

NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES SERVICE

MANUSCRIPT REPORT NUMBER 10

THE ACADIANS AT PORT-ROYAL

by

Margaret Coleman

September 1969

NATIONAL AND HISTORIC PARKS BRANCH

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

THE ACADIANS AT PORT ROYAL

MARGARET COLEMAN
SEPTEMBER, 1969

UNEDITED MANUSCRIPT
MANUSCRIPT INÉDIT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE BEGINNINGS	1
THE FRENCH PERIOD, 1671-1710	11
THE BRITISH AT ANNAPOLIS	40
WAR IN THE 1740's	63
ANNAPOLIS IN THE LATE 1740's	73
THE ACADIANS' LAST DECADE AT ANNAPOLIS	76
FOOTNOTES	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY	105

THE ACADIANS AT PORT ROYAL, 1632-1755

PART I - THE BEGINNINGS

Port Royal first saw European settlement in 1605 when De Monts and Champlain wintered on the right bank of the Basin opposite Goat Island. It was not, however, until the 1630's that any permanent colonization took place. Settlers did come under Jean de Poutrincourt in 1606, some fields were cleared and what is generally considered to be the first water-driven grist mill in North America was erected. But in 1607, De Monts' trading monopoly was revoked, and many of the colonists returned to France. In 1610 there was some revived interest in Port Royal, but in 1613 Captain Samuel Argall of Virginia raided and destroyed what settlement existed. A few barns and the mill seem to have been spared,¹ but again most of the settlers returned to France.² A few remained, but it is not known how many stayed in the country.

In 1621 Sir William Alexander became the possessor of "Nova Scotia" under a patent from James I, but no settlement occurred until 1629. In that year Alexander's son built a fort (Scotchfort or Charlesfort) and spent the winter there with 70 colonists while he sent back his ship for settlers and supplies. In May 1630 two English men-of-war sailed for Port Royal with settlers. When Alexander returned home that fall, however, he reported that 30 of the 70 colonists had died during the winter.³

By the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye of 1632 Port Royal was ceded to France and Alexander instructed Andrew Forrester, who was in command there, to prepare to abandon the colony.⁴ In December of that year Isaac de Razilly, acting for France and the Compagnie de la Nouvelle France, appeared at the fort and presented an order from the British and French Crowns to take possession. Forrester complied and the 41 Scottish settlers who wanted to return to France sailed soon after in the Saint Jean, arriving in England early in February 1633.

Isaac de Razilly's task was to begin the settlement of Acadia. In this venture he was backed by the Compagnie de la Nouvelle France and the Razilly-Cordonnier Company, a private company of Isaac de Razilly, his brother Claude de Launay de Razilly and Jean Cordonnier of Paris. It was this latter company which provided much of the financing. Preparations were made in the spring of 1632 and on July 3, three vessels containing what has often been termed "300 hommes d'élite" sailed for Acadia. They landed on September 8th at La Have and it was here that Razilly established his headquarters.

There is some question as to how many settlers Razilly actually brought out. Apparently the three ships of 1632 were outfitted at Auray and La Rochelle but there do not seem to be any passenger lists extant.⁵ Various accounts suggest that they included sailors, soldiers, workmen, craftsmen, several Capucins, a number of noblemen and twelve or fifteen families.⁶ Geneviève Massignon, who has done extensive research into the origins of the Acadians as part of her linguistic study of them,

thinks it unlikely that any actual colonists came in 1632; she suggests that those who say there were are acting under an impression created by Rameau de Saint-Père in his Une Colonie Feodale en Amérique of 1889.⁷ For one thing, it is odd, if there were 12 or 15 women in the 1632 group, that the first recorded birth in Acadia was not until that of Mathieu Martin in 1636. She has found records of two ships sent out in 1633 with men, supplies and munitions, but no colonists, and in 1634 Razilly asked for 50,000 écus from the King to use next year five ships, three for fishing and two for trade. Again colonists did not seem to have been involved.⁸ Isaac de Razilly died suddenly in December 1635. Nicholas Denys, who had come out with Razilly in 1632, wrote later that Razilly had spent a good deal of money on people for La Have and buildings for them to live in, and that at the time of his death there were about 40 residents who had already produced a quantity of wheat.⁹

It is not until 1636, however, that Geneviève Massignon was able to find any real proof of settlers going to Acadia: she found at La Rochelle a passenger list for the Saint-Jehan, sailing April 1, which included several names found in later Acadian censuses: Pierre Martin, Guillaume Trahan and Isaac Pesselin, as well as the names Burgaret and Blanchard. Some of the people who sailed in 1636 she found to have been back in France by 1637, so she assumes that they were "engagés".¹⁰ The passenger list included some carpenters and two salters to take salt from the marshlands; these had been hired by Claude de Launay de Razilly,

a fact which implies that Isaac's brother was doing the recruiting in France and that he continued to do it after Isaac died.

After Isaac de Razilly's death, Claude de Launay de Razilly became responsible for the colony. He was tied up in France, however, and delegated his authority to Charles Menou d'Aulnay who had come out as one of Isaac's lieutenants. Very soon d'Aulnay came into conflict with Charles de la Tour who was established in the Cape Sable area and who in 1635 had set up his headquarters at Fort Sainte-Marie at the mouth of the Saint John River. In 1632, the year in which Razilly was named Lieutenant of the King, La Tour had also been named Lieutenant of the King. Soon after, La Tour had visited France in order to get spheres of influence straightened out, and as a result Razilly had been given specific control over the La Hève, Port Royal and Sainte-Croix areas. As well, La Tour and d'Aulnay were to share the profits of the fur trade.

One of d'Aulnay's first acts after Razilly's death was the transfer of the settlers at La Hève to Port Royal. Several motives have been put forth for this move. The most frequently suggested is agricultural, that the land around Port Royal was more fertile and that the river was bordered by marshes which could be dyked to produce rich farmland.¹¹ Farming was indeed soon established, with the settlers being assigned lots of about 100 arpents along the river and paying for these a small rent in money and kind.¹² In a recent geographical study of Acadia, Andrew H. Clark suggests that the average frontage per settler along the river was between one-half and two miles with little depth except near

the largest areas of marshland where population was most concentrated and where frontage probably declined to a few hundred feet or less.¹³

Clark, however, disputes the suggestion that the move to Port Royal was in search of better land. He believes that the move was the result of d'Aulnay's desire to move closer to the rich fur-trade areas in the modern Maine-New Brunswick area. La Tour had established himself at the mouth of the Saint John and he believes d'Aulnay wanted to be as close as possible. To support his case, Hill suggests that the uplands at Port Royal were no more attractive and may not even have been as good as the lands at La Hève. As for the fertile marshlands, we have no record of their being farmed before the 1630's and he quotes Geneviève Massignon that the settlers had come from inland areas of France where dyking techniques would not have been used.¹⁴

There may be some validity to this last point, but a number of the 1636 settlers Massignon mentions by name did come from coastal areas like La Rochelle, Brittany and the list included some Basques.¹⁵ There may be some merit in Hill's suggestion that d'Aulnay was persuaded by the prospect of profit in the fur trade, but the agricultural motive cannot be discounted. Cultivation at least of the marshlands was very successfully carried out very soon.

It has also been suggested that d'Aulnay hoped to establish salt pans at the marshes along the river at Port Royal to avoid the necessity of bringing salt from France.¹⁶ As we have seen, two salters had been sent out on the Saint-Jehan in 1636.

Unfortunately we do not know exactly what the settlers found when they came to Port Royal. Most of the Scottish settlers had gone home after Razilly's arrival, but various scholars believe that some of these had remained. Some have suggested that the Melansons who became a prominent Acadian family were originally Scottish¹⁷, as were the Peselets or Pesely (from Paisley), the Pitres (from Peter or Peters), the Caissys or Caisses (from Kessey or Casey), and the Collesons or Coleson.¹⁸ In any case, if there were any Scottish settlers, they were absorbed into the French community and exerted no notable anglicizing influence.

It appears that there was some religious activity underway at Port Royal when the French arrived from La Hève. When Razilly came out in 1632 he brought with him six Capuchins some of whom must have established themselves almost immediately at Port Royal. According to a report written in April 1633, they had already been several weeks in their "couvent on habitation" there in December 1632 and they were busy studying Indian languages, preparing catechisms, etc.¹⁹ The Gazette de Renaudot of 19 July, 1633, quoted a letter in the Acts of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda to the effect that the Capucins occupied two buildings, one at Port Royal and one at La Hève.²⁰

In 1640 Cardinal Richelieu turned over to the Capuchins his share in the Compagnie de Razilly so that they could establish a school. Two houses were built, one adjoining the monastery for the boys and one for girls. Madame de Brice, a widow from Auxerre, arrived in Port Royal in

the summer of 1644 and taught up to thirty girls, including d'Aulnay's children.²¹ Indian children also came to these schools.

Unfortunately the period following Razilly's death is one of confusion and warring, first between d'Aulnay and La Tour, then between La Tour and d'Aulnay's creditor Le Borgne, between the French and English, and among the English through a series of claims and counter claims. No maps exist of the period and references to settlement at Port Royal only appear when it was touched by larger events. For this reason it is impossible to form any exact idea of the condition and location of the settlers before the 1680s.

We do know that under d'Aulnay the population of the colony increased; a memoir of 1644 indicates that he brought twenty families to Acadia to people the country.²² Geneviève Massignon has examined parish records in the Loudon area of France and has found that several families listed in the 1671 Acadian census came from there.²³ An account of d'Aulnay's activities written in 1688 records that besides bringing out these families d'Aulnay had built two "farms or manors" along with the necessary houses, barns and stables, and had ordered the construction of a water mill, a wind mill and a saw mill.²⁴

The church was probably located at the point indicated on the De Meulles' map of 1686, to the east of the fort. Although it was badly damaged by the English in 1654, we have no record of its having

been completely destroyed or moved until the New Englanders attack of 1690. We do know from Père Ignace that there was a choir separate from the main body of the church²⁵, and judging from a list of what the English took from the Capucins in 1654 it appears that there were two bells, one of 200 livres and one of 100 livres.²⁶ When Bishop Saint-Vallier of Quebec visited in 1686 he said no more than that the church was rather pretty.²⁷

By 1642 d'Aulnay had become the real master of the colony. On January 16 of that year Claude de Launay Razilly transferred to d'Aulnay his shares in the Compagnie de Razilly and his rights over Port Royal and La Hève. At the same time, through the help of Father Pascal de Troyes, he became administrator of the share that Richelieu had given to the Capuchins.

In 1640 d'Aulnay and La Tour had come to blows over fur trade matters and for the next few years were in constant competition with one another. In 1643, after three years in which one after the other had gained the upper hand and after d'Aulnay had tried to attack him at Fort Sainte-Marie, La Tour chased d'Aulnay back to Port Royal. La Tour's mercenaries from Boston refused to attack but he and 30 volunteers did land and attacked the mill to which d'Aulnay had retreated, burned it, wounded seven men, killed three and took one prisoner. As well they took one boat loaded with furs.²⁸ It was after this that d'Aulnay built his fort on the site of the present one. The fort consisted of four bastions with a half-moon in front.²⁹

On May 24, 1650, Charles de Menou d'Aulnay was returning from clearing a new tract of land up the river when his canoe overturned at the Rivière de L'Esturgeon, on the south side of the river about five miles east of the fort.^{29a} After being in the water about an hour and a half, he died, and the Capuchin Père Ignace had his body brought back to Port Royal. On May 25 he was buried at the chapel where one of his children had also been buried.

Peace did not come to Acadia with d'Aulnay's death, however; d'Aulnay had become greatly indebted to the merchant Emanuel Le Borgne of La Rochelle, and he was determined to collect. In 1651 he sent his agent to take possession of Port Royal and the goods belonging to Madame d'Aulnay. Madame d'Aulnay, acting through the son of Madame de Brice, sought the protection of the Duc de Vendome. In 1652, probably in retaliation, Le Borgne's men imprisoned Madame de Brice, and Fathers Côme de Mantes and Gabriel de Joinville. After being imprisoned for five months, they were returned to France.³⁰

In 1653 Le Borgne came to Port Royal himself, and in August forced Madame d'Aulnay, who by then had married her husband's rival La Tour, to sign a paper to the effect that he was still owed 206,286 livres. Armed with this he seized much of the property of the d'Aulnay heirs. In 1654, however, as Le Borgne was preparing an attack on La Tour at the Saint John, Port Royal was attacked by the English. The episode was

part of a series of attacks on various French posts including Pentagouet and Fort Sainte-Marie, in retaliation for attacks by French privateers on English ships. Le Borgne was outnumbered and on August 16 surrendered.

According to the Articles of Capitulation, the habitants were to be permitted to stay in the province in possession of their belongings, although they were to be permitted to go to France if they so desired. They were to be allowed to practice their religion and the Capuchins were permitted to stay, although if they did so their freedom of movement was to be severely restricted.³¹ The church itself suffered severe damage.³² Of the Capuchins, only Père Leonard de Chartres remained and he was put to death by the English.³³

Between 1654 and 1671 we know virtually nothing about Port Royal. In his history of Acadia Nicolas Denys wrote that after the English had become masters of the country the people living by the fort moved up the river where more marshland was drained for farming.³⁴ The inference here was that this was in order to escape British control. The geographer Clark suggests rather that it was a natural move if the system of farming the marshlands was to continue as the population grew, and there is probably a good deal of merit in the suggestion.³⁵ The next decade or so was one of conflict and fighting in Britain and New England over Acadia, and no records are available of the actual situation of Acadia.

PART II - THE FRENCH PERIOD: 1671-1710

By the Treaty of Breda of 1667 Charles II ceded Acadia to Louis XIV. The transfer, however, was delayed until the summer of 1670 by Thomas Temple, the governor of Nova Scotia, who refused to agree to the surrender. In February 1670 Hector d'Andigny de Grandfontaine was named Governor of Acadia for three years, and in July of that year the terms of the restitution were finally agreed upon in Boston. Grandfontaine's lieutenant, Pierre de Joybert de Soulanges et de Marson, officially took possession of Port Royal on September 2, 1670.

Grandfontaine, who set up his headquarters at Pentagouet, had been ordered to have a census taken of Acadia and this task he entrusted to Father Laurent Molin, a Cordelier, priest at Port Royal. This census, as well as succeeding ones, cannot be regarded as completely accurate but it is a valuable guide. It lists a total of 68 families including 63 men, 63 women, 5 widows and 227 children at Port Royal, a total of 358.¹ These possessed 829 horned cattle, 399 sheep and 417 arpents of land under cultivation. Three habitants, Fierre Melanson, Etienne Robichau and Pierre La Noue, refused to answer Molin's questions. Among the men were one surgeon, 45 farmers, 4 coopers, 1 weaver, 1 sailor, 1 mason, 1 tool-maker, 2 carpenters and one tailor. Virtually all of these also farmed. These 360 or so settlers constituted the major settlement in Acadia: the total listed for all Acadia was only 392. There was

undoubtedly the odd trader who wasn't counted but even so there were probably well under 500 people in the area between Cape Breton and the Penobscot.

In 1671 a vessel "L'Oranger" arrived in Acadia carrying 60 passengers including four girls and a woman.² What became of these we do not know exactly, but some of them were found in later censuses at Port Royal or at Beaubassin in the Isthmus of Chignecto.³

Jacques de Chambly, named Governor of Acadia in 1673, seems never to have visited Port Royal. La Vallière, responsible for Acadia after 1678, visited Port Royal soon after his appointment, for he wrote to Frontenac in 1679 that when he had been there the inhabitants had displayed no enthusiasm for taking orders from him. This he attributed either to their having been too long without a commander or too much under the British influence.⁴

It is not until about this time that we begin to get any idea at all about life at Port Royal. By 1679 we know that settlement had extended up the river as far as the present-day Granville-Bellisle area, for in that year Emmanuel Le Borgne, represented by his son Alexandre Le Borgne de Bellisle, granted Pierre Martin and his son Pierre some land in this region. The land, which they had improved, was bounded on the east by the great meadow, on the west by the brook Domanchin (this could be one of a number of brooks running into the Annapolis River), on the south side by the Dauphin River (Annapolis River) and on the north by the mountain.⁵

By the 1680s the population had grown somewhat more than the 1671 census. A Memoir of 1684 says there were 5 or 600 souls at Port Royal⁶ and one of 1686 says there were about 500 people from about 70 families spread over 5 or 6 leagues along the river.⁷

In 1686 Governor Perrot observed that there weren't many families left at Port Royal right around the fort. Most of them had moved up the river where they dyked more land and built houses. Perrot considered this farming of the marshlands to be a great evil because it made the younger people move away to find new lands. (It was in the 1680s that emigration to the marshland areas around the Minas Basin and in the Isthmus of Chignecto got underway, and the population at Port Royal did not rise in the 1680s and 90s as quickly as one might have expected.) In 1686 Perrot thought there to be 140 men capable of bearing arms at Port Royal.^{7a}

In 1686 Port Royal received two important visitors, Jacques de Meulles, Intendant of Canada, and Mgr. Saint-Vallier, Bishop of Quebec. De Meulles arrived in May on his tour of inspection of Acadia. He went about four leagues up the river to the end of the French Settlement and wrote afterwards that he thought Port Royal could become a good-sized colony because the land could support many more people and if necessary, help could be obtained from Minas and Beaubassin.⁸ While there, de Meulles had a map made and a census taken of Port Royal. The census shows about 592 people there, with about 643 horned cattle, 377 arpents of

land under cultivation and 627 sheep.⁹ The total for all Acadia was 885 people, so Port Royal was still the largest settlement. These figures do, however, represent fewer cattle, sheep and farmland than in 1671; this is difficult to explain when there were more people than in 1671.

