The real tragedy, the greatest wound inflicted upon us, what that an entire continent slipped out of French hands in the eighteenth century. Ever since, we have been orphans who have only survived by withdrawing into our shell, increasingly concerned about our future as we emerge from it into the outside world. The separation from our mother country was the most traumatic aspect of our infancy as a people.

— LÉON DION, POLITICAL SCIENTIST

The fall of New France, which brought about lasting social, economic, and political changes, was a very significant event for Canadian history, culture, and identity. The conquest of New France by Britain was one of the concluding events of the European empire-builders’ Seven Years’ War. During this time, there was also animosity between the settlers in the Thirteen Colonies and the French Canadians and their Aboriginal allies. The war took a large toll on the people of Quebec. The men went to war and some never came home; the women took over the farms and businesses; the people were plagued by food shortages throughout the war years; and their homeland became a battle zone. To many Aboriginal Peoples, the war was a fight for survival; they knew that the advance of British settlements would mean the loss of their lands.

The governor of Quebec and the French general clashed over battle strategies, but the early battles between the French Canadians and the British usually resulted in victories for the French. With the fall of Louisbourg, though, the tide began to turn as New France’s military and supply positions weakened. In the siege of Quebec and the battle of the Plains of Abraham, the British defeated the French. French Canadians and the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada came under British rule.

Following the Conquest, the British administrators in Quebec—facing the threat of the discontented Thirteen Colonies to the south and the need to govern a conquered people—decided that leniency would be the best policy. The Aboriginal Peoples, who had lost their bargaining power between French and English and who were losing their lands to settlers, tried and failed to rid their lands of the British. The Royal Proclamation of 1763 tried to address the question of land ownership, but unresolved issues from that document still haunt relations between Canadian governments and the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada.
By the end of this chapter, you will be able to:

- analyze the principal characteristics of the French and English colonial experiences in Canada
- analyze the impact of European contact on the lives of Aboriginal Peoples, and evaluate the responses of Aboriginal Peoples
- analyze how Canada’s changing relationships with France, Britain, and the United States have influenced the formation and transformation of Canada’s identity
- describe the role of selected significant events and legislation in the development of the current Canadian political system
- demonstrate an understanding of Canada’s role in international affairs prior to Confederation
- assess whether British colonial policies were directed towards the creation of a homogeneous society in Canada

**Timeline of Events:**

- **1757**
  - William Pitt becomes Prime Minister of Britain and begins to concentrate British forces on defeating France in North America

- **1758**
  - British forces attack Montcalm at Fort Carillon, but are defeated
  - Louisbourg falls to British forces

- **1759**
  - General James Wolfe sets out from London to New France with orders to conquer Quebec
  - British forces take Quebec; Wolfe and Montcalm are among the casualties

- **1760**
  - Governor Vaudreuil signs the Articles of Capitulation and surrenders all of New France to Britain

- **1763**
  - The Treaty of Paris ends the Seven Years’ War, and New France becomes the British colony of Quebec

- **1764**
  - Pontiac signs peace treaty with the English, and tries to enforce that the surrender of French forts did not mean that Aboriginal territory had been surrendered

- **1765**
  - Some Acadians return to the Atlantic colonies
The Beginning of the End: The Seven Years’ War

During the Seven Years’ War (1756–63) the great empires of Europe struggled to maintain colonial territory, economic wealth, and power on the European continent and in lands far removed from Europe. Involving the largest armies and navies in human history up until that time, the war was fought on all the seas of the world and aligned France and Austria against Britain and Prussia. Quebec was only one of many colonial possessions at stake and to the rulers of France and England, Canada and the colonies in other lands were only pawns in a much larger game. But to the French Canadians and to many of the Aboriginal Peoples of North America, the Seven Years’ War was a struggle for survival.

In the decades before the war, France’s empire had flourished, both in Europe and in colonies as far away as India. Once war was declared, France’s attention was focused on winning the war in Europe. But when William Pitt became British prime minister in 1757, he began to concentrate British forces on defeating France in North America. If France was gaining ground in Europe the British would focus their attention on winning the war in North America. Britain already controlled the Thirteen Colonies, the land under the Hudson’s Bay charter, which was almost a third of the territory that makes up Canada today, and most of Acadia from which it had expelled the Acadians in the years following 1755. Now Pitt sent one-quarter of the British navy, two hundred ships, and at least twenty-three thousand troops to conquer New France.
French Expansion and
The Thirteen Colonies

New France’s expansion into the Ohio and Mississippi valleys had started back in the mid-seventeenth century with Intendant Talon. The goal had been—and remained—to protect and extend French interests in the fur trade and to cement alliances with the Aboriginal Peoples living in the vast territories north, west, and south of Quebec. By 1755 the French held the Mississippi Valley all the way to the Gulf of Mexico. But while they claimed the land, they had only a few widely scattered French trading posts and forts to back up their claim.

In the Ohio Valley, French colonial governors had built forts along the Ohio River and its tributaries. Roland-Michel Barrin de La Galissonière, commandant-general of New France from 1747 to 1749, extended the fortifications, trying to ensure French control over the region and to keep the Thirteen Colonies contained.

In the meantime, a group comprised of wealthy Virginians and English investors had formed the Ohio Land company to promote settlement on 500,000 acres of Aboriginal lands over which the French claimed sovereignty. The Ohio Land Company established trade relations with some of the Aboriginal Peoples in the region and built its own fortified posts in the hope that settlers would feel secure enough to move into the newly acquired territory.

During the years between 1747 and the outbreak of the Seven Years’ War, there were battles in the Ohio valley between the French, French Canadians, and their Aboriginal allies on the one side and the British, the militia of the Thirteen Colonies, and their Aboriginal allies on the other side. Discontent with British rule may have been growing in the Thirteen Colonies, but the colonial militia fought alongside the British against the French. The Ohio valley became a killing ground as the two sides fought for territory. Oftentimes the victims were the settlers, and their scalps were taken to prove the kill.

