to send some members to destroy dangerous dogs in community. He sent two members who destroyed 100 to 150, deemed to pose a danger to public safety (RCMP, p. 472)

It is worth nothing, with respect to this event, the significant number of dogs killed in a single operation and a single village.

Without investigation, arbitrarily and without meeting or speaking with dog-owners or members of their families, agents of the Government of Quebec deliberately killed more than 1,000 dogs, leading to the results that have already been discussed at length in this report.

In so doing, they have engaged the Government of Quebec's liability.

The same agents and employees failed to carry out the duty of protection and assistance they owed to at least 75 owners and their families following the elimination of their dogs. Several owners mentioned that they could not purchase adequate chains or collars at the trading post: to do so, they needed the means to acquire them by trading furs. The government's agents and employees should have taken this into account, which they did not.

They engaged the liability of the Government of Quebec in its capacity as fiduciary.

The federal agents and civil servants failed to intervene on behalf of the Government of Canada in its capacity as fiduciary when agents and civil servants of the Government of Quebec took their operations to an extreme, without investigation and without asking with the owners about the importance of the dogs they wanted to kill, without inquiring whether the dogs they wanted to kill constituted a real, serious and current danger to the people.

They also failed to carry out, on behalf of the Government of Canada in its capacity as fiduciary, the duty of protection and assistance owned to at least 75 owners and their families following the elimination of sled dogs

In both cases, they engaged the liability of the Government of Canada.

6. **Recommendations**

At the time, the whole of Inuit society suffered the harmful and damaging consequences of the actions, attitudes and mistakes of civil servants, agents and representatives of both the Canadian and Quebec governments.

The crucial event in this matter occurred in the fall of 1958, when Canada should have intervened in its capacity as fiduciary because the interests and well-being of the Inuit people were at stake. Canada did not so.

Neither did Canada ever condemn the actions and attitudes of the Quebec government's officers and agents.

Since their officers, agents and civil servants engaged the liability of both governments, as described above, the governments owe compensation and apologies to the Inuit of Nunavik.

There is no doubt that the wrongful acts being complained of have produced harmful and damaging consequences and damages.

I trust in the good faith, sincerity, integrity and honour of representatives of both governments in order to assess the damages and establish fair compensation.

They will have to discuss the matter with representatives of Makivik Corporation.

Once the amount of fair compensation has been agreed upon and paid, it shall be divided equally among Inuit non-profit organizations whose objectives are to:

- organize sled dog races (*Ivakkak*) in Nunavik;
- promote the sale and distribution of Inuit art and sculpture;
- promote the teaching and use of Inuktitut and syllabics in Nunavik.

All parties mentioned above should govern themselves accordingly.

MONTREAL, Québec, this 3rd day of March 2010

The Honourable Jean-Jacques Croteau
Retired Justice of the Superior Court of Quebec