Monseigneur de Saint-Vallier's concern in Acadia was the spiritual welfare of its population, and at Port Royal he found the people devout and the church "assez jolie."¹⁰ The priest there had written him the previous year to say that although the inhabitants were spread a long way up the river, they all came regularly to mass on Sundays and holidays, and he needed a second priest with him." Saint-Vallier complied with this request, leaving a priest at Port Royal in 1686.

From the principal clerk at Port Royal in 1685-6, Gargas, we learn more about the nature of settlement. "Although Port Royal is the largest settlement", he wrote, referring to the area right around the fort, "it contains only nine or ten dwellings, the other buildings being barns. All the houses are low, made of pieces [logs] of wood, one on top of another covered with thatch, that in which the Governor lines being the only one covered with planks....[the shores of] the River Dauphin or Port Royal could support a large number of settlers if they would cultivate the high ground.... It is of no use that the river is full of fish, for there are not three settlers who own nets. To catch the fish they make "nira guans" which are weirs 6 feet high, at the

mouths of certain brooks which empty into the river. The high tide flowing over these brings the fish, which are left high and dry on the inner side of the weir when the tide has gone out. This is their sole means of fishing."¹²

Gargas also made a detailed census of the area:

- Port Royal: (the area right around the fort)
- 1 Priest, 1 Nun, 29 French, 26 Indians and one enlisted man:
Total 56^{12a}
- 1 church, 14 houses, 1 mill, 4 wigwams, 17 cattle, 30 sheep, 6 arpents of marshland and three arpents of upland cultivated.
- Le Cap: (about half a mile from fort to the east and a little to the south of the fort)
- 50 French and 10 Indians: Total 60
- 11 houses, 2 mills, 1 wigwam, 6 horses, 75 cattle, 90 sheep, 19 arpents of marshland and three of upland cultivated.
- Beau Séjour: (doesn't appear on any maps)
- 6 French people
- 1 house, 6 cattle, 6 arpents of marshland and one of upland cultivated.
- Pointe aux Sauvages: west of Allain River on south side of basin, probably within half a mile of the Allain.
- 13 French settlers
- 3 houses, 29 cattle, 8 arpents marshland under cultivation.
- Sainte Marie: not on any map
- 13 French and one enlisted man: Total 14
- 2 houses, 30 cattle, 11 sheep, 12 arpents marshland under cultivation.

- La Pointe aux Chesnes: (on north side of Basin, half-way between Granville Ferry and Goat bland
- 34 French
- 5 Houses, 2 horses, 1 colt, 42 cattle, 70 sheep, 28 arpents of marshland and 1/2 arpents of upland cleared.
- L'ble du Pont: (doesn't appear on any map)
- 17 people
- 2 Houses, 20 cattle, 24 sheep, 12 arpents marshland and 1 upland cleared.
- L'Isle Corneille: (on north side of basin between La Pointe aux Chesnes and Granville Ferry, but closer to la Pointe aux Chesnes)
- 25 people
- 4 Houses, 23 cattle, 23 sheep, 14 arpents marshland under cultivation
- La Pointe de Paris: (on the south side of the basin, first point east of the large point on which is Annapolis)
- 12 people
- 2 Houses, 15 cattle, 22 sheep, 7 arpents marshland and 1/2 arpents of upland being farmed.
- Au d'Estroit: - narrows just west of Granville Centre, about 4 miles east of Annapolis
- 6 people
- 1 house, 5 cattle, 10 sheep, 3 arpents marshland under cultivation
- La Pré Ronde: (vicinity of present Pré Ronde Marsh and Round Hill)
- 24 people
- 2 houses, 38 cattle, 49 sheep, 19 arpents of marshland and 5 of upland cleared.
- Aux Loups Marins: (east of Round Hill, south side of river)
- 10 people
- 1 house, 6 cattle, 2 sheep, 2 arpents marshland.

- A L'Afferme: (near Bellisle Marsh, on south side of the river, opposite Belleisle Marsh where the river jogs northward)
- 21 people & 1 enlisted man
- 2 houses
- 21 cattle, 30 sheep, 21 arpents of marshland and one of upland cleared
- A Beaupré: (south side of river opposite Beaulien)
- 8 people
- 1 house, 1 mill, 13 cattle, 12 sheep, 8 arpents marshland cleared
- A la Valée de Misère: (not on any maps)
- 5 people
- 1 house, 16 cattle, 3 arpents marshland
- St. Christophe: (not on any map)
- 9 people
- 1 house, 15 cattle, 31 sheep, 6 arpents upland
- La Montagne: (north side of river, about 2 miles east of Annapolis, about opposite Pointe à Paris)
- 8 people
- 1 house, 13 cattle, 18 sheep, 4 1/2 arpents marshland and 6 of upland cleared
- La Renaudière: (north side of river, probably about at Granville Centre)
- 12 people
- 2 Houses, 12 cattle, 23 sheep, 7 arpents of marshland
- Bellisle: (present day Belleisle where there are extensive marshlands)
- 74 people
- 10 houses, 72 cattle, 122 sheep, 40 arpents marshland, 2 1/2 of upland
- La Pointe aux Chesnes: (not marked on any maps)
- 20 people
- 2 houses, 20 cattle, 20 sheep, 5 arpents marshland & 1 of upland cleared

- La Grave: (not marked on any map)
- 5 people
- 1 house, 13 cattle, 20 sheep, 4 arpents marshland and 2 upland cleared
- La Grande Marre: (not marked on maps)
- 13 people
- 3 houses, 18 cattle, 17 sheep, 8 arpents marshland cultivated
- St. Jean: (not on any maps)
- 7 people
- 1 house, 10 cattle, 9 sheep, 3 arpents marshland cultivated
- Beaulieu: (north side of river; on French maps it is marked as just east of a large island in the river; could be about where Fash Creek comes in now if the island was opposite Bridgetown; Placide Gaudet suggests it is at Upper Granville)^{12b}
- 9 people
- 1 house, 15 cattle, 16 sheep, 4 arpents of marshland and 6 of upland
- Vert Pré: (not marked on maps)
- 17 people
- 3 houses, 21 cattle, 26 sheep, 7 arpents marshland and 2 of upland cultivated
- Bout du Monde: (not marked on maps - may be "Paradis Terrestre" marked on Lalanne map of 1684, perhaps modern Paradise)
- 7 people
- 1 house, 7 cattle, 12 sheep & 4 arpents marshland, 1 1/2 arpents upland
- Total for all settlements along the river:
- 1 Priest, 1 Nun and 471 people, including the Indians
 - 78 houses, 3 mills 1 sawmill, 5 wigwams, 580 cattle, 687 sheep, 254 1/2 arpents marshland, 44 1/2 arpents upland cultivated and 8 horses.¹³

In 1687 Governor Perrot was dismissed and was replaced by Louis-Alexandre Des Friches de Menneval. When Menneval arrived at Port Royal, he was not taken with what he saw. The houses, he wrote, were wretched affairs of mud and wood. There were no workers, largely because there were no tools, and if there were to be any progress made it would be necessary to settle married workers with their tools. Carpenters, wheelwrights, joiners, sawyers, blacksmiths, nailmakers, masons, brickmakers, bakers, weavers, tailors - virtually every kind of tradesman - were needed. The habitants travelled in bark canoes or hollowed out logs, and experienced boat builders were necessary.¹⁴ That year 30 soldiers were sent out, and now in the province there were 65 at Port Royal and 25 at Fort Saint Louis at Chedabucto. The soldiers too were short of many things - arms, uniforms, adequate shelter.

When another census was taken in 1689 the results, as might be expected, were very like those of Gargas except in the matter of land under cultivation. The total number of people was down slightly to 463, probably because emigration to other settlements grew in the 1680s. There were 78 houses, 4 mills (2 water, 1 wind and 1 saw), 573 cattle, 617 sheep, 619 pigs, 7 horses, and 136 arpents of upland and 352 of marshland cultivated.¹⁵

Almost everyone with any military interest who had visited Port Royal before the turn of the century commented on the poor condition of the fort, and there are no records of anything having been done to it for several decades.¹⁶ A map of 1688 marks the fort as "fort ruiné".^{16a} In June of 1689 Vincent de Saccardy was appointed engineer to carry out new plans for the fort. These plans, drawn up by the engineer Pasquine the previous year, called for an elaborate affair enclosing the church, priest's residence, mill, garrison and governor's residence.¹⁷ Saccardy was recalled to France late in 1689 for having begun even greater plans than his instructions called for. Shortly after his return he wrote two memoirs on Acadia.¹⁸ He observed that no settlers lived in the first basin, which was too exposed, but that around the second basin 29 habitants were established. He found the Acadian habit of farming only the marshlands disturbing: the marshland could so easily provide much-needed pasture land for cattle, the inhabitants were becoming lazy, and because they wouldn't farm the uplands the young people were finding new homes in other settlements.¹⁹ Saccardy went on to discuss the fort and defend his actions, and the next spring he was sent back with a more modest plan.

On June 14, 1690, Saccardy and Joseph Robinau de Villebon, who was to become Governor, arrived in Acadia to find that the New Englanders under Sir William Phips had successfully attacked Port Royal in May.

Late in April 1690 Sir William Phips had sailed from Boston at the head of a fleet of one frigate, 2 sloops and four smaller boats. In early May they took the French posts at Penobscot and the Passamaquoddy, and with very little difficulty proceeded to Port Royal.²⁰ On 19 May (new style) the New Englanders appeared in the basin of Port Royal.²¹ The next morning Phips sent a man ashore to the house of one M. Laverdure to bring him back to question him on the French situation. After talking to Laverdure Phips sent a letter to Menneval to the effect that if he didn't surrender, Port Royal would be attacked. Menneval, who was hopelessly outnumbered, replied that he would surrender and sent M. Petit, the priest, to treat. Petit returned with verbal assurance that the English terms would be reasonably generous. The Governor, officers and men were to be maintained in their possessions and were to be returned to France while the habitants were guaranteed their property and their religion. The effects of the King and the Compagnie de la Pesche Sedentaire de l'Acadie, which had warehouses at Port Royal, were to be turned over to the English.²²

On the 21st the English came up the river and landed men near Mr. Nelson's warehouse at Port Royal²³ then drew up at the fort. Menneval formally surrendered the fort and his sword and the soldiers gave up their arms. The soldiers were then imprisoned in the church and a guard was put on Menneval's house.

During the next few days the New Englanders did a certain amount of destruction and looting. Between the time the English had first been sighted and the time of the surrender many of the inhabitants had broken into the King's storehouses and other warehouses and taken what they could. Now these habitants were warned that if they didn't give up these goods immediately, all would be burned, so they co-operated. The English record states that on the 22nd they cut down the cross from the church, pulled down the altar, broke the statues and brought their plunder, arms and ammunition to Mr. Nelson's warehouse. Even Menneval's personal money was taken from him. Everything of use found within the fort was loaded onto their ships, as well as the furs and goods of the Compagnie de la Pesche Sedentaire. The fort as well as the palisading which had been built as a start to enlarging and strengthening the fort were destroyed, the cross was burned, the church and presbytery ruined and cattle and sheep were killed.

On May 24th, before the church had been destroyed, the habitants were summoned there where they were told that unless they swore an oath of allegiance to the British Crown they would be made prisoners of war and their houses burned. Faced with this prospect, they took the oath, and then were called upon to choose five members and a president for a council. As president they chose 'Chevalier' Charles La Tourasse, a serjeant in the French garrison, and the choice was approved by Phips.

Council members were to be Mathieu des Gouttins (chief clerk at the time), Alexandre Le Borgne, M. Price du Brucil (Pierre du Breuil), René Landry and Daniel LeBlanc.²⁴

On June 3rd the English ships weighed anchor and sailed for Boston, taking with them Governor Menneval, the soldiers and the two priests, Fathers Trouvé and Petit. Phips left La Tourasse and the Council in charge at Port Royal with orders to attack any French ship or any ship belonging to their "common enemies" which came to the harbour. They were to represent British interests, refrain from supplying the Indians with any powder or shot which could be used against the English, and to send an account of their situation from time to time.

On June 14 Joseph Robinau de Villebon, accompanied by the engineer Saccardy, arrived at Port Royal to find the colony badly damaged and the Governor removed to Boston. In this situation he became the official French representative in Acadia. Des Gouttins assembled the habitants and they officially protested the oath they had taken to the British monarchs. Villebon thereupon promised to send one copy of the protest to Frontenac and another to the French court.²⁵ After consulting with Saccardy, Des Gouttins and ex-governor Perrot who was at Port Royal, Villebon decided that a British expedition which they would be unable to resist might appear and for this reason determined to move to the Saint John River and set up a provisional government at Jemseg.²⁶

Villebon left Port Royal on June 17th. Shortly after his departure two English pirate vessels appeared, burned 12 of the houses closest to the sea, 15 or 16 of those at "le Cap" and the church. A number of cattle were killed and two inhabitants hanged. The house of one of these inhabitants was burned, along with his wife and children.²⁷ The mills were apparently left standing.²⁸ After their visit to Port Royal the freebooters sailed to the mouth of the Saint John where they captured Villebon's ship with Saccardy and Perrot, but Villebon himself was not aboard at the time.

Villebon returned to France for the winter 1690-91 and on 7 April 1691 was named Governor of Acadia. Meanwhile the English had appointed Colonel Edward Tyng their governor of Acadia and in 1691 he visited Port Royal. When he found that the inhabitants would not guarantee the good behaviour of the Indians if an establishment were set up, he moved on.²⁹ In November of 1691, Villebon came to Port Royal and raised the French flag but returned to the Saint John where he made his headquarters first at Jemseg, then Nashwaak and finally Fort Saint-Jean in 1698. La Tourasse could be counted on to act in the interests of the settlers.

Villebon and La Tourasse kept in as close contact as possible, with La Tourasse to act only under Villebon's orders and to avoid any action which might arouse the suspicion of the English at Boston.³⁰ In June 1693 La Tourasse resigned his post, after his wife's death en route to Boston where she was apparently trusted and where she hoped to discover English plans for Acadia.³¹

In 1693 the Acadians at Port Royal suffered more destruction at the hands of the British. In October of that year Villebon heard that an English frigate had appeared there. The settlers had raised the English flag as protection but when they refused to board the vessel, its occupants had landed, burned 10 or 12 houses, killed some cattle and burned three barns full of unthreshed grain. According to the captain, he had been sent to see if the settlers were helping the French filibuster Baptiste.³²

In 1693 a census was taken at Port Royal. It showed 500 people (up from 463 in 1689), 955 cattle (a substantial rise since 1689), 1240 sheep (about the same as 1689), 704 pigs and 1298 arpents of cleared land, also up from 1689.³³ Five years later, in 1698, there were 575 people and 9 domestics, 993 cattle, 1136 sheep, 576 pigs, 1257 arpents under cultivation and 1766 fruit trees.³⁴

During the 1690s it appears that the settlers at Port Royal did very little trading with the French on the Saint John or anywhere, largely because they feared English reaction if they were found out.³⁵ In 1698 Villebon, under orders from Pontchartrain, formally forbade this trade,³⁶ and when he visited Port Royal in that year he found the inhabitants grumbling about this.³⁷ (1698 was a bad year for grain too).³⁸

Throughout the 1690s the capital was not at Port Royal and as a result the settlement did not receive many travellers who might have left us accounts of their visits. The descriptions we do have are not very helpful. La Mothe Cadillac in 1692 mentioned the mills, two water and one saw and reported that large planks could be made there³⁹, but his concern was mainly the physical surroundings of the area and not settlement itself. He did say that there was slate along the river Imbert (Bear River), but there is no record of its having been used.⁴⁰ Governor Villebon wrote in 1699 that Port Royal could provide good food supplies and that the settlers there supplemented their diet with codfish and other smaller fish such as bass, shad, sardines, gasparaux and place; these they caught in weirs as they swam down the smaller rivers which ran into the Port Royal Basin. In 1699 Villebon found two saw-mills and four water mills for grinding grain.⁴¹ In a memoir on the present condition of Port Royal, written at about the same time, he reported that the land produced corn, wheat, rye, peas and oats and that flax and hemp were grown and linen made. The sheep supplied good wool. He called Port Royal a "little Normandy" for apples and noted that pears, cherries, cabbages, beets, onions, carrots, chives, shallots, turnips and parsnips were also grown.⁴²

Villebon died at Fort Saint John on July 5, 1700 and was replaced by François de Brouillan as governor. Between July 1700 and Brouillan's appointment in March 1701, Sebastien de Villieu was acting governor. When Brouillan was named governor he moved the seat of government back to Port Royal and once again we hear something of life there. It

appears that the settlement had not completely recovered from the English attacks of the early 1690s. Dièreville, the French surgeon and naturalist who visited the area in 1699-1700, wrote that the site was "fair enough" but that the houses were built rather far apart and were "nothing more than Cottages, very badly constructed, with chimneys of clay."⁴³ He thought little of the church: "I asked for the Church which I had been unable to identify because it differed in no way from the other buildings; & I should have been more inclined to take it for a Barn than for the Temple of the True God." The priest's "room" was badly furnished, at one end of the church, adjoining it.⁴⁴