The Aboriginal Position

While there were still some Aboriginal groups who remained allies of the French and some who became allies of the British, other Aboriginal Peoples of the Ohio region believed that neither the French nor the English would protect their land for them. As one Delaware chief told a British emissary: “We have great reason to believe you intend to drive us away and settle the country, or else why do you come to fight in the Land that God has given us . . . Why don’t you and the French fight in the Old Country, and on the Sea? Why do you come to fight
on our Land? This makes everybody believe you want to take our land from us by force and settle it.”¹

Nonetheless, many Aboriginal Peoples continued to prefer alliances with the French rather than the English in the Thirteen Colonies as the French treated them with more respect. Knowing that their Aboriginal allies were essential to their survival, the French continued to treat them as independent peoples with whom alliances were the appropriate action. In return, their Aboriginal allies gained advantages in trade and also in the power over other Aboriginal nations. In addition, the French Canadians, with only 43,000 people as opposed to the 906,000 in the Thirteen Colonies, did not try to settle in Aboriginal lands.

As one Iroquois explained to the French when he sought refuge in a French mission in 1754, there was a distinction between the French and English peoples who lived in Aboriginal territories:

> Brethren, are you ignorant of the difference between Our Father [the French king] and the English? Go see the forts our Father has erected, and you will see that the land beneath his walls is still hunting ground, having fixed himself in those places we frequent, only to supply our wants; whilst the English, on the contrary, no sooner get possession of a country than the game is forced to leave it; the trees fall down before them, the earth becomes bare, and we find among them hardly wherewithal to shelter us when the night falls.²

### Montcalm and Vaudreuil

The governor of Quebec, Pierre de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, and the French General Louis-Joseph, the Marquis de Montcalm, clashed over how to wage battles and defend the colony of Quebec. Vaudreuil, a native French Canadian, knew the country and believed that his strategies would keep Quebec from being conquered by the British. He wanted to strengthen the Canadian militia with thirty-six hundred French regular troops, co-ordinate large numbers of Aboriginal war parties with the French force, and launch a series of surprise guerrilla raids at various points along the wide American frontier.

Montcalm thought these strategies would not be effective, and they were contrary to the European tradition of war. He complained that “It is no longer the time when a few scalps, or the burning of a few houses is any advantage or even an object. Petty
means, petty ideas, petty councils about details are now dangerous and a waste of time.”⁴ Montcalm wanted to concentrate French troops along the inner defences of the St. Lawrence and Richelieu rivers, and he wanted the Canadian militia incorporated into the regular army, where they would be subject to traditional military discipline. He also wanted to fight decisive battles with armies arrayed against each other in a field of war. Vaudreuil insisted that the outer defence lines had to be strengthened and that the guerrilla warfare had to be kept up in the Ohio valley.

Vaudreuil knew and valued his Aboriginal allies, but Montcalm had only contempt for the Aboriginal allies and for the French-Canadian militia. Vaudreuil reported to the minister of marine in France that Montcalm “goes as far as to strike the Canadians. I had urgently recommended to see that the land officers treat them well, but how could he keep them in order, if he cannot restrain his own vivacity?” To Vaudreuil, Montcalm set the worst possible example for unity among the French and Canadian soldiers.

Montcalm’s aide-de-camp, Antoine de Bougainville, had greater respect for the abilities of their Aboriginal allies. He admired their skills, especially when it came to tracking down the enemy.

They see in the tracks the number that have passed, whether they are Indians or Europeans, if the tracks are fresh or old, if they are of healthy or of sick people, dragging feet or hurrying ones, marks of sticks used as supports. It is rarely that they are deceived or mistaken. They follow their prey for one hundred, two hundred, six hundred leagues with a constancy and a sureness which never loses courage or leads them astray.⁴

**The Battles**

Before the Seven Years’ War was officially declared, the French achieved a number of victories against the British. They defeated British troops at Fort Duquesne, and stopped attacks at Fort Niagara and in the Lake Champlain area. In the early days of the war, both Montcalm and Vaudreuil achieved more victories. Montcalm and his troops attacked Oswego on the south shore of Lake Ontario to prevent the British from entering the Great Lakes. In the Lake Champlain area, the French captured Fort William Henry. There were heavier losses among the British and the militia of the Thirteen Colonies than among the French-Canadians and their allies. The fighting was bloody, with scalps being taken on both sides. Governor Vaudreuil told his superiors in 1756 that one of his officers had been “occupied more than eight days merely in receiving scalps.”

Montcalm and Vaudreuil continued to quarrel over how the battles should be fought. Finally, Montcalm requested to be recalled to France, but instead, he was placed in supreme command of all French forces in North America. Future battles would be fought according to Montcalm’s rather than Vaudreuil’s strategies. As Vaudreuil observed, “Now war is established here on the European basis . . . . It is no longer a matter of making a raid, but of conquering or being conquered. What a revolution! What a change.” Montcalm would meet the British invaders in the same manner as they attacked—by following European tactics and conventions.

For a while the French held their own. In July of 1758, a British force of fifteen thousand soldiers, the largest army amassed in North America to that time, attacked Montcalm and the French at Fort Carillon. Montcalm, with only thirty-six hundred soldiers, kept the British at bay, though with a heavy loss of life. But Jeffrey Amherst had laid siege to Louisbourg, and the tide began to turn against the French.

**The Fall of Louisbourg**

The British determined that they had to capture Louisbourg, the remaining and powerful French fort in the Atlantic region. The fortified town had become a thorn in the side of the British. It served as a base for the French navy, protected the entrance to the St. Lawrence River, and offered a refuge for French pirates who captured ships belonging to New Englanders.
Using Historical Sources

Historians use a variety of sources to try to understand the different perspectives that individuals and groups have on historic events, situations, and issues. If historians want to be objective, they need to explore as many perspectives as possible. They also need to be aware that both primary and secondary sources may be based on political, economic, and social values that reflect the time frame in which the author is writing.

What are Primary Sources?

Primary sources are direct or firsthand accounts written or created by people who actually experienced the event or the situation. Examples of primary sources include journals, logs, letters, government documents, manuscripts, speeches, statistics, newspaper articles, and artwork. These sources provide the historian with a variety of frames of reference. Examples of primary sources on the subject of the September 11, 2001 attack on the World Trade Centre would include newspaper articles, television and video accounts, President Bush’s speeches, photographs, and email messages from people who were there. Examples of primary sources on the subject of the Fall of New France might include Montcalm and Wolfe’s letters, diaries and official reports, as well as Aboriginal Peoples’ oral histories.

Primary sources provide information that
• reveals the perspective of participants in an event or situation
• reflects the culture, attitudes, language and style of a past time
• often reflects the speaker’s personal involvement in the event
• helps readers, viewers, or listeners understand beliefs and values at the time of the event

What are Secondary Sources?

Secondary sources are accounts of an event written or created by people who are explaining an historic event or situation after it has happened. Examples of secondary sources include textbooks, articles, manuscripts, history books and art. Secondary sources provide a retrospective or hindsight view of an event. Examples of secondary sources on Canada’s role in World War II could include books and articles written on the causes and effects of the war, biographies of participants, documentary films, and speeches made at Remembrance Day ceremonies. To be objective, historians who write secondary sources material need to use a variety of primary and secondary sources with different viewpoints.

Secondary sources provide information that
• presents a perspective based on distance in time from the event
• presents the event in a larger context which includes the consequences of the event
• may be more readily available and easily accessed than primary sources
• are often compiled from a number of different sources

Why is it Important to understand historical sources?

Whether you are reading primary or secondary sources, it is important that you try to understand exactly what the author is saying, both explicitly and implicitly. Historical sources can sometimes be challenging, especially if they were written in the past where the use of language, values and references are different from what people use today. When you read, you understand based on your own lifetime experience. To read or view material
from the past critically, you need to place the source in its historical and cultural context and recognize the differences between the values of the past and those of contemporary society. The following strategies will help you to read critically.

**Strategies to use before you read**

- Think about what you already know about the period, event, or topic.
- Determine who wrote the document: Is it a primary or secondary source? When was it written? Do you know anything about the political, economic or social values at that time? What was the writer’s intended purpose and who was the intended audience?
- Scan the text and look for unfamiliar vocabulary. Guess the meaning based on the context of the word in the sentence. Make note of these words; the meaning may become apparent as you read or you may need assistance with these terms later.

**Strategies to use while you read**

- Note the main ideas in the document.
- Note points related to or supporting the main idea.
- Write questions that arise as you read; for example, “Why was this information used to support the main idea?”
- Use post-it notes or written notes to highlight points that you think are interesting or questionable or that challenge your beliefs or values.

**Strategies to use after you read**

- Write down the point of view and/or main idea expressed by the writer.
- List the points, data, information, evidence, bias, logic, and reasoning that the author uses to support his/her point of view.
- Think about those points of view that were not included or considered by the author.
- Think about who the author’s intended audience might be or might have been.
- Generate questions to help you clarify and extend what you have just read. For example, What don’t I know? What vocabulary or terms do I still not understand? What other information do I need? What questions might my teacher ask about the information I just read?

**Practice**

List the primary and secondary sources used in this chapter. Review the sections of the chapter where those sources were referenced. Select one of the sources for further study. Use the before, during, and after reading strategies recommended above to help you understand and appreciate the source. Then discuss in a small group why you think these particular primary and secondary sources were chosen for this chapter.
In 1758, the British sent thirty-nine ships, more than twelve thousand troops and almost one thousand mounted guns to attack Louisbourg. The British commander, General Jeffery Amherst, laid siege to the fort and began the bombardment. The governor of Louisbourg, Augustin de Drucour, reported the situation: “It seems that the British intention is not just to breach the walls but rather to kill everyone and burn the town.” His wife, Marie-Anne Drucour, tried to keep up French morale by going each morning to fire three cannons at the British. The soldiers who manned the guns gave her the nickname, “La Bombardière.”

Augustin de Drucour knew that his people and his town could not hold out forever. Food supplies were getting dangerously low, and the hospital had been destroyed. But he also knew that if he could keep the British at Louisbourg until the middle of summer, they wouldn’t be able to get to Quebec that year because of the threat of the ice that formed in the St. Lawrence River. Once the ice started to form, any ship in the river would be trapped until the following spring.

On July 26, 1758, Drucour finally surrendered to Amherst. The people of Louisbourg were deported to France. William Pitt had a direct influence on the destruction that followed. The British prime minister ordered that Louisbourg be “totally demolished, and razed, and all the materials so thoroughly destroyed, as that no use may, hereafter, be ever made of them.”

The Effect of the War on the People of Quebec

For the people of Quebec, the human cost of the war was high. The colony again became a society at arms. Habitant women took over the running and even defence of farms as the men left to serve in the militia. Some would never return. Farms were
neglected without enough people to work them, and
to make matters worse there were crop failures
during the war years. In the towns, it was a similar
story as the men left and their wives took over the
running of the business. Farms and homes were
destroyed by the British as a tactic of war.

The intendant at the time, François Bigot, was
not impressed with living in Quebec; he wanted to
be back in the more sophisticated society of France.
However, while he was in Quebec, he made a for-
tune from contracts to provide supplies for the
French military. Like many colonial officials of his
time, he was corrupt by today’s standards of ethical
behaviour in public office. Bigot and his associates
of the Grande Société in Quebec indulged in the
excesses of the casino, the ballroom, and the ban-
quet hall while the ordinary people of Quebec
faced rationing and privation.

Nonetheless, Bigot and his associates did manage
to have food and equipment shipped from France
to Quebec at a time when costs were growing at a
tremendous rate. But there was never quite enough
food as refugees, soldiers, and allies moved into
the walled city. Food shortages became so severe
that in April 1759 rations were cut to a few ounces
of bread per day. The price of food—even horse-
meat—rose dramatically and some people were
reduced to eating grass. And, into this misery,
came a smallpox epidemic.