In fact, the church had not been rebuilt since 1690 and various buildings in the area had served for several years. Dièreville went on to say that the house he rented had formerly been used as the church. It was the largest in Port Royal and contained "three rooms, downstairs, with attics above & a cellar of masonry under the middle apartment."⁴⁵ On the "Mill River" (the Allain) which flowed into the Dauphin, there were three mills, one for wheat and two for lumber, as well as 3 or 4 houses.⁴⁶

The Baron de la Hontan, who visited Port Royal about the turn of the century, seems to agree with Dièreville that it could have borne improvement; Port Royal, he wrote, was "only a handful of Houses, two storey high, and [had] but few Inhabitants of any Note."⁴⁷

In 1701 a nun, Soeur Chausson, wrote of the desperate plight of the church at Port Royal. The building being used was in a dreadful state, the roof was straw, the walls logs and the windows paper. There was no bell and the people were called to church by the beating of a drum. There were no church ornaments, no cupboards, and the communion vessels were kept in a plain wooden box.⁴⁸

After Brouillan's arrival plans were made for the construction of a new church but they do not seem to have been realized before Acadia came into British hands in 1710. In October 1701 Brouillan wrote that the wretched church there was too close to the fort site and that M. Mandoux, the priest, was pressing for a new church and presbytery.⁴⁹ The next spring the Minister of the Marine wrote that he approved of Brouillan's decision to build a new church in a more suitable location and that the King was going to allot 1000 livres for its construction.⁵⁰ In 1703 the governor assembled the habitants to hear their views on the situation for the church, the site was decided on (though no details were reported) and the habitants promised to help by contributing materials as they were able. Brouillan then gave 100 pistoles sent by the King to the man chosen churchwarden instead of giving it to Mandoux, who wanted to go to France to buy a bell.⁵¹ (There seems to have been a running feud between Mandoux and Brouillan, who considered that the priest interfered too freely in temporal affairs.⁵²)

Brouillan recorded that the people at Port Royal subscribed 800 livres for the construction of a church, and in June 1704 the Minister wrote that the King was sending the 1000 livres.⁵³ In 1704, however, Port Royal was again victim of an attack from New England and no start was made. Brouillan went to France in the autumn of 1704 to seek help for Acadia, but died on the return voyage to Port Royal with 1200 livres for the church. His heart was buried there on October 3, 1705, at the foot of a cross which had been erected on the site where the church was to be built.⁵⁴ Still no progress was made. Bonnaventure, who was acting governor during Brouillan's absence and after his death, wrote in November 1705 that the priest had bought M. de Villieu's house and was using it as a chapel. It was very unsatisfactory, however, because it was on low ground and every time it rained it was so wet the habitants preferred to go to mass at the fort.⁵⁵ Then, late in 1707, Des Gouttins, Chief Commissary and magistrate, wrote that Villieu's house had been burned down and they were holding services at one end of one of the barracks at the fort. This too was unsatisfactory because the room was too small to accommodate everyone.⁵⁶

Meanwhile some work was being done on the fort but it was never rebuilt to a very acceptable state. As we have seen, plans were being carried out for the rebuilding of the fort when it was completely destroyed in 1690. Since then various observers had called for its

reconstruction,⁵⁷ and in April 1699 Pontchartrain wrote Villebon that it was the King's intention to do this.⁵⁸ Villebon heartily concurred in this decision. He praised Port Royal as a centre for food supplies and suggested that it could be a trading centre if warehouses were built and Port Royal fortified to protect them. It was close to Minas, also a productive source of food. He considered the old fort to be in the best location, and there was clay nearby and good places for making bricks. He made several suggestions about the design and construction of the fort and advised also that a battery of cannon be placed at the opening to the basin.⁵⁹

After Villebon's death, acting governor Villieu wrote that he was preparing to build the fort but he hardly knew where to begin because he hadn't had any detailed instructions.⁶⁰ The habitants in 1699 had provided M. Fontenu, Commissary of the Marine, with a list of what they could contribute, and now he (Villieu) intended to dismantle the fort at Nashwaak and use some of the material from there.⁶¹ When Brouillan arrived, however, and assembled the habitants to speak to them about rebuilding the fort, they replied that they considered this request for help a burden and that they would prefer to be under the English than under the control of a company like La Compagnie de la Pêche Sedentaire.⁶² According to his own account, however, he organized them and encouraged them, and also began to bring material from Fort Sainte-Jean.⁶³

Brouillan appears to have tried from the beginning to organize life at Port Royal. A market was established for every Saturday, although he was subsequently ordered to change the day so that it couldn't run into Sunday and prevent the habitants from attending mass.⁶⁴ He also organized the male population into six companies of militia, each of 26 or 27 men.⁶⁵ Meanwhile, progress on the fort was slow, and it was the subject of criticism of several observers.⁶⁶ Some work did take place, though, and in April 1704 Brouillan wrote that he hoped to have the fort almost finished by the end of the summer.⁶⁷

Before we go on to the events of 1704, however, we should take note of the census taken in 1701 by M. de Villieu.⁶⁸ At Port Royal there were now 456 souls, which actually represents a decrease since 1698. By this time the population at Minas (490) had passed that of Port Royal while that of the third major settlement, Beaubassin, was 188. At Port Royal in 1701 there were also 715 cattle (a decrease), 768 sheep (down from 1136), and 462 pigs (down from 576). A census of 1703 shows 485 souls at Port Royal,⁶⁹ and by 1707 the population was up to 566, cattle to 963, pigs to 974 and sheep to 1245.⁷⁰ It is probable that the slow growth and even drop in population at Port Royal in the 1680s and 90s can be accounted for by emigration to Minas and Beaubassin in those years.

In July 1704 Port Royal was once again visited by an expedition of New Englanders but this time almost no damage was done. In the fall of 1703 Governor Dudley of Massachusetts was making suggestions about

how to "remove that nest of pyrates so near to us" (i.e. at Port Royal).⁷¹
The next spring an expedition was outfitted from Boston under
Colonel Benjamin Church, who was instructed to use all possible means to
destroy houses and dams, to loot and to take prisoners.⁷² Early in
July the expedition divided into two with one part going to Port Royal
and the other to Minas.⁷³

Between 5 and 6 A.M. on July 2 those at the fort at Port Royal
heard shots in the distance and shortly afterwards learned that the
English had surprised the two-man guard at the entrance to the basin.⁷⁴
These they had taken prisoner along with four habitants who had been out
fishing. They had then landed about one league from the fort at Pointe
aux Chesnes on the north side of the basin and there they had taken one
woman and her children prisoner and looted the other homes. M. de Brouillan
stopped the soldiers working on the fort, sounded the alarm, and
summoned the habitants to the fort, where they had all assembled by
around noon. The rest of the day was spent preparing for a possible
attack. Reports arrived that when the English had heard canon shots from
the fort they had hastily embarked on their ships, even leaving some of
their booty behind.

On the evening of July 2nd Brouillan sent out a guard of 15 or 30
men⁷⁵ to a mill along the Allain River where the enemy might appear on
the way to the fort. There they set up two small cannon and made a small

entrenchment near the mill. A small guard of habitants was sent out and a message sent to Minas to warn the settlers there of the presence of British ships. The guard sent to the entrance to the harbour reported on the evening of the 3rd that there were anchored in the basin 10 ships, including one frigate of 50 canons and one of 24 to 30 canons.

On July 5th one Pierre Le Blanc arrived at the fort with a letter to the habitants from the English who had sent it via the woman they had taken prisoner, and whose children they now kept as hostages. The letter warned the habitants that if they surrendered within 48 hours they would be well treated but if they did not their houses, livestock and crops would be destroyed by 1300 men and 200 Indians. The women and children would be taken prisoner.⁷⁶ These numbers, 1300 and 200, represent a great exaggeration, because when the ships which had gone to Minas rejoined those at Port Royal later in the month there were only 400 men in all.⁷⁷ Brouillan sent the woman back to the British the next day to tell them that she had been ambushed by 100 soldiers, that the commander had her letter and that she hadn't seen the inhabitants. For several days the English remained in the basin while the French speeded up work and as a result did more work on the fort than they had anticipated. There was the odd shooting at scouting parties, etc., from both sides, the occasional false alarm, and the English frequently moved their ships around in the basin.

After the expedition to Minas had done a great deal of damage there it joined the other ships in Port Royal Harbour, where all the officers conferred together. According to information they had gathered, Port Royal was very strong and held a number of men much greater than their 400, so they considered it unwise to land and attack.⁷⁸ On the 19th the French saw the English raising their sails in the basin and heard canon shots. French scouts later arrived and reported that they were just firing at some French they had seen near the entrance to the bay. A detachment of 50 men sent to the mouth of Basin found no trace of the ships. On the 24th Brouillan summoned the habitants to allow them to go back to their usual pursuits. Aside from the small amount of plunder, the New Englanders took four habitants and four soldiers prisoner. Delabat observed that the worst of the episode had been that Brouillan had exhausted his supplies while he had all the soldiers and habitants working on the fortifications. But there had been one valuable result: the habitants had proved loyal to the King in a crisis, something the French officials had feared might not happen.

Despite the concentrated work on the fort during July 1704 it does not seem to have been brought to a satisfactory state. The Sieur Delabat, for instance, wrote home in December that the fort was falling apart, partly because of bad weather but largely because of Brouillan's bad administration.⁸⁰

In 1707 Port Royal was the object of two attacks from New England. Both were unsuccessful from the English point of view but a great deal more damage was inflicted than in 1704. The French had had some warning that the New Englanders did not intend to leave them in peace, when in 1705 eight French prisoners at Boston had escaped and brought word that the English there were planning an attack.⁸¹

Early in the morning of June 6, 1707, word arrived from the guard posted at the entrance to the basin that British vessels had appeared.⁸² About 11.00, M. de la Tour, who was sent to investigate, reported that there were 17 ships there, including 3 large (with 54, 40 and 18 canons) and 14 smaller ones. At noon the fleet appeared within sight of the fort and anchored behind Isle-aux-Chevres. Soon men were landed at "L'Escarboutine", the point on the south side of the basin opposite Goat Island, and just to the east of the old Scotch fort on the north. Governor Subercase summoned the inhabitants to the fort and most came in before night. During the next two or three days several parties of French were engaged in skirmishes with the British, who generally outnumbered them and forced them to retire. These episodes took place at various points between l'Escarboutine and the Allain River as the English made their way closer to the fort. Much to Subercase's distress the habitants who were sent out with the soldiers disappeared at the first signs of fighting. The English passed the River Allain south of

the fort near the mill of Louis Allain⁸³ and drew up at what was called the Lion Rampart on raised ground south of the fort and east of the Allain.⁸⁴ Subercase marched out to make an entrenchment between the English and the fort, but the enemy marched toward him with 300 or 400 men and, not trusting the habitants, Subercase retired, burning the houses near the fort as he went.⁸⁵

The next few days saw a few small encounters but mainly both sides were preparing. The English seemed to be installing themselves in a long line between the Allain River around to the east and north to the beginning of the raised ground of modern Troop Point. During this time the French saw the British burning the houses on the other side of and up the Annapolis River. On the night of June 13-14 the English came out and advanced along the marsh south of Troop Point. There they burned 9 houses on the west side of the point near the water, up to the houses of M. de Bonnaventure and Sieur Desgoutins, just north-east of the fort.⁸⁶ Subercase fired only a few shots because he anticipated a full-scale attack and wanted to save ammunition, but about 1.00 or 2.00 A.M. the English withdrew to their camp. On the night of the 14th-15th the English took stones from fences and piled them in a line to the Allain River, burning many houses, killing livestock and destroying crops as they went.

On the night of the 15th-16th of June it appeared that the English were going to attack and the French fired the fort's canons. The English retired early in the morning, proceeded to their ships and sailed away on the 18th.

After the retreat of the New Englanders a habitant reported to the Governor that the priest Gaulin and M. de Saint-Castin had appeared with 7 or 8 Indians and some men from Minas and the upper end of the river (total 30 or 35 men). These had met a party of English going up the river to burn. In the skirmish which followed 10 or 12 of the English were killed, the English retreated and the houses at the upper end of the river were unharmed. This retreat, as well as the general one on the 16th, may have been a result of a rumour Subercase started on the 8th or 9th that he was expecting 400 or 500 Indians and more than 100 habitants.

During the June episode the French had few wounded and only one or two killed, while when the French went to the deserted English camp they found 30 or 40 dead. The French had, however, suffered very great property losses at the hands of the English and the homes of many habitants and officers, including those of Bonnaventure, Des Goutins, Delabat, Falaise and Subercase, were burned.

The English were not finished with Port Royal, however, but the next time the French were well warned.⁸⁷ Before the English fleet of about 22 ships appeared in the Basin on August 20th the French had been working hard on the fortifications, the habitants had hidden their household effects and livestock so as to be in a position to harrass the enemy, and a filibuster had arrived with valuable supplies taken in

two seizures from the English. On the 20th and 21st of August Subercase called the habitants to the fort and the English landed about 1200 men, mortars, guns, and munitions across the river from the fort.⁸⁸ On the 22nd and 23rd the English moved to within a quarter of a league of the fort but because of French fire could not make more headway.

On August 24th a party of French and Indians captured an advance guard, killed 6 or 8 of them and found out as much as possible about English plans. The party to follow, which apparently consisted of 700 or 800 men, returned to camp. The French continued to fire and fires were set in the English camp; several English parties were ambushed, and on the 28th the attackers were forced to leave their quarters and return to their ships. On September 1st they sailed down into the Basin and on the 4th disappeared altogether.

The New Englanders, after two failures, were still determined to take Port Royal. On October 20, 1708, the Council and Assembly of Massachusetts Bay warned the Queen that Port Royal was a menace and a rendezvous for pirates which should be removed from French hands.⁸⁹ In 1709 the British authorities promised help in the form of money, arms and munitions and preparations were made in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire and Rhode Island. The help from Britain did not arrive until July 15, 1710, so it was not until September 18th (O.-S.) that the expedition under Col. Francis Nicholson sailed for Acadia.

On September 24, 1710, thirty six ships appeared in Port Royal Basin carrying a British regiment and 4 colonial regiments totalling 3600 men. Subercase in the French fort had less than 300 men and very few arms, and most of the habitants took to the woods when the seige began on the 25th.⁹⁰ Subercase held out as long as possible but was forced to surrender on October 16th. He departed from the fort with the full honours of war and was sent with his soldiers back to France. Peace between France and Britain did not officially come until the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 but in Acadia the war was over and Port Royal became Annapolis Royal in the Province of Nova Scotia.

PART III - THE BRITISH AT ANNAPOLIS

By the terms of the Capitulation of October 1710, the French garrison was to be sent back to France along with its guns and baggage. The inhabitants of the banlieue, a three-mile area around the fort and the only area directly mentioned in the terms, were to be permitted to stay in possession of their homes and farms. Those who wanted to move to French territory were free to do so within three years while those who stayed were to take an oath of allegiance to the British Crown.¹ Nicholson arranged for Samuel Vetch to stay as governor in what was now Annapolis Royal, with 200 British marines and 250 New Englanders to support him. Before Nicholson sailed with the remaining troops in mid-October, Nicholson and Vetch issued a proclamation to the Acadians to the effect that they were now in British territory and no communication was to take place between them and the French or Indians.²

Vetch almost immediately had a count made of the persons within the terms of the capitulation; he found 481 people, and 84 families living in that range.³ The fort itself was very delapidated. Plans for its repair had never been completed and it had suffered under the recent bombardment. When the engineer Forbes made a report in January 1711 he considered the situation almost desperate; accommodation for the garrison was woefully inadequate, all the buildings needed repairing or rebuilding, the coal, lumber and food supplies they had

brought with them would soon be exhausted, and whenever soldiers were sent out to get more lumber, they were attacked by the Indians.⁴

Vetch spent the winter of 1710-1711 in Boston where he experienced very great difficulties in getting money to pay the men and buy supplies. When he returned to Annapolis in the spring, he found that the winter there had been a very hard one. By June matters were becoming critical. Only 57 heads of families had signed the oath of allegiance.⁵ The Indians, urged on by the French, threatened work parties sent out from the fort and terrorized any Acadians who had taken the oath or who had worked for the British. The priests too threatened dire consequences for anyone who co-operated with the British. And by mid-June 116 men had been lost, mostly by death but some by desertion, and illness had further reduced the effectiveness of the garrison.⁶

The situation at the fort was precarious and although Forbes was doing his best to repair it he lacked almost everything. In mid-June he and Vetch decided to send an expedition up the river to check on habitants who were supposed to be supplying timbers. Forbes left the fort with a party of 70 men. When the lead boat reached a narrow part in the river near the mouth of what is still called Bloody Creek, it was attacked by 150 Indians who had hidden themselves along the banks. The British were surrounded. Fifteen or sixteen, including Major Forbes, were killed and the rest, including several wounded, were

taken prisoner.⁷ The problem did not diminish as summer wore on. In September the Baron de Saint-Castin, the Indian leader, wrote to the inhabitants of the banlieue of Port Royal that they exposed themselves to possible destruction if they co-operated with the British.⁸ Abbé Gaulin was also writing of ways to interfere with the British.⁹ Vetch complained to Dartmouth in September that his men couldn't even go out to cut wood because they were so often shot at or attacked by French or Indians hiding in the bush.¹⁰ Vetch's difficulties were not confined to harrassment by French and Indians. He received very little help from Britain, few instructions, and no regular provision was made for pay for the men.

The state of almost undeclared warfare in Nova Scotia continued until the establishment of peace between France and Britain in 1713. By the Treaty of Utrecht, signed April 11, 1713 (old style), France was given possession of Cape Breton but to Britain went "all Nova Scotia or Acadia, with its ancient boundaries, as also the city of Port Royal, now called Annapolis Royal, and all other things in those parts, which depend on the said lands and islands....."¹¹ Those who wanted to return to French sail were free to do so within a year, but those who stayed would be subjects of Britain and would have to take an oath of allegiance. These were also "to enjoy the free exercise of their religion, according to the usage of the church of Rome, as far as the

laws of Great Britain do allow the same." Nicholson was named governor of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia soon after the Treaty of Utrecht and came out to the province in 1714.

At the time of Nicholson's arrival it appeared that most of the province's Acadian population intended to leave. He wrote the Lords of Trade in August that he had been informed that the French at Annapolis Royal and Minas had built 40 or 50 sloops to go to Cape Breton and that several of them were leaving daily.¹² And in August of 1714 two French officers visited Annapolis as well as Cobequid (Truro) and Minas to establish how many inhabitants intended to go to Cape Breton. At that time, Père Felix Pain counted 915 in the Annapolis area, not including 22 who were fishing and 11 who were absent.¹³ This included 152 or 153 heads of families.¹⁴ Nicholson ordered the habitants to assemble to hear them and sent Paul Mascarene, an engineer and later administrator of the province, with one of the officers to notify the settlers farther up the river. When they arrived they found that it was the feast of St. Louis and the inhabitants were at mass, so Mascarene read the order in front of the church where they were assembled.¹⁵ The next day, at a meeting in front of the fort, 148 of the male inhabitants signed a document to the effect that they intended to leave the province.¹⁶

The prospect of an Acadian withdrawal from the province was alarming to the British. No British settlement had taken place, and the Acadians could at least supply food. Not only would Nova Scotia be

depopulated but it would be faced by a large French colony on its doorstep at Cape Breton. And, as Vetch observed to the Lords of Trade, one Frenchman born and raised in North America and skilled in the use of birchbark canoes and snowshoes was worth five soldiers fresh from Europe.¹⁷ But the threat of an exodus never really materialized. Several factors account for this. The terms for the departure were not clear and Nicholson felt he couldn't provide any assistance now that the year since the Treaty of Utrecht had elapsed. Vetch's prediction of the dangers such a move would raise proved influential in London so no encouragement came from that quarter. But the fault lay on both sides. When representatives of the Acadians visited Cape Breton and Ile Saint Jean (Prince Edward Island) they found both the land and the climate less attractive than that which they already enjoyed in Nova Scotia.¹⁸ In the end very few Acadians actually left the province. But when Queen Anne died in 1714 and the new King, George I, was proclaimed at Annapolis in January 1715, only 36 men were prepared to take an oath and they only if their right to emigrate with their possessions whenever they wished were admitted and if the oath only applied as long as they were in the province.¹⁹

The first description of Annapolis Royal after the British assumption of control does not come until 1715 and it is not very complete. In November of that year lieutenant-governor Caulfeild wrote that

Annapolis Royal, the "Metropolis" of the country, produced some 10,000 bushels of grain each year, mainly wheat but with some rye, oats and barley. There were about 2000 oxen and cows, 2000 sheep and 1000 hogs which, if true, would represent a respectable growth since the early 1700s. "Fourty Thousand weight" of furs had been exported from Annapolis Royal since 1710, but, since Annapolis was to be the sole port of export, this does not necessarily mean furs provided by the settlers along the river there. Caulfeild was very impressed with the harbour where, he said, thousands of ships could anchor safely in all seasons.²⁰

Between his appointment in 1715 and his death in 1717 Caulfeild struggled along with very little help from London. After his death the difficulties encountered in straightening out his affairs made it obvious to British authorities that a fresh start would have to be made and stronger stands taken if Nova Scotian affairs were not to become completely chaotic. Colonel Richard Philipps was named governor and Captain John Doucett his lieutenant.

Doucett came out to the province immediately and tried again to persuade the habitants to take an oath. He met with no more success than his predecessors: The Acadians still refused to swear any oath without an exemption from bearing arms.²¹ In addition they insisted

that if they took an oath they would be attacked by the Indians.²² Doucett believed that many habitants would sign if their priests didn't keep telling them that the reason the fort was in such poor repair was that "the Pretender [would] be soon settled in England and that this country [would] again fall into the hands of the french king."^{22a}

Philipps himself did not come out to Nova Scotia until 1720, but when he came, armed with new instructions, he was full of enthusiasm for the task at hand. He had been instructed to invite the Acadians "in the most friendly manner" to swear allegiance to the King within four months of his arrival. After taking the oath they were to "enjoy the free Exercise of their Religion, and be protected in all their Civil and Religious Rights & Liberties" as long as they behaved themselves as good subjects.²³

Philipps arrived at Annapolis in mid-April, and three days later the priest at Annapolis, Père Justinien Durand, arrived at his doorstep "at the head of one hundred & fifty lusty young men (as if he meant to appear formidable)". Philipps read the Proclamation to him and had it read it to the Acadians. Durand replied on their behalf that they were not free to swear allegiance "because that in General Nicholson's time they had sett their hands unanimously to an obligation of continuing Subjects of France & retireing to Cape Breton, and for another reason, they were sure of haveing their throats cut by the Indians whenever they became Englishmen".²⁴

On April 30 Philipps sent the proclamation up the river with orders to Durand to post it on the church door so that no-one could plead ignorance of it.²⁵ The inhabitants were to choose six deputies who would then act as go-betweens between the governor and the habitants.²⁶ On May 4th the six elected representatives appeared before the Council. Of these Alexander Robichaux, Bernard Godet, Charles Landry and Pierre Godet were acceptable to the Council, but Nicolas Gauthier and Prudent Robichaux were not, on the grounds that they did not possess enough property in the province.²⁷ When the habitants were ordered to choose two new deputies,²⁸ they refused, saying they had already elected the two best and could not choose any better.²⁹ Later in the month, however, they gave in and named Abraham Bourg and Germain Savoy as the two new representatives.³⁰ At this time they declared that they would behave as good subjects but would not take up arms against the French; Philipps observed to Secretary Craggs that if this were written into an oath, he thought they would take it. He was not, however, prepared to consider exempting them from taking up arms against the Indians.³¹ But no oath had been imposed and now Philipps was faced with another problem. He had allowed the French residents four months in which to take the oath, but, as he wrote home, he had neither orders nor sufficient power to drive them out if they refused.³²

In order to allow time for further instructions to reach him, Philipps extended the four month time limit. After this action the habitants seemed more kindly disposed towards him, and became more willing to co-operate with the British in supplying food.³³ By that fall, however, they showed no signs that they intended to either take the oath or leave the province. After considering the situation, the Governor and Council petitioned the King that it was absolutely essential that 600 men be sent to the province with a proportionate number of officers.³⁴ And this is where the matter lay when Philipps returned home in 1723.

Relations between the governor and the habitants were strained during his first spring in the province by another issue. He reported home that he had learned that "the Inhabitants of this river are hard at worke in opening a communication thro' the Woods to Minas, which was formerly a road in order to retire thither with their Cattle & Effects (as I have had the Honour to find before) & had sent to Minas that those People might do the same on their side."³⁵ Council discussed the matter on May 17,³⁶ and an order was issued to the habitants of both settlements to stop this activity.³⁷

Early in Philipps' stay, Council decided that a public storehouse should be erected at Annapolis Royal for surplus grain, a place where those who wished to buy or sell grain could do so easily.³⁸

In September 1720, the engineer Mascarene made a very detailed report on the condition of the province. It included a description of Annapolis Royal where, apart from a few traders and the British administration, the inhabitants were still French:

Annapolis Royal is seated on the Southern side of the Bay of Fundy, about thirty leagues from Cape Sables. The entry from the Bay into the British River is of a mile long, and in the widest place about half a mile broad, this entry leads into a larger Basin where a vast number of ships may safely anchor. Three leagues from the entry, and up the British river lies Goat Island; the ship channel between that and the main lies on the larboard side going up, it is narrow, but has water enough for the biggest ship, the other side of the Isle is full of shoals, and has a very narrow and difficult channel. Two leagues above Goat Island is the Fort, seated on a rising sandy ground on the South side of the River on a point formed by the British River and another small one called Jenny river. The lower Town lies along the first and is commanded by the Fort, the upper Town stretches in scattering houses a mile and half South East from the Fort on the rising ground betwixt the two rivers. From this rising ground to the banks of each river, and on the other side of the less one, lies large plats of meadow which formerly were dam'd in, and produced good grain and sweet grass, but the dykes being broke down, are over flowed at every spring tide from Goat Island to five leagues above the Fort. On both sides of the British River are a great many fine farms Inhabited by about two hundred families. The tide flows that extent, but the river is not navigable above two leagues above the Fort, by any other than small boats. The Bank of this River is very pleasant and fruitful and produces wheat, rye and other grain, pulse, garden roots, herbs and the best cabbages of any place, here abounds also cattle and fowls of all kinds and if the several good tracts of land along this river were well improved they would suffice for a much greater number of Inhabitants than there is already.

The chief employment of the French Inhabitants now farming and the time they have to spare they employ in hunting, and catching of Sable Martins. Their young men who have not much work at farming beget themselves to Fishing in the summer. The Fort is almost a regular square, has four Bastions, and on the side fronting the Point, which is formed by the junction of the two Rivers, it has a ravelin and a battery of large guns on the counterscarpe of the ravelin, which last with the battery, have been entirely neglected since the English had possession of this place and are entirely ruined. The works are raised with a sandy earth and were faced with sods, which being cut out of a sandy soil (the whole neck betwixt the two rivers being nothing else) soon mouldered away, and some part of the works needed repairing almost every spring. The French constantly repaired it after the same manner except part of the courtin, covered with the Ravelin, which they were obliged to face with pieces of timber some time before they quitted possession of this place. The English followed that last method in repairing of this Fort, reverting of it all round with pieces of round timber, of six or seven inches diameter, to the height of the Cordon, and raising a parapet of sod work, but whether by neglect of the workman, or those who had the overseeing of them, or their little thrift in carrying on these repairs, or some other reason, they put the Government to a prodigious deal of charge, and gave an entire disgust for any manner of repairs. Thus the fort laid for a great while tumbling down, till at the arrival of Governor Philipps, the orders from his Majesty signified by him to the French Inhabitants not pleasing them they shewed some forwardness to disturb the peace and to incite the Indians to some mischief, which made it necessary to put the fort into a posture of defence against the insults which might be offered to the Garrison which is too small of itself to encounter so great a number, as even the Inhabitants of this River, might make against it, they being able to arm and assemble four hundred men, in twenty four hours time. It is therefore humbly proposed in relation to this place, that till the Inhabitants are more loyal, two hundred men of regular Troops may remain garrisoned here, and that whilst a new projection for the fortifying of this place shall be agreed and carried, this fort may be next summer, thoroughly repaired, the sum demanded for these repairs, not exceeding eight hundred pounds sterling, by which this place will be put in a condition to last the time requisite for providing of materials, and building a stone redoubt &c., and may serve to secure the materials, and workmen, which otherwise will be much in danger. This project will be more particularly transmitted this fall to the Honorable Board of Ordnance.³⁹

The early 1720s was a period of undeclared warfare with the Indians, during which several attacks were made on British property. Most of the warring took place at Canso and up the Bay of Fundy, however, and the inhabitants of Annapolis do not appear to have been greatly affected by it. In September 1723 Prudent Robichaux of Annapolis was suspected of supplying Indians, but because of insufficient evidence he was warned and released.⁴⁰ In May 1725 he was found guilty and put in prison for entertaining Indians in his house.⁴¹ In 1724 two British soldiers were killed and several were wounded during an attack made on the garrison by 50 or 60 Indians. Doucett, still Lieutenant-Governor, suspected French connivance and had several Acadian houses burned. Père Charlemagne Cuvier, who had replaced Justinien Durand in 1720, was sent to Louisbourg.⁴² Cuvier was now replaced by M. Charles de Breslay.

A major source of concern for the British during this period was the houses in the "lower town", the area Mascarene had described along the Annapolis River above the fort. Many of these had been vacated because of fear of the Indians, and now they provided good hiding places for attacking Indians.⁴³ These empty houses, it appears, had been occupied by the British and not the Acadians. In any case on July 20, 1724 Council ordered that they be torn down.⁴⁴

In 1725 Captain John Doucett was succeeded as Lieutenant Governor by Major Laurence Armstrong. Armstrong had previously been in the

province but he was in England at the time of his appointment and did not arrive in Annapolis until September 1726.

Almost immediately he addressed himself to the problem of the oath. On September 21st he summoned the deputies and gave them a copy of the oath he wanted sworn. They were then instructed to convey this to the habitants and to have them assembled before the fort four days later.⁴⁵ On September 25th Armstrong met with the local inhabitants "at the fflag Bastion". They were reminded of all the advantages they would enjoy as British subjects and a French translation of the oath was read. It was to be a complete loyalty oath which no threats or promises or "hopes of Absolution from any in Holy Orders" should cause them to violate. But despite Armstrong's protests that a Roman Catholic could not serve in the army, several inhabitants insisted on a specific exemption from bearing arms. The Lieutenant-Governor, with the advice of the Council, thereupon "Granted the Same to be writt upon y^e Margent of the french Translation in order to gett them over by Degrees."⁴⁶ This addition was not made on the copy of the oath sent to England, so it never was officially approved, but it represented the beginning of the Acadian claim to neutrality.⁴⁷ Attempts to impose an oath at Minas and Beaubassin were unsuccessful.

In September 1727, with word of the death of George I and the accession of George II, Armstrong was presented with another opportunity to try to impose an oath. On September 16 the inhabitants met with Armstrong and the Council but refused to take any oath without an exemption from bearing arms and a guarantee of a sufficient number of priests. This time Council termed their remarks "insolent" and four deputies, Abraham Bourg, Charles Landry, Guillaume Bourgeois and Francis Richards were imprisoned.⁴⁸ When the Council considered the case further the next day it held that because of their having assembled the inhabitants in a riotous manner and for "framing a Rebellious Paper" that Bourg should be expelled from the Province and the other three put in irons.⁴⁹ Francis Richards was subsequently released⁵⁰ on the grounds that it had not been he who had assembled the habitants and that when he had refused to take the oath he had been made drunk by those who wanted him to act that way.⁵¹

By 1729 Governor Philipps felt that the situation in Nova Scotia again warranted his presence there in an effort to straighten affairs out. Accordingly he arrived at Canso in June, spent the summer there, and proceeded to Annapolis in mid-November. On November 20th his commission was read to the Lieutenant-Governor, the Council, the Garrison and the inhabitants.⁵² The following day he announced to Council that he had appointed new deputies for the Annapolis River, that

he had increased their number from four to eight, and that he had chosen those most inclined to His Majesty's Service.⁵³

One of Governor Philipps' first acts was to re-establish M. de Breslay in the parish at Annapolis. This priest had apparently protested on behalf of his people against Armstrong's behaviour. Armstrong had declared that he was notoriously insolent and that he was "assuming to himself the authority of a judge in Civil Affairs and Employing his Spiritual Censures to force them to a submission." When the Lieutenant-Governor had sent his adjutant to speak to him, de Breslay had not been home. As Armstrong saw it, he was out stirring up the Indians "pursuing his former practices of obstructing H.M. service and exciting the savages to mischief." To stop this, Armstrong had thereupon ordered him out of the province.⁵⁴ When Philipps arrived, the inhabitants had been without church services for fourteen months while Breslay had been hiding in the woods, and now, in an effort to create good will, the Governor restored him to his parish.⁵⁵

Philipps' gesture was successful and the inhabitants in fact volunteered to take an oath.⁵⁶ As a result the Governor was able to write home in January that all the males above 16 at Annapolis had taken an unqualified oath without his having had "to make use of threats or compulsion" or even "prostitute" the King's name!⁵⁷ The oath, signed by 194 persons and witnessed by Breslay, ran as follows:

"Je promet et Jure en Foi de Chrétien que Je serai entirement Fidelle, et Obeirais Vrayement sa Majesté Le Roy George Le Second, que je Reconnaiss pour le Souverain Seigneur de la Nouvelle Ecosse et l'Acadie."⁵⁸

When Philipps had been out in the province in the early 1720s he had expressed the opinion that a new system of land tenure should be adopted and the vestiges of the old seigneurial system removed. The latter had never really operated effectively in Acadia but the memory of it was considered a link with the French. In 1729 when he returned to the Province Philipps determined to bind the inhabitants to the Crown not just by an oath but also by their property holdings in a system of new grants from the King.⁵⁹ This naturally involved disposing of any remaining seigneurial claims. On December 24, 1730, Philipps ordered the inhabitants of Annapolis to bring all deeds or claims to the secretary's office to be confirmed "Inasmuch as no other tenure will be allowed valid."⁶⁰ When the authorities in London considered the problem they found only one claim worth entertaining, that of Agathe de la Tour. Agathe de la Tour, who had married and outlived two British officers at Annapolis, received £2000 in March 1733 for her somewhat vague claim, and the Crown became Grand Seigneur in the province.⁶¹ In fact in January of that year it had been declared that the inhabitants

of Annapolis should pay quit rents to the British Crown as tokens of their holding land from it as their "only and Supreme Seignior."⁶²