The Conquest

In early 1759, General James Wolfe started out
from London under instructions from King George
II and William Pitt to conquer Quebec. Wolfe
brought with him twenty-nine ships: warships that
had at least two gun decks and were heavily
enough armed that they could take a position in
the line of battle, twenty-two frigates (warships
capable of high speeds), eighty transport ships,
and fifty-five smaller ships. In total, the ships car-
rried fifteen thousand soldiers, two thousand can-
nons, and forty thousand cannonballs. Among
those on board were surgeons, Protestant minis-
ters, children and their parents, and livestock.
When the fleet arrived in the St. Lawrence River, it
stretched for 150 kilometres and had a population
greater than that of Quebec.

The Siege of Quebec City

The bombardment of the town of Quebec began
on July 12, 1759 and lasted for nine weeks. Night
after night British cannon and the fires that fol-
lowed the cannon shots destroyed homes, ware-
houses, churches, convents, and streets in Quebec.
Sister Marie de la Visitation and the other nursing
sisters at the Hôpital Général on the outskirts of
the town witnessed these events at close hand. The
nuns were caring for the soldiers who had arrived
from France suffering from a “malignant fever.”
They were also caring for injured British soldiers
who had been captured by the French. Sister Marie
de la Visitation recalled the siege, “During one night,
upwards of fifty of the best houses in the Lower Town were destroyed. The vaults containing merchandise and many precious articles did not escape the effects of the artillery. During this dreadful conflagration, we could offer nothing but our tears and prayers at the foot of the altar at such moments as could be snatched from the necessary attention to the wounded.\(^8\)

In an effort to force the Canadians to surrender, General Wolfe had ordered that the habitants’ farms and livestock be destroyed for 150 miles along the St. Lawrence. Sister Marie de la Visititation wrote, “famine, at all times inseparable from war, threatened to reduce us to the last extremity; upwards of six hundred persons in our building and vicinity, partaking of our small means of subsistence, supplied from the government stores, which were likely soon to be short of what was required for the troops.”\(^9\)

As General Montcalm had told his superiors in France, he was not optimistic about the French chances for winning the battle for Quebec. To him, the loss of one more French colonial outpost was not all that significant. For his part, General Wolfe was suffering from the late stages of tuberculosis. In his last letter to his mother before his death, he told her that he had decided to leave the military after his tour of duty in North America.

**September 13, 1759**

Just before midnight on September 12, 1759, British troops began to launch small boats from their ships in the St. Lawrence alongside the citadel of Quebec. By 2:30 a.m., the soldiers, their guns, one small cannon, and ammunition were underway. When they reached the shore at Anse au Foulon a few kilometres from the town, the men climbed a steep 50-metre-high cliff and moved silently through the night towards the abandoned cornfield where General Wolfe hoped to engage his enemy. By 5:00 a.m., Wolfe’s army was in place, on the Plains of Abraham.

As Rear-Admiral Charles Holmes, who was third in command of the British forces, reported to his superiors in London, Wolfe had decided the
day before to launch the stealthy attack. He wanted to try one more time to engage the enemy before his ships would be forced out of the St. Lawrence River by winter ice. Most of Wolfe’s officers disagreed with his plan, thinking that it was far too risky. Success was highly unlikely. But Wolfe was in command, and so just before dawn on September 13, the British waited on the Plains of Abraham. The French did not even know they were there. The morning mist, the overgrown condition of the terrain, and a hill between the town and the field obscured the view, even from the high walls of Quebec.

Montcalm and most of the French troops were at Beauport where he and his men had watched all night for an expected British attack. When he heard that the British were outside the walls of Quebec, Montcalm quick-marched his troops back to the town. They arrived exhausted from the journey and from a night with little sleep.

On the British side of the battlefield were soldiers of Irish, Scottish, and English descent, as well as militia from the Thirteen Colonies. On the French side were soldiers from France who were fighting yet another colonial battle and who had no particular interest in the land for which they were fighting. French-Canadian militia from Quebec, Acadians who had escaped the expulsion, and Iroquoian and Algonkian allies accompanied the French soldiers. Among the ranks of the French-Canadian militia were descendants of families who had been in Canada for 150 years. These men and boys—some were no older than twelve—were fighting to save their homeland.

At 8:00 a.m. the British fired their small field cannon. The French troops—whose soldiers and militia had never trained together—attacked in three ragged columns. As Maurès de Malartic, a participant in the battle reported, the left column of the French force was too far in the rear and the centre column too far in front. “The Canadians who formed the second rank and the soldiers of the third fired without orders and, according to custom, they threw themselves on the ground to reload.” The French soldiers misunderstood their action, thinking they had been cut down. At this
point, the first line of the British force, which according to one witness was a mile long, fired on the French. Then the feared Fraser Highlanders charged. Joseph Trahan, an Acadian survivor of the battle, remembered “the Scotch Highlanders flying wildly after us with streaming plaids, bonnets and large swords—like so many infuriated demons—over the brow of the hill.”10 Though Canadian and Aboriginal snipers tried to cut down the Scots and the other British soldiers from the woods, the battle was lost; the surviving French and Canadians retreated back into the ruins of Quebec.

Sister Marie de la Visitation and her fellow nuns witnessed the carnage from the windows of the Hôpital Général: “We were in the midst of the dead and the dying, who were brought in to us by hundreds, many of them our close connexions; it was necessary to smother our griefs and exert ourselves to relieve them. Loaded with the inmates of three convents, and all the inhabitants of the neighbouring suburbs, which the approach of the enemy caused to fly in this direction, you may judge of our terror and confusion. . .11

Before the day was over, French reinforcements led by Governor Vaudreuil and Colonel Louis-Antoine de Bougainville had arrived. But it was too late. Quebec was lost, and although Montreal did not fall until the following spring, French rule in Canada was over. The battle ended less than three hours after it started and left 220 French and Canadian militia dead and more than 400 wounded. The British casualties were sixty-seven British dead and almost six hundred wounded.12 Among the British wounded were General James Murray and Brigadier General Guy Carlton who would become the first two governors of the new British colony of Quebec. Wolfe was killed in the battle, and Montcalm died the next day from his wounds.

On September 18, Admiral Holmes reported to London that “We have at last brought to a happy conclusion the great Service we were sent upon; and the Capital of all Canada acknowledges the superior Bravery & Success of his Majesty’s Arms.”13 To Sister Marie de la Visitation, the view was very different: “Alas! Dear Mothers, it was a great misfortune for us that France could not send, in the spring, some vessels with provisions and munitions; we should still be under her dominion. She has lost a vast country and a faithful people, sincerely attached to their sovereign; a loss we must greatly deplore, on account of our religion, and the difference of the laws to which we must submit. . .”14

The Capitulation of Montreal

With three separate British forces converging on Montreal and with many of their Aboriginal allies already having signed peace treaties with the British,
Governor Vaudreuil decided that the war for the French colony had been lost. There was nothing to be gained from further bloodshed and loss of life. On September 8, 1760, Vaudreuil signed the Articles of Capitulation and surrendered the whole of New France to General Amherst.

By these Articles of Capitulation, Amherst took possession of the town of Montreal in the name of the British Crown. Members of the French-Canadian militia were allowed to evacuate the town, and any other French possession in Canada, and to return to their habitations, “without being molested on any pretense whatever, on account of their having carried arms” against the English. The governor and other French colonial administrators and senior military personnel were to be carried “by the straitest passage to the first seaport in France.” Catholic nuns who chose to remain in the former French colony were to be exempt from lodging any military and received a guarantee that they would not be molested in any way by the British. The French-Canadian clergy and seigneurs were to continue to have their rights and privileges.

Also in the Articles of Capitulation were two points that would have long-term significance for French Canadians in Quebec and the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada:

Article XXVII: The free exercise of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Religion, shall subsist entire, in such manner that all the states and the people of the Towns and countries, places and distant posts, shall continue to assemble in the churches, and to frequent the sacraments as heretofore, without being molested in any manner, either directly or indirectly.

Article XL: The savages or Indian allies of his most Christian Majesty, shall be maintained in the lands they inhabit, if they chuse to remain there; they shall not be molested on any pretense whatsoever, for having carried arms . . .

Those who were slaves in French territories at the time of the Capitulation did not fare as well as the French Canadians and Aboriginal Peoples. Article 47 stated that “The negroes and panis of both sexes shall remain, in their quality of slaves, in the possession of the French and Canadians to whom they belong . . .”

Many artists were inspired to paint the deaths of the two heroes of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham. On the left is a version of the Death of Montcalm, and on the right, the most famous portrayal of the Death of Wolfe, by artist Benjamin West, who painted the scene in 1770, several years after the fact.
The Consequences of Conquest

The Treaty of Paris, which ended the Seven Years’ War, was signed on February 10, 1763, by representatives of England, France, Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands, and Prussia. There were no representatives of the Aboriginal Peoples of North America present at the signing. By the treaty, various territories in Europe shifted from the control of one country to another. In addition, the European rulers and their delegates settled the fate of colonial and Aboriginal Peoples in Canada, in many West Indian islands, in Senegal and other African colonies, and in India, Malabar, Sumatra, Bengal, and Majorca. In Canada, the French king renounced “all pretensions which he [had] heretofore formed or might have formed to Nova Scotia or Acadia in all its parts” and he ceded to the king of England “in full right, Canada, with all its dependencies, as well as the island of Cape Breton, and all the other islands and coasts in the gulph and river of St. Lawrence.” The French were left with the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon “to serve as a shelter to the French fisherman” but the islands could not be fortified nor could there be any more than fifty soldiers stationed there.16

At the bargaining table in Paris, France had decided that the sugar-rich island of Guadeloupe in the West Indies was more valuable in economic terms than was Canada. France also managed to retain fishing rights off the coast of Newfoundland, perhaps hoping to regain New France in the years to come. In the Thirteen Colonies, there was talk of rebellion against British rule. Also, there was word that the Aboriginal Peoples whose lands were being taken from them along the Ohio valley and in the Great Lakes basin were on the verge of “taking up the hatchet” against the settlers.

With the signing of the treaty by the European powers, New France became the British colony of Quebec. Military rule ended and James Murray became the first governor of the colony. Quebec was to be ruled as a British crown colony, separate from the Thirteen British Colonies to the south. In some ways, life continued as before for the French Canadians, but in other ways life changed. After the defeat, the members of the Canadian colonial militia had taken their oath of allegiance to the British sovereign and returned to their farms and towns. French Canadians would keep their religion and its institutions, including the seigneurial land-holding system. Some British military officers bought up seigneuries from departing military commanders, French government officials, and members of the French nobility. The fur trade remained intact, but French Canadians now served as guides and traders, rather than having controlling interest in the trade.

Life in Quebec under Murray and Carlton

Both of the early British governors of the colony of Quebec—first General James Murray and then his replacement Brigadier General Guy Carlton—tended to be fairly lenient toward the conquered people. They had to be concerned about the expense of running a large military establishment and they were also very aware of the discontent in the Thirteen Colonies and feared the possibility of French and/or Aboriginal uprisings. Murray and Carlton recognized that their relatively small British army was surrounded by seventy thousand French-speaking, Roman Catholic Canadians who had a well-established culture and identity in Canada.
Governors Murray and Carlton also knew the value of the Catholic Church in keeping the French Canadians under control and in offering social assistance where necessary. Most of the French-Canadian clergy counselled their people to submit to British rule, knowing that if they didn’t offer this advice they might be removed from their positions and replaced with more obedient ministers. The British governors recognized that the Catholic Church and the seigneuries also represented an aristocratic and hierarchical ideal at a time when the Thirteen Colonies were growing in their republican demands for more power.

Among the French-Canadian merchants who chose to stay in Quebec, there was hardship. Mercantilism was still the main force governing colonial economic policy. But now the mercantile power was England not France. And all of the trading alliances that the French-Canadian merchants had forged with members of the French court and merchants were no longer of any use. The few British merchants who set up shop in Quebec tended to get the best contracts and made the biggest profits. In Montreal, the British merchants also took over much of the fur trade.