Now the dreadful problem had arisen of who owned what land. Few records other than memory were available. If no proof could be produced that the land had been granted in French times, it became Crown land and its occupants declared squatters. And frequently, as the population had increased, many young people had settled on ungranted unused land. In many cases Council was forced to accept the situation as it was because it did not have the strength to alter it. It was not until July 20, 1733, that George Mitchell was ordered to undertake a survey.⁶³ One or two inhabitants of each village were to help, and residents were to plant stakes at boundaries. The resulting map seems, however, to have been disappointingly general.⁶⁴

Under the new system of land tenure, local Acadians were to serve as rent-gatherers. This arrangement never worked very efficiently, for two reasons. First, the vast majority of the Acadians were illiterate so the possible number of choices was severely limited, and second, the problem of who to charge for what land was never satisfactorily cleared up. These rent-gatherers were also responsible for registering titles, sales, exchanges, mills, mortgages, marriage settlements, etc.⁶⁵

Along the Annapolis River there seem to have been several rent-collectors to serve the various small communities, and the rent seems to have consisted largely of grain, fowl, game and a small amount of money.⁶⁶ Prudent Robichaux collected rent in the area close to the fort; when he turned in 20 3/4 bushels of wheat, 30 capons, 1 chicken, 2 partridges and some money in January, 1740, he declared that this had been the eighth year he had acted as rent-gatherer.⁶⁷

By the 1730s the bulk of the Acadian population along the Annapolis River had moved away from the immediate neighbourhood of the fort. Council minutes and letter-books of the period made frequent references to land sales and grants near the fort, and these almost invariably involved British officials rather than Acadians.⁶⁸

It appears that in the 1730s there was a church for the French somewhere in the vicinity of the fort, although it does not seem to have been marked on any available map. As we have seen there was a chapel up the river in 1716.⁶⁹ In 1731, however, the priest Gaulin at Annapolis seems to have been spending most of his time on the lower part of the river. In November of that year the inhabitants of the upper part of the river petitioned that he be permitted to spend half his time with them. Armstrong replied that Gaulin would be permitted to go there only every third Sunday and that he (Armstrong) should be kept informed of all his movements.⁷⁰ On December 9 of the next year

the inhabitants again petitioned that the priest be allowed to work half-time up the river or that the church be moved up the river where it would be more easily accessible to a larger number of people, particularly old people and children. Armstrong would consider no change. There was normally only one church to each parish, he said, so how could they legitimately demand more? He had found the church where it had been built by the French (which implies that it was still an old house being used as a church or that a new one, of which we have no record, had been built between late 1707 and 1710), and he would not allow it to be moved without orders from Britain. Nor could the priest's place of residence be changed.⁷¹ And there matters seem to have rested for two and a half years.

In June of 1735 word reached Armstrong that the inhabitants of Annapolis had established a second "Masshouse" and in effect divided the parish into two. He summoned the deputies to explain.⁷² The matter seems to have been dropped, however, until 1736 when the Council was considering what it considered the insolent and unsatisfactory behaviour of Fathers de St. Poncy and de Chevreux. De Poncy, who had come to Annapolis in 1732,⁷³ was ordered to leave the province. Council declared that henceforth mass must be said only at Annapolis. The minutes tell the story; Council decided that

"there should be no more Mass said up the River, that the Mass House there should be Demolished & one Built here to which they might all resort⁷⁴ As an Eternal Monument of their said Treachery. The Inhabitants, No doubt through the Advice & Instigation of their said Independent Priests, had repaired or rebuilt One up the River which they had Adorned & Made much finer than this One here below, And that it was Reported that Mass was Said up the River at that House as frequently as at this; And as thereby they showed their Contempt of & Disobedience of the Govern^t if they had done any such thing without Permission; It was therefore Motioned as a thing Worthy the Consideration of the Board."

When Armstrong heard of these developments he ordered that it be further investigated and that in the meantime the church doors be nailed up.⁷⁶

On June 8, when the question was further discussed, Council decided to summon the deputies.⁷⁷ By the time they appeared on June 12th Armstrong had directed the Council to have the inhabitants dismantle the church up the river and bring down the timber to enlarge that in the Lower Town. The enlarged church would then serve as their only meeting place. The deputies now insisted that the building was not a real church although their priests did conduct services there when they were up the river. In fact, they said, the house was so old and rotten that it was not worth removing its walls and the Host was never left in it. Nevertheless the British ordered them never to use any church except that in the Lower Town. They then promised to comply with these orders and to nail up the chapel doors.⁷⁸

The inhabitants were for some time without a priest. De Foncy was expelled but returned on the orders of St. Ovide at Louisbourg. Again Council ordered him out at the earliest opportunity.⁷⁹ He had not yet left on November 10 when the inhabitants petitioned that he be allowed to stay the winter because they had no other priest.⁸⁰ On December 4 Council allowed de Poncy to say mass but only at the designated point in the Lower Town at Annapolis Royal.⁸¹

Another source of tension during the 1730's was roads. As we have seen Philipps in 1720 had ordered the habitants to stop building a road to Minas, but some communication between the two places was apparently maintained. In 1730 the route between the two places was described as a cart road.⁸² In May 1731 Philipps ordered the inhabitants to complete the road⁸³ but the order was not followed. Each habitant seems to have been responsible for the part of the road passing through his territory. As late as 1734 Armstrong was complaining that the road was being "obstructed by some of the Inhabitants who have opposed passing through their Ground to the great prejudice of the Service thereby Intended, by cutting off through their unreasonable obstinacy, even all Communication between one Village to Another, unless through long round about unknown & almost impracticable paths."⁸⁴ The deputies were summoned and ordered to see that the road was completed "from the nethermost to the uppermost Houses on both sides of this River of

Annapolis Royall; & to make and draw it through any up Land or low ground in as direct and streight a line as the nature & situation of the ground will admit of." Mr. George Mitchell was ordered to supervise this activity on the north side of the river and Lieutenant Amherst on the south.⁸⁶ Delays persisted, however, and in January 1738 Armstrong again complained that the road had not been kept up. The inhabitants were ordered to repair it, on penalty of 20 shillings per head. The deputies were to inspect the roads two or three times a year.⁸⁷

More orders for road construction came in 1740. According to the report of two, John Eason and John Hargrave, the old road passing through René Barnabe's marsh (which seems to have been about where Hazelwood Brook runs into the Annapolis River) was impracticable; a new one running along the edge of the wood could be built and maintained at very little expense. Council therefore ordered Pierre Blanchard, deputy for Bellisle, to order the inhabitants in his area to help in this affair "as had been Practised in such Like Cases."⁸⁸ In June of the same year the deputies were similarly ordered to have the road repaired between "the Cape" south-east of the fort to the shore. Mascarene, then acting Governor, ruled that this was a public highway used by everyone, so everyone must contribute material, labour, carriage, or payment.⁸⁹ And in October the residents of the south side of the river were ordered to join in

building a bridge over "Sawmill Creek" which appears to have run into
the Annapolis River from the south side across from the Bellisle Marsh.⁹⁰

PART IV - WAR IN THE 1740s

While the 1720s and 1730s may have seen tension between the habitants and the British at Annapolis, it was a quiet period militarily. In 1739 war was declared between Spain and Britain and in 1740 war broke out in Europe over the question of the Austrian succession. In that year in Nova Scotia Paul Mascarene became Acting Governor of the province following Armstrong's suicide in late 1739. For four years Britain and France hovered on the brink of the war which was declared in the spring of 1744. Mascarene in the meantime seemed quite content with the behaviour of the inhabitants; in 1742 he reported to the Duke of Newcastle that the rumours of war hadn't made "any alteration in the Temper of the Inhabitants of this Province who [appeared] in a good disposition of keeping to their oaths of fidelity, and of submitting to the orders and regulations of this Government for maintaining Peace, except in the matter of settling themselves on the unappropriated lands...."¹

The prospect of war nevertheless was an alarming one for Mascarene. In December of 1743 he wrote the Lords of Trade that the fort being built "of a sandy nature" it was likely to fall down in heavy rain or spring thaws.² In addition there was a shortage of men in the garrison. Mascarene's comments on the town at this time show that it had become British:

"the Town which consists of two Streets, the one extending along the River side & the other along the Neck of Land, the Extremitys whereof are at a Quarter of a mile Distance from the Fort, has no Defence against a Surprize from the Indians. The materials [for repairing the fort] & the Artificers are lodged there, as well as several Familys belonging to the Garrison, who for Want of Conveniency in the Fort, are obliged also to quarter there."³

In March 1744 the French declared war on Britain and in April Britain reciprocated. The French at Louisbourg heard of the outbreak before the news reached Annapolis, and they took the initiative in a successful surprise attack on Canso in May. When word reached the British in May the seventy women and children in and around the fort were sent home.⁴ The fort was in deplorable condition and Mascarene prevailed upon the chief engineer to speed up repairs; in this he had the assistance of the habitants who seemed willing enough to supply labour and timber.⁵ And even after the Canso attack Mascarene wrote the Lords of Trade that the French inhabitants of Annapolis had assured him that they would remain loyal, and that they were continuing to work on the fort.⁶

On July 1, after killing two men who were out in the garden, about 300 Indians attacked the fort. British cannon fire forced them back as they hid among stables and barns at the foot of the glacis, and they moved toward the Lower Town, about a quarter of a mile from the fort.

There, as they set fire to some houses, a blockhouse which had been erected near them was threatened.⁷ A detachment sent out to help pulled down garden fences and burned any houses close to the blockhouse which were providing cover for the enemy. Mascarene also had a group of "hovels" near the glacis pulled down for the same reason. When the detachment which had been sent out returned to the fort, the men were in high spirits and wanted to return to tear down the houses within half musket shot. Mascarene couldn't hold them back and the enemy was forced to retreat about a mile from the fort along the edge of the woods. From then until the 4th, when reinforcements arrived from Massachusetts, they came out in small parties but did little damage other than stealing some cattle and sheep.⁸

After the attack Mascarene wrote that the inhabitants had not actively supported the Indians and continued to give "new assurances" of their loyalty. This meant, in effect, that they would not help the enemy or the British, for since the attack not one of them had helped on the work on the fort although they had done so right up until July 1.⁹

In August, 1744, Duvinier, the French officer at Canso, left Louisbourg with about 200 officers and men and later in the month met up with a large number of Indians.¹⁰ Early in September, after making preparations at Minas, the expedition appeared at the head of the Annapolis River. Duvinier set up camp at Bellair, a little more than

a mile from the fort, and stayed there over three weeks, harrassing the British and trying to make them surrender without a full-scale battle. During this time the French made many demands on the Acadians for items such as pickaxes, shovels and ladders,¹¹ cattle,¹² sheep,¹³ and clothing.¹⁴ On the 23rd the inhabitants of the upper river were ordered to bring grain to the mill of Claude Thibeau and Charles Martin at Pré Ronde to be ground, and then to bake it into bread and bring it to the French camp.¹⁵ The extent of Acadian co-operation is not known. The Acadians themselves later showed Mascarene the orders they had received & said they had been threatened with death if they disobeyed; they assured him, however, that despite Duvinier's entreaties they had refused to take up arms.¹⁶

Meanwhile, soon after his arrival, Duvinier sent his brother to treat with Mascarene. He was, he said, expecting 250 men as well as three warships; the British could not hope to withstand this, so he suggested that a truce be declared and terms of surrender decided upon. These would not, however, be finalized until the arrival of the French reinforcements.¹⁷ Mascarene refused to entertain these proposals, saying he would consider what to do when the time came. Yet he was alarmed. On September 20th (old style) he wrote the Lords of Trade that despite the arrival of two more groups of reinforcements since July he was still short of men. Many of the garrison were unfit for

duty and everyone was short of arms. He feared that Duvinier might stay the winter, as he had threatened to do, thus forcing them to surrender because of lack of provisions.¹⁸ Not only this, but many of officers favoured accepting Duvinier's proposals to avoid the possible humiliation of being made prisoners of war.¹⁹ Although they put great pressure on him to agree, Mascarene refused and eventually convinced the officers that Duvinier's aim as much as anything was to create division among the British.²⁰ Negotiations were broken off, to the apparent pleasure of the men who reacted to the news "by three cheerfull Huzzas." The French continued their nightly attacks, harrassment and skermishing. Finally a ship from Massachusetts arrived with 50 Indians. Duvinier decamped and made his way back towards Minas. When the three French ships arrived a few days later they found that the land forces had retreated and withdrew too.²¹

Almost immediately after the French withdrawal the deputies from the Annapolis River appeared before Mascarene with tales of how they had refused to take up arms. They were reminded of their "remissness" in the past and were warned to behave in the future.²²

On December 21 the deputies of Annapolis presented a petition to be relieved of their duty of providing pilots and guides against the enemy. When Council discussed the petition it decided that no exemption could be made, although the inhabitants were assured that they would not be forced to serve on New England ships.²³

During the winter of 1744-45 more work was done on the fort.

Mascarene wrote in March that he

"had also prevail'd with the Deputies of the Inhabitants of this River to furnish the Engineer the materials requisite for our Repairs att the stated price, which the seem'd to undertake and perform chearfully, and tho' the season was farr advanc'd when the Ennemy totally left us, two Bastions [had] almost entirely been revested before the winter sett in...."²⁴

In January 1745 an expedition of 100 Canadians and Indians was sent from Canada under the Sieur Paul Marin de la Malgue to either give assistance at Louisbourg or go to Annapolis. At Beaubassin, in April, he received orders to proceed to the latter place.²⁵ The British there knew nothing of the expedition until May 1 when the French were within one hours' marching time of the fort.²⁶ On May 4th, after surprising a small party of rangers, they appeared near the fort.²⁷ Again several Lower Town houses which could have afforded protection to the invaders were torn down, this time after careful consideration and after possibilities for compensation had been discussed.²⁸ But after three weeks of somewhat feeble activity, Marin was called to Louisbourg, then under attack by a large New England expedition. On May 23rd, therefore, the French broke up camp at Annapolis and marched along the river on their way to Minas.²⁹

On May 25th, the eight Annapolis deputies were called before the Council. Asked about the Canadians' behaviour towards them, they replied "that the enemy coming in the night sent men to every house whilst they were buried in sleep and threatened to put to death that [sic] should stir out or come near the fort, that they had been ordered to furnish weekly a certain quantity of cattle to bring their carts and teams the orders being most of them on pain of death."³⁰

In June 1746 an expedition of 600 troops under the Sieur de Ramezay left Quebec to be ready for action at either the Isthmus of Chignecto or Annapolis. From France was coming a huge naval armada including about half the navy to help the Canadians retake Louisbourg and perhaps attack Boston. In July the expedition reached Beaubassin where it was decided that the whole detachment should march on Annapolis. On August 20, de Ramezay, then at Minas, was ordered back to Quebec and on September 1 left for Beaubassin. There, on the 17th, as he was about to leave for Quebec, he heard that the French armada was arriving and decided to return to Minas. On October 8th he arrived at Grand Pré.

Meanwhile at Annapolis Mascarene had heard that de Ramezay and 1600 Canadians had taken up quarters at Minas and were awaiting the arrival of the French fleet. Right away he had sent to Governor Shirley of Massachusetts for help.³¹ The Acadian inhabitants, when they heard that the French were arriving, disappeared from the fort where they had been

working.³² On October 10th (N.S.) the expedition of about 300 men and a small number of Indians set out from Minas, and on the 13th de Ramezay called together the deputies of the head of the Annapolis River. These were ordered to furnish them with supplies and to cut off all contact with the British.³³

On October 14th about 250 French left their camp and, marching in single file to make themselves appear more numerous, came to camp near Belair, about two miles from the fort. There they hoisted a flag on a tree, called "Vive le Roy" and began making fortifications, keeping a careful eye on Mascarene's activities all the while. The latter marched his men out of the fort but returned them to the Fort before the French had decided on their next move. About 2 P.M. a habitant came to de Ramezay and reported that he had been at the fort and that the British intended to come and attack that night. De Ramezay reconsidered his position; there had appeared to him to be about 800 soldiers marching earlier in the day, and the French could not hope to defend themselves against that number. The decision was made to move back.³⁴

The next morning, the 15th, de Ramezay found a new camp site, about four miles from the fort yet still close enough to observe British movements. It was better located, too, from the point of view of cutting any communication to the British and drawing on the habitants for supplies.³⁵ As a British observer remarked, the camp was well situated

for the French because it was "in a Place so Situated that it was impossible to Check them there being no way but passing a Bridge where out one Single Person could go abreast."³⁶ When Mascarene saw that the French had gone, he sent out a 150-man party to scout. On their return they burned several houses and barns in the "Cape" because their owners had run from them when they went out. For several days, while the French were plagued by cold, hunger and sickness, no large confrontation but only a few skirmishes took place.³⁷ Mascarene's men managed to capture two inhabitants who told them exactly who the invaders were and that they were expecting great help from the French armada, even though sickness had considerably reduced its numbers.³⁸ The Lieutenant Governor, after consultation, decided to work harder at enlargements of the fort; including workmen he had 1100 men at his disposal.