The French Canadians knew about the expulsion of the Acadians and they feared the same fate. However, as Murray and then Carlton believed, they had a better chance for stability with the French Canadians than with the rebellious inhabitants of the Thirteen Colonies. Indeed, Murray told the Board of Trade in London in 1764 that the French Canadians were “the bravest and best race upon the face of the globe.” Carlton would argue later regarding the terms of the Quebec Act of 1774, that if only the people were “indulged with a few privileges which the laws of England deny to Roman Catholics at home,” they would soon “become the most faithful and most useful set of men in this American empire.”

Because of their religion, French Canadians were not allowed to vote or hold public office. In the beginning of British rule, only Protestants could be lawyers, judges, or jurors. Eventually, French-Canadian Catholics were allowed to become lawyers and to serve on juries, but they still found the British civil law code foreign to their culture and their society. Eventually, Carlton appointed twelve Canadian seigneurs to his council, so the French Canadians had at least some representation even if it wasn’t an elected one.

Meanwhile, in Atlantic Canada, some of the expelled French Acadians started to return to the region. In Nova Scotia, they found their fertile, diked farmlands taken over by New Englanders. Many of them went on to what is today New Brunswick, while others started homesteads along the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Cape Breton, and St. Pierre and Miquelon. Between the years of 1764 and 1800, the Acadian population in the British Atlantic colonies increased from a low of sixteen hundred to eight thousand. Acadia became once again a flourishing French community in Canada.

Aboriginal Peoples and the Conquest

As the historian Olive Dickason says, while the defeat of France was a “bitter blow” to French Canadians, it was a disaster for the Aboriginal nations of Quebec, of the east coast, of the Great Lakes region, and of the northwest. These peoples lost their bargaining position between the French and the English; they lost the gift distributions upon which they had come to depend, and settlers encroached farther and farther into their lands. During the century and a half that the French and the English had been battling for control of North America, the Aboriginal Peoples could form alliances or remain neutral as it best suited their interests. They could play one colonial power against the other. But with the British in control, they lost their strategic position.

The Aboriginal Peoples had not ceded their lands to the European powers. As Ojibwa chief Minwewheh told the English: “Although you have
conquered the French, you have not conquered us. We are not your slaves. These lakes, these woods, and mountains were left us by our ancestors. They are our inheritance, and we will part with them to none.”

To British Commander-in-Chief Jeffrey Amherst, however, there was no question of Aboriginal Peoples having rights to the lands that the British and French had fought so hard to conquer. As for gift distributions, Amherst saw no need to continue the practice that he considered little better than bribery. He did not agree with the Aboriginal Peoples’ view that the gifts were “the agreed-upon price” for allowing the French and the English to live on Aboriginal land. And, with the loss of guns, ammunitions, and trade goods that they had been receiving for generations, Aboriginal Peoples were in dire straits.

In the regions to the west of the Thirteen Colonies, instead of settlers being removed from the land as had been promised, they continued to move into Aboriginal territory. No matter what the British assurances to the Aboriginal Peoples, land speculators—including George Washington and Benjamin Franklin—were not going to be prevented from taking over Aboriginal lands and selling it in parcels to those who wanted to move west into what was still known as Indian territory.

**Pontiac, the War Chief**

Pontiac, an Ottawa (Odawa) war chief, had fought as an ally of the French at Montreal. As other war chiefs had done before him, Pontiac had earned his status and his right to lead war parties by past victories in battle. After the British conquest, he had tried to build trading alliances with the British, but without success. He saw his people suffering from scarcity as the gift distributions lessened and as they received less and less in trade for their furs. The Confederacy of the Seven Fires (or Seven Nations) held councils to consider what to do about their desperate situation. At these meetings of leaders from branches of the Iroquoian, Mohawk, Algonkian, Abenaki, Nippissing, Onondagas, Oneida, and Odawa nations, Pontiac emerged as a leader and a spokesman for the confederacy.

British perspectives on Pontiac varied. Major Robert Rogers, stationed at Fort Detroit during these years, said that Pontiac had “great strength of judgement and a thirst after knowledge.” Another British officer wrote of how much he was “Ador’d by all the Nations herabouts” and praised him for his integrity and humanity. Other reports were less complimentary, saying that Pontiac was “proud, vindictive, warlike, and very easily offended.”

Pontiac wanted the Aboriginal Peoples to rid themselves of their dependence on European goods and to return to their traditional way of life.

*Why do you suffer the white men to dwell among you? . . . Why do you not clothe yourselves in skins, as your ancestors did, and use the bows and arrows, and the stone-pointed lances, which they used? . . . You have bought guns, knives, kettles, and blankets, from the white men, until you can no longer do without them; and what is worse, you have drunk the poison firewater, which turns you into fools. Fling all these things away . . . as for the English . . . you must lift the hatchet against them.*

Pontiac succeeded in convincing the members of the Confederacy to make war against the English, to drive them out, and to send them back to their homeland. On May 5, 1763, he told the Grand...
Council of the Huron, Odawa, and Potawatomi peoples of his futile attempts to obtain supplies from the English, and of how the English commander only laughed at the death of his people. “If I ask anything for our sick, he refuses with the reply that he has no use for us.” Pontiac concluded that the English were seeking the ruin of all Aboriginal Peoples. Together, the assembled chiefs drew up a war plan to rid their homelands of the British.

During the summer of 1763, a war belt and hatchet were circulated among the Aboriginal Peoples of the Ohio, Great Lakes, and Northwest regions. Any French who remained in the regions encouraged the Aboriginals in their discontent. British traders were attacked, forts were taken, settlers were killed, and their homes and farms destroyed. Although Pontiac’s attack and seige on Fort Detroit was unsuccessful, nonetheless between May 16 and June 20, 1763, the Seven Nations Confederacy took nine British forts and were in control in the regions north and west of the Thirteen Colonies. The British only retained control of Fort Detroit, Fort Niagara, and Fort Pitt.