By the beginning of November life in the Canadian camp was becoming desperate. Now, on the 3rd, de Ramezay heard that the French fleet had run into a terrible storm the day after it had left Chebucto (Halifax) harbour for Annapolis. Badly dispersed and knocked about and still struggling against adverse winds, the officers had decided to turn back. According to the Canadian diarist this news sent the Acadians into a great rage; now not only would they be exposed to the fury of the British but all their supplies had been consumed with no benefit of them.³⁹ On November 3rd and 4th the 60 Canadian sick were transported in boats to the head of the river, and on the 4th French scouts reported

that reinforcements had reached Mascarene from Boston. De Ramezay had no alternative but retreat. On the 5th the main body of the troops left Annapolis around mid-day after he had tried to arrange with the deputies for some compensation for food, etc. On the 8th de Ramezay arrived at Minas and on the 22nd departed for Beaubassin.

Again the extent of Acadian co-operation with the French is not unknown. The only official actions taken were against Nicholas Gauthier of the Cape who was found guilty of dealing with the enemy and against Paul Doucett and Charles Pelerin who had gone over to the enemy. The goods of all three were confiscated.⁴⁰

With de Ramezay's retreat, French attempts to recapture Annapolis Royal ended forever. Much military activity would take place in the next decade around Minas and particularly in the Isthmus of Chignecto but never again would Annapolis be directly attacked.

PART V - ANNAPOLIS IN THE LATE 1740s

This is a good opportunity to pause in the narrative of events at Annapolis to see what Annapolis was like in the late 1740s. Otis Little, who described the province in 1749, considered the Basin there a "most delightful Harbour." The fort was well situated for repulsing attacks by water but badly located in case of land attacks. About the French inhabitants he says only that the families were spread over thirty miles along the River, and because they were so close to the Garrison, they were the only "tractable" people in the province.¹

The surveyor Charles Morris left the most complete description available:

"Annapolis River rises from the Hills that lye Southwest from the Village of Minas, its general Course is nearly WSW about 70 English Miles, receiving into its Channels the several little Rivulets which fall from the two Ranges of Hills on its north and South, it emptys it self into the Bason of the same name, and both into the Bay of Fundy thro a Passage of about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a Mile wide, Commonly Call'd the Gut. Goat Island lyes in the mouth of the River, and divides it from the Bason; it has two Channels the one on its north Side; This is the Common ship Channell it is narrow and deep Large Ships ought to have a leading Gale of Wind going in and coming out; in going in they are lyable to be carried on by the Tide on a Mud bank, which Runs SW from Goar Island; but the Winds being generally SW that is seldom wanted, in coming out with the little wind the Chester was driven a ground by the Tide on Goat Island, tho' she had some Boats a Stead; The Bason is about nine miles in Length and $\frac{1}{2}$ Miles in Width; there is good Anchorage in the Channell of the Bason which is a Mile Wide in most places and thro' the whole Length from 5 to 10 fathoms Low Water and the River of Annapolis is a safe Harbour; and good anchorage generally about 5 or 6

fathom Low Water from Goat Island to the Fort which is 5 miles. The south Channell is Rocky and no Vessells attempts to pass that way; this River is navigable for small vessels about eighteen Miles above the Fort, beyond Y^e the Bottom at Low Water is intollerably Rocky and foul but the Tides flow to the falls more miles further and so far Large Boats on the Tide may go on this River is the Fort of Annapolis. The Inhabitants are settled on this River on both sides from Goat Island near thirty miles into the Country, in small Parcels then or fifteen Familys together where the Soil is good and where they have marshes to raise their bread & Corn on Bell Isle is the most considerable Village, where about thirty Familys are settled within the Compass of two Miles. Twelve Miles from the Fort up this River is the Chief Church of this Parish where the Priest Commonly resides, there are several Chappels of ease for the Convenience of the Inhabitants. these People are more in subjection to the English Government than the other districts on account of its Vicinity to the Fort² they are in Number two Hundred Familys."

This reference to the church is interesting. As we have seen, in the 1730s the Acadians were ordered not to use the chapel up the river from the fort and the priest was ordered to say mass only at the church nearby. A memoir of the 1740s indicates that the new church was built fairly close to the fort in what was called the Lower Town and that its priest, M. Desenclaves, served 2000 communicants who lived for twelve leagues along both sides of the river.³ The church and priests' house were burned during one of the French attacks during the 1740s; in February 1749 M. Desenclaves and the inhabitants of Annapolis petitioned for a new one. According to the petition, the presbytery, right

alongside the church, was new, and much of the church had been newly repaired. Both structures had been filled with furniture and in addition two smaller buildings had been lost. One of these had been used for wood and one for fowl. The court had contained wood for fuel for the next winter and the garden had been destroyed. The inhabitants claimed that the British Crown should reimburse them for these losses.⁴ Mascarene wrote in a covering letter that the church had been burned in the first attack on the fort when it had been necessary to destroy any buildings which could provide protection for the enemy.⁵

PART VI - THE ACADIANS' LAST DECADE AT ANNAPOLIS

Shortly after the French retreat to Minas Mascarene had sent to Massachusetts for more troops and soon afterward heard from Governor Shirley that they were on their way.¹ Early in December 400 "New England" and 150 "New Hampshire" troops arrived and more were expected daily. Many of these Mascarene decided to send to Minas to winter there in order to establish British authority and deal with those who had been known to deal with the French. Early in December the main party of about 500 men left and smaller detachments followed.

On January 8th an Acadian messenger appeared before de Ramezay at Beaubassin with word of these events. Seeing his chance, de Ramezay sent off some of his own forces and their Indian allies. After a difficult journey overland in the dead of winter, the expedition attacked the British as they slept. The surprise was complete, and after a day and a half of fighting a truce was called. Shortly thereafter the British, who had outnumbered their attackers, capitulated and withdrew to Annapolis. The general population at Minas had not joined in the fight, and in fact the French were only able to stay about a week after the British had gone because of a shortage of provisions.

Even if the mass of the inhabitants hadn't joined with the French when they invaded the province, the presence of a large alien population in the province was naturally a source of uneasiness to the British.

Mascarene had written in 1746 that "As soon as the Enemy appears, we have no more [Acadian] assistance nor even can procure any Intelligence by their means."² The "Battle of Grand Pré" and the fact that the Canadians were wintering at Beaubassin served to demonstrate how precarious British control of the province really was and for the next two or three years Mascarene and his mentor, Governor Shirley of Massachusetts, were actively campaigning for more help for the province and for forts at centres like Minas and Chignecto.³ At the same time the necessity to improve the fort at Annapolis was constantly urged.⁴

From time to time since 1710 the suggestion had been made that the deportation of the Acadians might be the solution to the problem they posed. This proposal had always been rejected, however, and usually on grounds of expense. Now the idea of bringing British settlers to live near or among the Acadians began to appear an attractive alternative. Governor Shirley, the principal exponent of this idea, felt that the presence of the British could not help but have a beneficial effect on their Acadian neighbours. Since 1746 he had employed Capt. Charles Morris to survey the province and now he sent him to investigate suitable areas for British settlement.

In his Report, Morris suggested that six settlements could be made around Annapolis, four around the Minas Basin and nine around the Cumberland Basin in the Isthmus of Chignecto. The first area he suggested at Annapolis was on the west side of the Basin well south of Digby. Here,

14 miles from the fort, there were no French farmers and the land could support 180 families. The second area he suggested was on the north shore around "Scotch Fort." Here he thought 40 families could be accommodated, although the Acadians occupied the best marshlands. But these he thought could be divided between them and the new settlers "in Equal Lotts." Between this area and that north of the fort there was also a "considerable Quantity of Marsh undyk'd" where 40 families might be situated. Eighty settlers could also be established between the fort and "Moose River" (?), west of the fort. There, about 1 1/2 miles from the fort, there were two undyked marshlands. The last two settlements would be up the River six miles from the fort.⁵

The pleas of Mascarene and Shirley that the defences of the province should be strengthened and that British Protestant settlers should be brought in finally had some effect. In 1748 the situation had become more urgent with the return of Louisbourg to France by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. Now the French seemed secure in Canada, Ile Saint Jean and Ile Royale and Annapolis, the only British centre in the province, provided no counterbalance. When a new governor, Colonel the Honourable Edward Cornwallis, came out to the province in the summer of 1749, he brought with him instructions to establish settlers at Minas, La Have, Whitehead (near Canso), Halifax and Baye Verte.

Cornwallis' arrival and the establishment of the capital at Halifax spelled the end of Annapolis as an important political centre. The

proposed new settlements, which other than Halifax did not materialize, were all except Minas on the Atlantic coast where they could conceivably be of some strategic use. From 1750 to 1755 the French were busy establishing themselves at Fort Beauséjour which they were building on the north west side of the Missaguash River in the Isthmus of Chignecto. British eyes were naturally turned in that direction and Annapolis, far from the scene of the action, became an outpost.

On July 14, 1749, the new Council under Cornwallis was sworn in. The same day the new Governor issued a proclamation reminding the Acadians of the King's kindness in allowing them peaceable possession of their lands and freedom to practise their religion. Up until now this good will had not been returned, but His Majesty would be willing to continue to provide it if they took an unqualified oath of allegiance within three months.⁶ On that occasion there were present only the deputies from the Minas area; these were given copies of the King's declaration and were told to return to their people and notify the deputies of the other settlements to appear at Halifax as soon as possible.⁷

On July 31st the deputies from the various settlements, including Alexander Hebert and Joseph Dugas from Annapolis appeared as requested. When they declared that they wanted assurances that they would be allowed to practise their religion freely and would be exempted from bearing arms, the deputies were assured that although the first point

constituted no problem, the second would not be granted.⁸ On August 1st the deputies met again with Council and were warned that failure to take the oath would mean leaving the province and forfeiting all property. They were then sent home with a warning that they would have to take the oath before October 15/26 or leave the Province.⁹ Mascarene reported to the Governor from Annapolis that he thought most of the Acadians would refuse the oath: "Several in this River are very wavering but dare not separate themselves from the herd who in general are influenc'd by the fear of their posterity becoming att last Protestants & the natural inclination they have for the French interest preferable to the English."¹⁰

Cornwallis, however, was no more successful than his predecessors in imposing an unqualified oath on the Acadians. On September 6 the deputies appeared to say that they would only sign the oath Governor Philipps had given them two decades before, i.e. that exempting them from any duty to bear arms. The Governor couldn't accept this, and October 15/26 came and went without the signing of any oath. But Cornwallis did not force them to emigrate because of the lateness of the season, and there the matter rested.

In May of 1750 representatives from the Annapolis River presented a petition for leave to retire from the province.¹¹ The deputies of Minas had petitioned in April, and on May 25th the answer came. First the inhabitants of Annapolis were reprimanded for sending the petition by way of representatives other than deputies. And then they were all told that

the British had done everything in their power to make the province an attractive place for the Acadians to stay. They had been allowed to continue in their religion and to remain in possession of the best lands in the province; the fact that they wanted to leave was astonishing! If the Acadians were permitted to leave the province without passports during that unsettled time, great confusion would result. These passports would be provided when "peace and tranquillity" returned to the province and not before.¹² It seems that now, when the French were becoming so solidly entrenched at Beauséjour, the British were anxious not to provide them with any more strength than they already had.

The safety of the province had always been a problem, and on July 23, 1749, Cornwallis wrote home that it would be necessary to demonstrate to the Acadians that the British were able "to master them or protect them." As part of this policy two companies were to be sent to Minas to erect a barrack and spend the winter.¹³ As a result when Mascarene, on August 21, returned to Annapolis from greeting Cornwallis he bore instructions to send 100 men with a blockhouse and provisions and supplies for the winter.¹⁴ It took some time to organize the expedition; although Mascarene was back at Annapolis on August 24th it was not until mid-September that the detachment left.¹⁵

The early 1750s were a very quiet period at Annapolis. In July 1751 Mascarene left the province. The capital was now at Halifax, and, although troops were maintained there, Annapolis had been relegated to the position of an outpost.¹⁶

In fact the early 1750's were quiet militarily throughout the province. However by the fall of 1754 plans were underway in Halifax and Boston to remove the French military for once and for all from the Isthmus of Chignecto. In January, Governor Lawrence of Nova Scotia and Shirley, now Commander-in-Chief of all British forces in North America decided that the next spring would be the strategic time to strike. A force of 2000 men was raised to serve under Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Monckton. Leaving Boston on May 23rd it arrived on June 2nd in the Isthmus where, after a 10-day siege, the French at Fort Beausejour surrendered.

Early in the spring, as a precautionary measure, the inhabitants of the Minas area had been prohibited to travel by boat or canoe, and in June the British had removed all their firearms from them. This latter step the residents considered intolerable and on June 10 they petitioned for return of their arms. On July 3rd, after the surrender of Beausejour, the Governor and Council met to discuss the situation. They and fifteen Acadians went over the petition, which the Council termed audacious and impertinent.¹⁷ The petition had stated that possession of arms would not determine a man's fidelity but that this was a matter for his conscience. At this point Council informed the deputies that a "very fair Opportunity" had now presented itself for the inhabitants to take the unqualified oath.¹⁸ The Acadians replied that they "were not come prepared to resolve the Council on that head" and refused to take any unqualified oath without consulting the general population. The next day they had not changed their minds and Council resolved that orders should be sent to the various settlements to

send new deputies. It also decided of the Acadians "that none of them should for the future be admitted to Take it after having once refused so to do, but that effectual Measures ought to be taken to remove all such Recusants out of the Province."¹⁹ The deputies were called in, and although they now offered to take the oath it was rejected because they had before refused. They were ordered into confinement and taken to George's Island.²⁰

The thought of expulsion had crossed Lawrence's mind before. In January 1755 he had directed Monckton not to give the "revolted" inhabitants of the Isthmus of Chignecto any opportunity to take the oath because such an oath would tie their hands should they want to deport them.²¹ Lawrence's attitude seems to have been hardened by the discovery of about 300 Acadians in Fort Beausejour after the capitulation and by July 13th he was writing to Monckton that all the Acadians who had crossed the Missaguash River to what the French had declared to be their property should be removed from the Province as soon as he had made all possible use of them.²² By the end of July this sentence had been extended to all the Acadians.

On July 25, 30 representatives from Annapolis appeared at Halifax where they declared that while in the past they had co-operated well with the British and had helped work on the fort, etc., they were not prepared to take a new oath.²³ They were warned that once having refused to take the oath they would not be allowed another chance, and were given until Monday the 28th at 10.00 P.M. to reconsider the situation.

On Monday the 28th the deputies from Minas, River Canard, Pisequid and Annapolis all refused to take the oath and were thereupon thrown into prison.

Council minutes continue the story:

"As it had been determined to send all the French Inhabitants out of the Province if they refused to Take the Oaths, nothing now remained to be considered but what measures should be taken to send them away, and where they should be sent to.

After mature Consideration, it was unanimously Agreed that to prevent as much as possible their Attempting to return and molest the Settlers that may be set down on their Lands, it would be most proper to send them to be distributed amongst the several Colonies on the Continent, and that a sufficient Number of Vessels should be hired with all possible Expedition for that purpose."²⁴

Action followed quickly on the decision. Those in the Isthmus of Chignecto were to be the first to go, followed by those of Minas and Annapolis. Lieutenant Colonel John Winslow was assigned to organize the deportation at Minas. Sending Winslow his instructions, Lawrence wrote "When you have Executed the Business of Shipping Oft all that Can be Collected of the Inhabitants in the Districts about Mines Bason you will March your Self or Send a Strong Detachment to Annapolis Royal to Assist Major Handfield in Shipping oft those of that River, And you will So Order it as all the Straglers that May be Met with by the way May be taken up and Carried to Annapolis in Order to their Being Shipped with the Reste."²⁵

On September 5th all the male inhabitants of Minas were summoned to the church where they were informed that they were now prisoners and would

be shipped off as soon as possible. Delays occurred while transports were found and it was not until mid-October that the main body of the Acadians there sailed and not until mid-December that the task had been completed.

On September 11th Lawrence sent the Minas and Annapolis deputies who had been in prison at Halifax to Winslow so that they could be shipped off with their families.²⁶ On the 19th Winslow sent those from Annapolis along to Major John Handfield, commander of HM forces at Annapolis. Escorting the 27 deputies were 2 serjeants, 1 corporal and 35 privates; these were directed to collect any men they found en route and order the women and children to follow with provisions.²⁷

On September 23rd this detachment under Lieutenant Peabody arrived at Annapolis. Because Winslow was short of men Handfield sent them back although this time, after complaining of sore feet and bad roads, they went by transport.²⁸ To speed up the process at Minas Lawrence had ordered Handfield to send to him all the transports he had, and it was in one of these seven ships that the soldiers travelled.²⁹

After the main body of the population at Minas had sailed in mid-October Winslow arranged for a detachment of 8 Privates, 2 Captains and 4 subaltern officers to go to Annapolis.³⁰ On November 3rd, Captain Adams was ordered to march.³¹ By December 8th Adams could report to Winslow that he had embarked 1664 inhabitants on board and that they had sailed. The 251 men, 263 women, 539 boys and 611 girls were on board seven ships

heading for Boston (1), Connecticut (2) New York (1), North Carolina (1) and South Carolina (2).³² It is generally believed that about 300 of the Inhabitants of the head of the river had managed to escape into the woods.

As at the other settlements the buildings at Annapolis seem to have been destroyed. Captain John Knox recorded in 1757 that as one approached the fort from the river one could see the ruins of farms and extensive orchards of apple and pear trees heavy with fruit. And on further reconnoitering expeditions up the river he observed more ruins.³³

1755 saw the end of Acadian settlement around Annapolis Royal. In the 1760's Protestant English-speaking settlers began to move in, and, although some Acadians made their way back to the province, Annapolis was never again a centre of Acadian population.

FOOTNOTES

PART I - THE ACADIANS AT PORT ROYAL, 1632-1755

- 1 Ryder, Huia, "Jean de Pontrincourt" Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol. 1, p. 98.
- 2 A description was published in W.A. Calneck and W.A. Savary's History of the County of Annapolis of the remains of this French activity visible in the 1890's:
"The first mill was built on the easternmost mouth of the Lequille, Allain R. where it discharges its waters fresh from Grand Lake into the tideway at the head of the marsh. The remains of the old dam are plainly visible today, having been composed of stones and earth, and may be viewed by walking a few rods down the stream from Dargie's mills. The structure, it will be seen, stood at the foot of a steep hill of considerable elevation, and the visitor, if he choose to climb to the summit of that portion of it which is in the north-western direction from the dam, will be rewarded by seeing the remains of the works once erected by the French settlers for the defence of the mill in case of attack. The remains of the breastworks, which formed a shelter to their musketeers, may be traced many rods, in an irregular curve, from where the chief battery was fixed, in a north and westerly direction, following the summits of the heights; and the ditch which was made in excavating the material to form this work is still visible in many places. The main battery commanded the head of the marsh so as to render an attack by way of the river by boats both dangerous and difficult. It also covered the mill, and commanded the high lands on the opposite side of the stream. These remains are well worthy the notice of tourists, and should be better known to our own people." (p. 15) It should be noted that fighting took place around the mill on later occasions, particularly in the early 1700's, and any remains should be considered with this in mind.
- 3 Harvey, D.C., "Sir William Alexander," DCB, I, p. 53.
- 4 MacBeath, George "Andrew Forrester," DCB, I, p. 310-11.
- 5 Massignon, Geneviève, Les Parlers Français d'Acadie, p. 32.
- 6 MacBeath, George "Isaac de Razilly," DCB I, p. 568. Arsenault, Bona, History of the Acadians, p. 21. Clark, A.H. Acadia The Geography of Early Nova Scotia to 1760, p. 94-5, etc.
- 7 Massignon, op. cit., p. 32.
- 8 Ibid., p. 32.

- 9 Ganong, W.F. (ed.), Nicholas Denys: The Description and Natural History of the coasts of North America, p. 98, 146.
- 10 Massignon, op. cit., p. 33.
- 11 Arsenault, op. cit., p. 25; Candide de Nant, Pages Glorieuses de l'Épopée Canadienne, p. 162; Bernard, A., Le Drame Acadien depuis 1604, p. 67, Lauvrière, La Tragédie d'un Peuple, vol. 1, p. 78.
- 12 Bernard, op. cit., p. 73; Candide de Nant, op. cit., p. 163.
- 13 Clark, op. cit., p. 134.
- 14 Ibid., p. 95-96.
- 15 Massignon, op. cit., p. 33.
- 16 Baudry, René, "Charles Menou d'Aulnay," DCB, I, p. 503.
- 17 Cormier, Clément, "Charles Melanson," DCB, I, p. 499-50.
- 18 Clark, op. cit., p. 101, Lauvrière, op. cit., I, p. 63, Bernard, op. cit., p. 69.
- 19 Candide de Nant, op. cit., p. 137.
- 20 Albéric, Maurice, "Les Capucins en Acadie," La Nouvelle France, vol. XIV, 1915, p. 343.
- 21 Baudry, René, "Madame de Brice," DCB, I, p. 129.
- 22 MG7, 9821 (Margry Collection), fol. 104, p. 199.
- 23 Massignon, op. cit., p. 35-37.
- 24 Certificat de Michel Bondrot, 1687, quoted in Candide de Nant, op. cit., p. 227 and Lauvrière, op. cit., I, p. 78.
- 25 Collection de manuscrits relatifs à la Nouvelle-France, I, p. 138.
- 26 Public Archives of Canada (hereafter cited as PAC), MG 7, Bibl. Nat. Tr., 17871, fol. 190, quoted completely in Candide de Nant, op. cit., p. 328-330.
- 27 Têtu, Mgr. Henri (ed.) Mandements, lettres pastorales et circulaires des Evêques de Québec, vol. 1, part 2, p. 218.

- 28 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 1-2, 20 October 1643, Testimony of Recollet Fathers re attack in August 1643, reprinted in Candide de Nant, op. cit., p. 315, under title "Testimony of Capuchin Fathers...." See also biography of D'Aulnay, DCB, I, p. 504.
- 29 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, vol. 2-1, p. 39, Relation de la province d'Accadie, 1686, Perrot; Letter of Père Ignace, Collection de Manuscrits Relatifs à la Nouvelle-France, p. 137-139, and Candide de Nant, op. cit., p. 326-8).
- 29a This appears on the modern Topographical map 21 A/14 west half to be north east of Mochelle, just south of the narrow stretch of the river.
- 30 Père Ignace, "Brève Relation de la mission d'Accadie...1656," PAC Report, 1904, Appendix H, p. 340-341.
- 31 Articles of Capitulation, Collection de Manuscrits... vol. 1, p. 145-149.
- 32 List of what the Capuchins lost to the English in 1654, PAC, MG 7, Bibl. Nat. Fr., 17871, fol. 190, reprinted in Candide de Nant, op. cit., p. 328-330.
- 33 Dumas, G.-M., "Léonard de Chartres," DCB, I, p. 468-9; letter of Père Ignace, 1656, PAC Report, 1904, Appendix H, p. 337.
- 34 Ganong, op. cit., p. 123.
- 35 Clark, op. cit., p. 108.

PART II - THE FRENCH PERIOD: 1671-1710

- 1 PAC, MG 1, G 22, vol. 466, part 1, p. 3-13, reprinted in PAC Report, 1905, part 2, Appendix A, p. 1ff.
- 2 Letter of Grandfontaine to ?, quoted in Rameau de Saint-Père, Une Colonie Féodale en Amérique, vol. II, p. 316.
- 3 Massignon, op. cit., p. 40.
- 4 Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec, vol. 7, 1926-27, p. 111, Frontenac to King, 6 November, 1679.
- 5 Quoted in Murdoch, Beamish, A History of Nova Scotia, vol. 1, p. 157, and in Rameau de Saint-Père, op. cit., II, p. 318.

- 6 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 1-2, p. 398, Unsigned Memoir, 1684.
- 7 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 2-1, p. 4, Le Sieur Bauregard, 1686.
- 7a PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 2-1, p. 39-40.
- 8 See Morse, W.I. (ed.) Acadiensia Nova, I, p. 110, "Voyage of Monsieur de Meulles to Acadia," and PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 2-1, p. 119 Report of De Meulles on Port Royal.
- 9 PAC, MG 1, G 22, vol. 466, part 1, p. 57.
- 10 Têtu, op. cit., p. 218.
- 11 Ibid., p. 219.
- 12 Morse, op. cit., vol. I, p. 177-178.
- 12b See Doughty A.G. (ed.), Capt. John Knox, An Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America, map at end of volume 1.
- 13 Morse, op. cit., I, p. 144-159.
- 14 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, vol. 2-1, p. 186-188.
- 15 PAC, MG 1, G 22, vol. 466, part 1, p. 58-59.
- 16 Menneval, loc. cit., PAC, MG 2, B³, vol. 55, folio 458, 1688, De. Lagny.
- 16a See map at PAC, HL/240, Annapolis Royal, N.D. [1688], M.
- 17 Le Blanc, E. "Vincent de Saccardy," DCB, vol. 1, p. 586 and PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 2-1, p. 314, Saccardy to Minister, 3 Jan. 1690.
- 18 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 2-1, p. 309-11, Saccardy to Minister, and same to same, quoted in Morse, op. cit., I, p. 203ff.
- 19 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 2-1, p. 309-11, Saccardy to Ministre, 3 Jan. 1690.
- 20 "Journal of the Expedition under Sir William Phipps against Port Royal, 1690," PAC Report, 1912, Appendix E, p. 54 ff.
- 21 "Relation de la prise du Port Royal par les habitans de Boston et de Selan Commandez par Vuillam Philps, le 21 May, 1690, PAC, MG 1, 24, ~~56~~ 56, Carton 2, part 1, p. 1, reprinted in PAC Report, 1912, Appendix F, p. 67 ff.

- 22 See also p. 474-5, "Narrative of the most remarkable occurrences in Canada," 1689, 1690," in Brodhead and O'Callaghan (eds.) Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York.
- 23 Trade with New England had continued after 1670: see Memoir of 1684, PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 2-1, p. 79-80 which reported that while the New Englanders traded at Port Royal and indeed had two large storehouses there, the French were not permitted to trade as Boston.
- 24 For the summons, oath and orders to the Council see PAC Report, 1912, Appendix E, p. 58-62.
- 25 PAC Report, 1912, Appendix F, p. 71.
- 26 Webster, J.C. (ed.), Acadia at the End of the Seventeenth Century, Villebon to Marquis of Chevre, President of the Trading Company of Acadia, 1690, p. 24.
- 27 PAC Report, 1912, Appendix F, p. 73, and Villebon's account in Webster, op. cit., p. 27.
- 28 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 2-2, p. 393, Memoir on the present state of Acadia and the means of preserving it, M. de Chevre, 5 Feb. 1691.
- 29 Fergusson, C.B., "Edward Tyng," DCB, I, p. 654 and Fergusson, C.B., "Charles La Tourasse," DCB, I, p. 426.
- 30 Webster, op. cit., p. 45.
- 31 Ibid., p. 46, 47.
- 32 Ibid., p. 53-54.
- 33 PAC, MG 1, G 22, vol. 466, pt. 1, p. 79.
- 34 Ibid., p. 133.
- 35 Webster, op. cit., p. 155, 148, 141, "Report of What I Have Seen Since My Arrival Upon the Shores of Acadia, up to September 30, 1695," M. Tibierge of the Compagnie de la Pesche Sedentaire, also PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, vol. 3-2, p. 300, 302, Letter of Villebon, 16 October, 1698.
- 36 Collection de Manuscrits, II, p. 296, Pontchartrain to Villebon, 26 March 1698.
- 37 Webster, op. cit., p. 116.
- 38 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 3-2, p. 355, letter of M. de la Cosle, 1698.
- 39 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, vol. 10, p. 23.

- 40 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 10, p. 63-64.
- 41 Webster, op. cit., p. 133-134.
- 42 Ibid., p. 128.
- 43 Webster, J.C. (ed.), Diereville: Relation of the Voyage to Port Royal in Acadia or New France, p. 82.
- 44 Ibid., p. 83.
- 45 Ibid., p. 84.
- 46 Ibid., p. 46.
- 47 Thwaites, Reuben Gold, ed., Baron de La Hontan: New Voyages to North America, vol. 1, p. 331.
- 48 Letter of Soeur Chausson, Congregation des Filles de la Croix, 27 Oct. 1701, printed in Faillow, M., Memoires Particuliers pour servir à l'histoire de l'église de l'Amérique du Nord, vol. 2,
- 49 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 4-1, p. 139, Memoire pour accompagner la lettre de M. de Brouillan du 6 Octobre 1701.
- 50 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 4-2, p. 323, Minister to Brouillan, 19 March 1702.
- 51 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 4-2, p. 405-6, Brouillan to Minister, 21 October 1703.
- 52 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 4-2, p. 399 ff., Brouillan to Minister, 21 October 1703.
- 53 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 5, p. 19, Minister to Brouillan, 4 June 1704.
- 54 Bernard, op. cit., p. 226. For the site of the burial of Brouillan's heart see Delabot's map of 1710, no. 42.
- 55 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 6, p. 199, Bonnaventure to Minister, 30 November 1705.
- 56 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 6, p. 26, M^r des Gouttins to the Minister, 23 December 1707, and p. 299 ff., Governor Subercase to Minister, 20 December 1707. For the location of the house burned in 1707 see no. 38 on Delabot's map of 1710.
- 57 i.e. PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 3-2, p. 548, M. de Cherry; ibid., p. 553, Sieur de Fontenu; C¹¹D, vol. 4-1, p. 10, Unsigned Memoir.
- 58 Collection de Manuscrits, II, p. 316, Pontchartrain to Villebon, 15 April 1699.

- 59 Webster, Acadia at the End of the Seventeenth Century, Villebon's Memoir on Port Royal, p. 128 ff.
- 60 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 4-1, p. 37, Villien to Minister, 20 October 1700.
- 61 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 4-1, p. 30, 31, same to same, 29 September 1700.
- 62 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 4-1, p. 135-6, Brouillan to Minister, 6 October 1701.
- 63 Collection de Manuscrits, II, p. 385, Letter of Brouillan, 30 October 1701.
- 64 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 4-2, p. 316, Minister to Brouillan, 19 March, 1702.
- 65 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 4-1, p. 135, Brouillan to Minister, 6 October 1701; C¹¹D, 4-2, p. 317, Minister to Brouillan, 19 March, 1702, & Delabat (Royal Engineer) to Monsieur de Villermont, 20 November 1703, in Morse, op. cit., p. 2.
- 66 See comments of Royal Engineer Delabat, PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 4-2, p. 339, Labot to Minister, 30 October 1702.
- 67 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 5, p. 3, Brouillan to Minister, 15 April 1704.
- 68 PAC, MG 1, G 22, vol. 466 pt. 1, p. 169.
- 69 PAC, MG 1, G 22, vol. 466, pt. 1, p. 207-210.
- 70 Ibid., p. 225-31.
- 71 PAC, MG 11, CO 5, vol. 863, no. 66, p. 177-8, Dudley to Board of Trade, 19 December 1703.
- 72 Church, Thomas, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676....., p. 255.
- 73 See accounts by M. Delabat , in Collection de Manuscrits, II, p. 416 ff, and 2 unsigned memoirs in PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 5, p. 5 ff, and MG 1, 24, Depot des Fortifications des Colonies, Carton no. 1, pièce no. 24.
- 74 The guard at the entrance to the harbour usually consisted of one habitant and two soldiers. Brouillan on this occasion had let the habitant go, with the result that there were only two soldiers.
- 75 Collection de Manuscrits, II, p. 418 and PAC, MG 1, 24, Carton no 1, pièce 24, July 3.

- 76 This letter is printed in Collection de Manuscrits, II, p. 419, 420 & dated June 24, 1704 (old style).
- 77 Church, op. cit., p. 280-81.
- 78 Ibid., p. 280-281.
- 79 Collection de Manuscrits, II, p. 424-5.
- 80 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 5, p. 73-4 ff, Delabat to Minister, 12 December 1704.
- 81 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 5, p. 171, Bonnaventure to Minister, 30 November 1705.
- 82 For accounts of the June 1707 attack see PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 6, p. 44-68, Extracts of letter of M. de Subercase to Minister, 26 June 1707; Collection de Manuscrits, II, p. 464 ff, and Delabat's account, 6 July 1707, Collection de Manuscrits, II, p. 477 ff.
- 83 See no. 16 on map on Delabat's map, 1710, and "t" on map of "la Banliene du fort Royal a lacadie et de Ses Environs," PAC Map Division Number H9/239.
- 84 See no. 42 on Delabat's map and "r" on H9/239. This seems to be at the point where there is a (1) on modern topographical map 21A/12E.
- 85 See H9/239 for exact location of burned houses.
- 86 See "B" and "F" on H9/239.
- 87 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 6, p. 21, Subercase to Minister, 7 July 1707 and 8th page of MG 1, 24, Carton 2, part 1, (no pages given), "Relation de ce qui cest Passée au Port Royal, a l'occasion des anglois qui y sonts retournés pour Lattaquer une seconde fois au mois d'acoust, 1707."
- 88 See Delabat's map of 1710 and H9/239.
- 89 PAC, MG 11, CO 5, vol. 865, no. 16, p. 26-7.
- 90 Nova Scotia Historical Society (hereafter cited NSHS), vol. 1, p. 34, "Journal of Colonel Nicholson at the Capture of Annapolis."

PART III - THE BRITISH AT ANNAPOLIS

- 1 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 3, p. 15-16, Articles of Capitulation, 2 October 1701 (O.S.).

- 2 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 3, p. 25-6, Proclamation by Nicholson and Vetch to Inhabitants, Oct. 12, 1710; See also Waller, G.M. Samuel Vetch, Colonial Enterpriser, p. 186-9.
- 3 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 3, p. 45-8, Rolle des Habitans de la bans Lieux du fort du Port Royal Speciffie famille par famille du 25 8^{bre} 1710.
- 4 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 3, p. 65 ff, Forbes' Report, January 15, 1711.
- 5 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 3, p. 73-4.
- 6 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 3, p. 187-88, Vetch to Dartmouth, 14 June 1711.
- 7 NSHS, IV, Papers Connected with the Administration of Governor Vetch: p. 93-4, Vetch to Queen and Ministry, June 24, 1711; p. 95, Vetch to Governor of Massachusetts, no date, and p. 104, Vetch to "British Minister," no date, p. 104.
- 8 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, 7, p. 193, Saint-Custin to Inhabitants of banlieue of Port Royal, Sept. 3, 1711.
- 9 Ibid., p. 195 ff.
- 10 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 3, p. 229-30, Vetch to Dartmouth, 11 September 1711.
- 11 The terms relevant to Nova Scotia are reprinted in Akins, T.B., Selections from the Public Documents of the Province of Nova Scotia (hereafter cited PDNS, p. 14).
- 12 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 7, p. 139, Nicholson to Lords of Trade, 16 August 1714.
- 13 PAC, MG 1, G 22, vol. 466, pt. 1, p. 232-36, Census of Felix Pain.
- 14 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 5, p. 74-80. This Census lists 922 people.
- 15 There is no record of this chapel being built, but a map of 1716 (PAC, VI/210, Annapolis, 1716, by George Seely) does show one at what appears to be Bellisle Marsh.
- 16 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 5, p. 66 ff and Account by La Ronde Denys and De Pensens about meeting with inhabitants and the declaration signed by them, 25 August 1714, p. 57-63.