Amherst was outraged and determined to use any method—even biological warfare—to exterminate his enemy. Pontiac had warned his people about the danger of European diseases, “I warn you, that if you allow the English among you, you are dead, maladies, smallpox, and their poison will destroy you totally.” Amherst’s plan was to spread smallpox among the Aboriginal People by giving them blankets used by those who were infected with the disease. Colonel Henry Bouquet, one of his officers, put Amherst’s plan into effect. Bouquet had an infected blanket cut into small pieces and placed in small tin boxes. The boxes, which the British claimed contained medicine, were given to a delegation at Fort Pitt with instructions that they were not to be opened until the members of the delegation were back among their own people (see primary source feature in this chapter).

Pontiac signed a peace treaty with the English in 1765 in which he again stated that the French surrender to the British of their forts did not mean that the Aboriginal lands had been surrendered. Pontiac was present and spoke at the final ratification of agreements in Fort Ontario in 1766. But his influence dwindled. As the British failed to rid Aboriginal
lands of settlers and as the peoples’ sufferings increased, he was expelled from his tribe. On April 20, 1769, he was murdered by Illinois tribesmen said to have been bribed by an English trader.

The Royal Proclamation, October 7, 1763

Whereas We have taken into Our Royal Consideration the extensive and valuable Acquisitions in America, secured to our Crown by the late Definitive Treaty of Peace, . . . and being desirous that all Our loving Subjects, as well of our Kingdom as of our Colonies in America, may avail themselves with all convenient Speed, of the great Benefits and Advantages which must accrue therefrom to their Commerce, Manufactures, and Navigation, We have thought fit, with the Advice of our Privy Council, to issue this our Royal Proclamation . . . ”

The Royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763 set the boundaries and governmental policies of the colony of Quebec, along with those of East Florida, West Florida, and Grenada. The ultimate authority in the colonies would be the governors who were appointed by the English monarch, his or her council, and the British parliament and House of Lords. While the colonial governors were directed to work with elected representatives of the people, the appointed council had seniority over any elected assembly. The monarch, English government, and appointed governors were to have the power to “make, constitute, and ordain Laws, Statutes, and Ordinances for the Public Peace, Welfare, and good Government of our . . . colonies.”

The governors also had the power to settle land, which now belonged, by right of conquest, to the English king. British military offers and common soldiers were to be given land grants to encourage them to settle in Quebec. The proclamation laid out the details of these grants:

- To every Person having the Rank of a Field Officer—5000 Acres
- To every Captain—3000 Acres
- To every Subaltern or Staff Officer—2000 Acres
- To every Non-Commission Officer—200 Acres
- To every Private Man—50 Acres

Following the conflicts over Aboriginal lands during the summer of 1763, the proclamation was designed largely to counteract the fears of the Aboriginal Peoples over the loss of their lands. Although they had ultimately lost those battles, the Aboriginal Peoples had shown that they were a distinct threat to British power in North America. By drawing the boundary line west of the Appalachians, British authorities hoped to be able to continue established French alliances and keep the peace. The upper country was to be a vast Aboriginal reserve and all settlers were ordered to leave. Ownership of this land could only go to the English crown. No private individuals or land companies could hold claim to land in the region.
Royal Proclamation of 1763: Aboriginal Provisions

And whereas it is just and reasonable, and essential to our Interest, and the Security of our Colonies, that the several Nations or Tribes of Indians with whom We are connected, and who live under our Protection, should not be molested or disturbed in the Possession of such Parts of Our Dominions and Territories as, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are reserved to them, or any of them, as their Hunting Grounds — We do therefore, with the Advice of our Privy Council, declare it to be our Royal Will and Pleasure, that no Governor or Commander in Chief in any of our Colonies of Quebec, East Florida, or West Florida, do presume, upon any Pretence whatever, to grant Warrants of Survey, or pass any Patents for Lands beyond the Bounds of their respective Governments, as described in their Commissions: as also that no Governor or Commander in Chief in any of our other Colonies or Plantations in America do presume for the present, and until our further Pleasure be known, to grant Warrants of Survey, or pass Patents for any Lands beyond the Heads or Sources of any of the Rivers which fall into the Atlantic Ocean from the West and North West as aforesaid.

And We do hereby strictly forbid, on Pain of our Displeasure, all our loving Subjects from making any Purchases or Settlements whatever, or taking Possession of any of the Lands above reserved, without our especial leave and Licence for that Purpose first obtained.

And We do further strictly enjoin and require all Persons whatever who have either wilfully or inadvertently seated themselves upon any Lands within the Countries above described. or upon any other Lands which, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are still reserved to the said Indians, forthwith to remove themselves from such Settlements.

And whereas great Frauds and Abuses have been committed in purchasing Lands of the Indians, to the great Prejudice of our Interests. and to the great Dissatisfaction of the said Indians: In order, therefore, to prevent such Irregularities for the future, and to the end that the Indians may be convinced of our Justice and determined Resolution to remove all reasonable Cause of Discontent, We do, with the Advice of our Privy Council strictly enjoin and require, that no private Person do presume to make any purchase from the said Indians of any Lands reserved to the said Indians, within those parts of our Colonies where We have thought proper to allow Settlement: but that, if at any Time any of the Said Indians should be inclined to dispose of the said Lands, the same shall be Purchased only for Us, in our Name, at some public Meeting or Assembly of the said Indians, to be held for that Purpose by the Governor or Commander in Chief of our Colony respectively within which they shall lie: and in case they shall lie within the limits of any Proprietary Government, they shall be purchased only for the Use and in the name of such Proprietaries, conformable to such Directions and Instructions as We or they shall think proper to give for that Purpose: And we do, by the Advice of our Privy Council, declare and enjoin, that the Trade with the said Indians shall be free and open to all our Subjects whatever, provided that every Person who may incline to Trade with the said Indians do take out a Licence for carrying on such Trade from the Governor or Commander in Chief of any of our Colonies respectively where such Person shall reside, and also give Security to observe such Regulations as We shall at any Time think fit, by ourselves or by our Commissaries to be appointed for this Purpose, to direct and appoint for the Benefit of the said Trade...

Given at our Court at St. James’s the 7th Day of October 1763, in the Third Year of our Reign.

GOD SAVE THE KING
In the Thirteen Colonies, the proclamation was viewed as an attempt to hold back expansion westward. But, for the Aboriginal Peoples, it was recognition of their right to a share in the lands of North America. The Ohio valley, over which the French and the British had fought before and during the Seven Years War, was designated as part of the “Indian reserve” and would remain so until the Treaty of Paris of 1783, which ended the American War of Independence.

The Royal Proclamation and the Royal Commission

The 1996 Report on the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, People to People, Nation to Nation, speaks of the need to examine the past to “reveal a cache of secrets” that have been long ignored in traditional histories of Canada. As Violet Soosay of the Montana First Nation community said during the hearings related to the Commission, “History has not been written yet from the Indian point of view.” And the writers of the report explain that all Canadians need to examine their history carefully, “for its ghosts haunt us still.”

According to the 1996 report, the Royal Proclamation of 1763 was a defining document in the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in North America. The proclamation outlined the rules that were to govern British dealings with Aboriginal People, “especially in relation to the key question of land.” The Aboriginal Peoples of North America were not to be “molested or disturbed” on their lands.

King George II and his privy council had realized that it was “essential” to British interests and to the security of British colonies in North America that the Aboriginal Peoples “not be molested or disturbed in the Possession of such Parts of Our Dominions and Territories as, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are reserved to them.” Therefore no governor had the right to grant lands to settlers or land speculators within the territories reserved for the Aboriginal Peoples unless those lands were ceded or sold to the crown. In addition, the Proclamation declared that anyone who had either “willfully or inadvertently” settled on the lands reserved for the Aboriginal Peoples were “forthwith to remove themselves from such settlements.” Trade between the British colonials and Aboriginal Peoples was to continue so long as colonial traders obtained licences from the governor or commander-in-chief of the colonies and so long as they adhered to the regulations.

Review...Reflect...Respond

1. How did the Conquest change life in New France?
2. Why is the Royal Proclamation a defining moment in the relationship between Aboriginal Peoples and non-Aboriginals in North America?
3. As an Acadian who had been expelled, would you have chosen to return to your homeland or stay in the United States? Explain your decision.

Conclusion

As the 1996 Royal Commission Report says, the Royal Proclamation of 1763 “portrays Indian nations as autonomous political entities, living under the protection of the Crown but retaining their own internal political authority.” However, while the Proclamation seemed to give Aboriginal Peoples rights over their land, it also set the stage for future settlement on land claimed by the Crown. The 1996 Commission report goes on to say that the document “walks a fine line between safeguarding the rights of Aboriginal Peoples and establishing a process to permit British settlement.”
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Knowledge & Understanding

1. Identify six of the following people, concepts, and events and explain their historical significance to Canadian history and the development of its culture and identity.
   - battle strategies
   - empire
   - territorial expansion
   - military alliances
   - William Pitt
   - James Wolfe
   - the Seven Years War
   - the siege of Louisbourg
   - the Conquest
   - the Royal Proclamation of 1763

2. Create an annotated timeline of the events that affected the destiny of the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada from the beginning to the end of the French regime. In the notations on your timeline, briefly explain the significance of those events.

Thinking & Inquiry

3. Compare the policies that the British put into place in Acadia following their takeover of that French colony with the policies that they enacted in Quebec following the Conquest. What were the policies in each instance? What were the causes for the policies? What were the effects of the policies on the French Canadians?

4. Chart the chronology and investigate the relationship between Pontiac’s unsuccessful uprising and the contents of the Royal Proclamation of 1763. In your opinion, how much of an influence did Pontiac and his people have on the Proclamation?

Application

5. Imagine that you are a French-Canadian citizen of Quebec following the Conquest. Write two journal entries, the first of which is dated September 14 immediately after the French defeat at the Plains of Abraham, expressing your fears for your people and your cultural identity. Your second journal entry should be written on September 14, 1760, with your colony now under James Murray’s administration. In this second entry, relate your actual experience to your earlier fears.

Communication

6. In June 1759, General James Wolfe sent a manifesto to the people of Quebec suggesting that they could not win against the British forces and that they would be better off to surrender at once.

In this great dilemma, let the wisdom of the people of Canada shew itself; Britain stretches out a powerful yet merciful hand, faithful to her engagements, and ready to secure her in her most valuable rights and possessions; France, unable to support Canada, deserts her cause at this important crisis, and, during the whole war has assisted her with troops who have been maintained only by making the natives [Canadians] feel all the weight of grievous and lawless oppression.

You and your fellow French Canadians have read this manifesto and have met to debate the possibility of surrender. Take one side or the other in this issue and present an argument that is intended to convince those who oppose your stand. Should you fight? Do you have any chance of victory? What are likely to be the consequences if you fight and win? Or fight and lose?
Unit Two Research Activity

Research

1. The *coureurs de bois* are in many ways symbolic of New France and have added a unique flair to the image of Canada. Men such as Étienne Brûlé and Pierre Esprit Radisson are popular figures on interest for students of history at all ages. Writers such as Joseph-Charles Taché and Léo-Paul Desrosiers wrote novels centred around the life of the coureurs-des-bois. Research the reality behind the image and discover who it was that became voyageurs (as they eventually became known).

Interpretation and Analysis

2. How symbolic were the *coureurs de bois* of New France? Did they represent positive aspects of society, negative aspects of society, or both?

3. How has the meaning of *coureurs des bois* changed over the years? What did it represent in the beginning? What did it change into? What image does it create in the minds of today’s Canadian citizens?

4. How have the lives and legends of the *coureur de bois* shaped Canadian identity? Does the spirit of their adventures live on in any way today?

Applying and Communicating Your Skills

5. Write a short biography (three pages) of a *coureur de bois*. This will come largely from your imagination, but be as accurate and as reasonable as possible as you summarize his or her life. Pay attention to details of their life from birth to death, but concentrate mostly on their time as a voyageur.

6. Create a visual that shows how the image of the *coureur des bois* fits in with the Canadian identity. Is it an image that Canadians still associate with and try to replicate today? Make sure the observer will understand the ideas you are trying to get across.