- 17 PDNS, p. 6, Vetch to Lords of Trade, 24 November 1714.
- 18 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹A, vol. 35, p. 192, 195; p. 221, Bégon to the Minister, 25 September, 1715; and letter of Felix Pain to the Governor of Cape Breton bland quoted in Herbin, John The History of Grand Pré, p. 44.
- 19 Collection de Documents Inédits sur le Canada et l'Amérique, (hereafter cited Coll. de Docs.) vol. 1, p. 110-11, Oath Taken by the French Inhabitants of Annapolis, 22 January 1715.
- 20 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 7, p. 165-66, Caulfeild to Board of Trade, November 1, 1715.
- 21 Macmechan, A.M. (ed.) Nova Scotia Archives II, A Calendar of two letter-books and one commission-book in the possession of the Government of Nova Scotia, (hereafter cited N.S. Arch II), p. 51-52, November 1717, and PDNS, p. 15-16.
- 22 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 9, p. 68, Report by Lords of Trade on memorial sent by Gov. Philipps, May 18, 1718.
- 22a PDNS, p. 13, Doucette to Secretary of State, 5 November 1717.
- 23 Brebner, J.B. New England's Outpost, p. 77.
- 24 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 11, p. 86-88, Philipps to Secy Craggs, May 26, 1720; PDNS, p. 31.
- 25 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 11, p. 47-8 and PDNS, p. 23.
- 26 For the order see PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 11, p. 47-8 and PDNS, p. 22.
- 27 Council Minutes, PDNS, May 4, 1720, p. 24 and Macmechan, A.M., Nova Scotia Archives III, Original Minutes of His Majesty's Council at Annapolis Royal 1720-1739 (hereafter cited N.S. Arch. III), p. 7.
- 28 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 11, p. 54.
- 29 N.S. Arch. III, p. 8, May 17, 1720 and PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 11, p. 56, Answer of J. Duon and 103 inhabitants of Annapolis River, 4 May 1720, and p. 81-2, Letter of Inhabitants of Annapolis to Philipps, 20 May, 1720.
- 30 PDNS, p. 35; PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia II, p. 110, 115, enclosure in letter of Philipps to Secretary Craggs, 26 May 1720.

- 31 PDNS, p. 35; PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. II, p. 95-6, Philipps to Craggs, 26 May 1720.
- 32 PDNS, p. 33; PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. II, p. 92, Philipps to Craggs, 26 May 1720.
- 33 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. II, p. 145, Mascarene to Board of Ordnance, 13 June 1721.
- 34 PDNS, p. 55-57; PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 12, p. 104-106, Representation of Governor and Council on the State of Nova Scotia, 27 September 1720.
- 35 PDNS, p. 33; PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 11, p. 91, Philipps to Craggs, 26 May 1720.
- 36 N.S. Arch. III, p. 9; PDNS, p. 29, May 17, 1720.
- 37 PDNS, p. 30, Philipps to Inhabitants of this river and Menis, 18 May 1720.
- 38 N.S. Arch. III, p. 2, Minutes, April 27, 1720.
- 39 PDNS, p. 43-45; PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, 12, p. 128-133. The Jenny River is the Allain. A map of 1725 shows settlement in detail along the river between Goat Island and a mile or two east of the fort. (PAC, H9/240, 1725, "A Draught of Part of the British River and of the Fort of Annapolis Royal in Nova Scotia, 1725.")
- 40 N.S. Arch. III, p. 47-48, Minutes, 21 September 1723.
- 41 N.S. Arch. III, p. 100-101, Minutes, 22 May 1725.
- 42 Bernard, op. cit., p. 261.
- 43 N.S. Arch. III, p. 60-61, Minutes for 18 July 1724.
- 44 Ibid., p. 63, Minutes for 20 July 1724.
- 45 PDNS, p. 66, Council Minutes for 21 September 1726.
- 46 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia B, vol. 1, p. 94, Minutes for September 25, 1726; also in PDNS, p. 66-7 and N.S. Arch. III, p. 129-130.
- 47 Brebner, op. cit., p. 89.

- 48 N.S. Arch. III, p. 159-160, Minutes of September 16, 1727.
- 49 N.S. Arch. III, p. 161, Minutes for Sept. 17, 1727; PDNS, p. 76-7 and PAC, MG 1, Nova Scotia B, vol. 1, p. 154 ff.
- 50 PAC, MG 1, Nova Scotia B, vol. 1, p. 171, Minutes for October 20, 1727.
- 51 Ibid., p. 168, Minutes for October 14, 1727.
- 52 N.S. Arch. III, p. 169, Minutes for November 20, 1729.
- 53 Ibid., p. 170, Minutes for November 21, 1729.
- 54 PDNS, p. 82-3, Armstrong to Lords of Trade, 23 June 1729.
- 55 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 19, p. 9 ff. Address of Inhabitants to Philipps enclosed in letter of Philipps to Lords of Trade, 3 January 1729-30; see also PAC, MG 1, C¹¹D, vol. 10, p. 129 ff; Memoire on Missions in Acadia.
- 56 PAC, MG 11, ibid., p. 11.
- 57 Ibid., p. 3-4; reprinted in PDNS, p. 83.
- 58 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 19, p. 15; reprinted in PDNS, opposite p. 84.
- 59 N.S. Arch. III, p. 98.
- 60 N.S. Arch. II, p. 80.
- 61 Brebner, op. cit., p. 151.
- 62 N.S. Arch. III, p. 261, January 3, 1732-3.
- 63 N.S. Arch. II, p. 95, 196.
- 64 See map at back of Doughty, A.G. (ed.) Knox's Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America, end of vol. 1.
- 65 N.S. Arch. II, p. 237-38.
- 66 N.S. Arch. III, p. 294, Minutes for March 4, 1733-34.

- 67 Fergusson, C.B., (ed.), "Minutes of His Majesty's Council at Annapolis Royal, 1736-1749," Nova Scotia Archives IV, (hereafter cited N.S. Arch. IV), p. 24.
- 68 i.e. N.S. Arch. II, p. 182, re grant of land between the fort and the water to John Dyson, April 28, 1731; N.S. Arch. III, p. 182, 185, 234, 236, 254, re grant to Ensign Handfield; N.S. Arch. II, p. 195, 230, re grant to Mascarene 1/2 mile from fort, and p. 231 for grant to John Adams; N.S. Arch. III, p. 189, re land on NNE side of Cape to Capt. Alldridge. William Bontein's map of 1754 (PAC, H9/240, 1754, "Annapolis River and Fort and what is called y^e Town") shows many houses occupied by officers or officers' wives in the area around the fort and along the shore east of it.
- 69 There is no record of this chapel being built, but a map of 1716 (PAC, VI/210, Annapolis, 1716, by George Seely) does show one at what appears to be Bellisle Marsh.
- 70 N.S. Arch. III, p. 204, Minutes for November 11, 1731.
- 71 N.S. Arch. II, p. 88, Armstrong to Deputies of Annapolis, 13 December 1732, and N.S. Arch. III, p. 257, Decision at Council Meeting December 13, 1732.
- 72 N.S. Arch. II, p. 209, Order re Mass House at Annapolis, June 9, 1735.
- 73 PDNS, p. 99, Armstrong to Bishop of Quebec, 21 November 1732.
- 74 This implies that whatever they were using as a church was not large enough.
- 75 N.S. Arch. III, p. 343-5, Minutes 18 May 1736.
- 76 N.S. Arch. III, p. 345.
- 77 Ibid., p. 352-3.
- 78 N.S. Arch. III, p. 354-5, Council Minutes, 12 June 1736.
- 79 N.S. Arch. IV, p. 8, Minutes for 26 October 1736.
- 80 Ibid., p. 10, Petition signed by 107 heads of families.
- 81 Ibid., p. 11, Minutes for December 4, 1736.

- 82 N.S. Arch. II, p. 180.
- 83 Ibid., p. 80.
- 84 N.S. Arch. II, p. 202, Order of Armstrong re road, October 29, 1734.
- 85 Ibid., p. 202.
- 86 Ibid., p. 202-203.
- 87 Ibid., p. 218-219, Armstrong to Deputies of Annapolis, 28 January, 1737/8.
- 88 N.S. Arch. II, p. 235-6, Order re Road-Making, 12 May 1740.
- 89 N.S. Arch. II, p. 240, Mascarene to Deputies of Annapolis, 4 June 1740.
- 90 There appear to have been two sawmills, the one mentioned and one on the Allain, or as the British sometimes called it, Jenny's River. The latter was mentioned often enough by name that this "Sawmill Creek" probably refers to the other. See George Suly's map of 1716, PAC, VI/120, Annapolis, 1716.

PART IV - WAR IN THE 1740'S

- 1 PDNS, p. 119-120, Mascarene to Duke of Newcastle, 28 June 1742.
- 2 PDNS, p. 129.
- 3 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 26, p. 46, Mascarene to Lords of Trade, 1 December 1743; reprinted in PDNS, p. 130.
- 4 PDNS, p. 140, Mascarene to Governor Shirley of Massachusetts, December, 1744.
- 5 Ibid., p. 140-141.
- 6 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 26, p. 93, Mascarene to Lords of Trade, 9 June, 1744.
- 7 See William Bontein's map of 1754, "1".
- 8 PDNS, p. 141-2, Mascarene to Shirley, December, 1744.
- 9 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 26, p. 146-147, Mascarene to Lords of Trade, 27 July 1744, and p. 107-8, Mascarene to Secretary of War, 2 July 1744.

- 10 According to Mascarene there were 450 Indians, PDNS, p. 131-2, Mascarene to Lords of Trade, 20 September, 1744.
- 11 N.S. Arch. IV, p. 65, September 10, 1744.
- 12 Ibid., p. 66, September 16, 1744 and p. 64, 22 September.
- 13 Ibid., p. 66, September 16, 1744, and p. 65, 19 September.
- 14 Ibid., p. 64, 24 September 1744.
- 15 Ibid., p. 66.
- 16 PDNS, p. 147, Mascarene to Shirley, December, 1744.
- 17 Ibid., p. 143-4, Mascarene to Shirley, December, 1744.
- 18 Ibid., p. 131-133, Mascarene to Lords of Trade, 20 September 1744.
- 19 Ibid., p. 144-5, Mascarene to Shirley, December, 1744.
- 20 Ibid., p. 145.
- 21 Ibid., p. 146-7 and p. 133-4, Mascarene to Lords of Trade, 25 September 1744.
- 22 Ibid., p. 147.
- 23 N.S. Arch. IV., p. 54, December 1744; See also PDNS, p. 152-3.
- 24 PDNS, p. 150, Mascarene to ?, March 15, 1745.
- 25 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹A, vol. 83, p. 276-278.
- 26 N.S. Arch. IV, p. 82-3, November 8, 1745, Representation of the State of His Majesties Province of Nova Scotia & the Fort & Garrison of Annapolis Royal, drawn up by a Committee of Council."
- 27 Ibid., p. 83.
- 28 Ibid., p. 70-71, Council Minutes for May 10 and May 13, 1745.
- 29 Paltsits, Victor (ed.) The Journal of Captain William Pote, Jr., p. 24, 27.
- 30 N.S. Arch. IV, p. 71, and PDNS, p. 155, Minutes, May 25, 1745.

- 31 PAC, MG 18, F 10, p. 24, "A Brief Survey of Nova Scotia," probably by Charles Morris.
- 32 Ibid., p. 26.
- 33 Coll. de Docs., II, p. 40-41, "Journal de la Campagne du Canada à l'Acadie et aux Mines, en 1746-47" by Beaujeu. Note that this is the new style calendar which was 11 days ahead of the old one still used by the British.
- 34 Ibid., p. 41-42.
- 35 Ibid., p. 42.
- 36 PAC, MG 18, F 10, p. 26.
- 37 The Canadians complained that the Acadians fed them only promises. Coll. de Docs., II, p. 43.
- 38 PAC, MG 18, F 10, p. 27.
- 39 Coll. de Docs., II, p. 49.
- 40 N.S. Arch. IV, p. 94-5, Minutes for 14 November 1746.

PART V - ANNAPOLIS IN THE LATE 1740's

- 1 Little, Otis, The State of trade in the Northern colonies considered with an account of their produce and a particular description of Nova Scotia, p. 54-55.
- 2 PAC, MG 18, F 10, p. 84-85.
- 3 PAC, MG 1, C¹¹A, vol. 87, part 3, p. 186, unsigned Memoir. The index gives as the date 1748 but there is no date on the document. This is copied in Coll. de Docs., I, p. 44-45, where it is attributed to the priest Le Loutre.
- 4 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 33, p. 45 ff, 10 February 1749.
- 5 Ibid., p. 69, Mascarene to Lords of Trade, 14 February 1748/9.

PART VI - THE ACADIANS' LAST DECADE AT ANNAPOLIS

- 1 PAC, MG 18, F 10, p. 33.
- 2 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 29, p. 126-127, Mascarene to Duke of Newcastle, 12 November 1746.
- 3 See Report on Chignecto, p. 48-49 and on Minas (Grand Pré), p. 57-9.
- 4 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 32, p. 238, Mascarene to Lords of Trade, 17 October 1748.
- 5 For Report and map of prospective settlement see PAC, 1912, Appendix H, p. 79-80, Report by Captain Morris to Governor Shirley upon his survey of Lands in Nova Scotia available for Protestant Settlers, 1749.
- 6 PDNS, p. 165-6.
- 7 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia B, vol. 4, p. 18, Minutes for July 14, 1749, reprinted in PDNS, p. 166-167.
- 8 PDNS, p. 168-9, Minutes for 31 July 1749.
- 9 PDNS, p. 170-171. October 15 was old style, October 26 new.
- 10 PAC, MG 21, E 5, Brown MSS, 19071, folio 99, quoted in Brebner, J.B., "Paul Mascarene of Annapolis Royal" in Rawlyk, G.A. (ed.) Historical Essays on the Atlantic Provinces, p. 30.
- 11 PDNS, p. 188.
- 12 Ibid., p. 189-91, Minutes for May 25, 1750.
- 13 Ibid., p. 564, Cornwallis to Duke of Bedford, 23 July 1749.
- 14 Ibid., p. 576, Cornwallis to Lords of Trade, 20 August 1749.
- 15 PAC, MG 11, Nova Scotia A, vol. 35, p. 49, Cornwallis to Lords of Trade, 11 September 1749; in PDNS, p. 584.
- 16 PDNS, p. 199, Governor Hopson to Lords of Trade, 23 July 1753.
- 17 Ibid., p. 250-51, Minutes for July 3, 1755.
- 18 Ibid., p. 254.
- 19 Ibid., p. 256.

- 20 Ibid., p. 256 and 260.
- 21 PAC, MG 18, T 13, p. 117-118, Lawrence Papers, 30 January 1755.
- 22 Ibid., p. 41, Lawrence to Monckton, 13 July 1755.
- 23 PDNS, p. 261, Minutes for July 25, 1755.
- 24 Ibid., p. 266-7, Minutes for 28 July 1755.
- 25 Nova Scotia Historical Society (hereafter cited NSHS), III, p. 80-1, Winslow's Journal, Lawrence to Winslow, August 11, 1755.
- 26 Ibid., p. 124, Lawrence to Winslow, September 11, 1755.
- 27 Ibid., p. 134, Winslow to Handfield, 19 September 1755, and p. 134-5, Winslow to Lieutenant William Peabody, same date.
- 28 Ibid., p. 142, Handfield to Winslow, 23 September 1755 and p. 168, same to same, 8 October, 1755.
- 29 Ibid., p. 162, Lawrence to Winslow, 1 October 1755 and p. 169, Winslow to Lawrence, 11 October 1755.
- 30 Ibid., p. 181, Lawrence to Winslow, 27 October 1755.
- 31 Ibid., p. 181, Winslow to Captain Adams, 3 November 1755.
- 32 Doughty (ed.) Knox's Historical Journal, vol. 1, p. 115.
- 33 Ibid., p. 116 ff. Knox spent the winter of 1757-8 at Annapolis where Acadians hiding in the woods and taking pot shots at the British were still a problem. (Ibid., p. 66, 110).

PART VII - BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) PRIMARY SOURCES

Public Archives of Canada:

- MG 1 C¹¹A (General Correspondence, Canada), vols., 35, 87, 107.
- C¹¹D (General Correspondence, Acadia), vols. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10.
- 22, G, vol. 466, pt. 1, (Acadian Census Returns).
- 24, (Depot des Fortifications des Colonies), Carton no. 1.
- MG 2 Série A¹, Vol. 5, liasse 39, "Arrest du Conseil d'Etat du Roy Concernant les Concessions faites des terres de la province d'Acadie dans la Nouvelle France."
- B³, vol. 55, 1688, fol. 458.
- MG 7 9821 (Margry Collection), fol. 104.
- Bibl. Nat. Fr. 17871, fol. 190.
- MG 11 CO 5 (America and West Indies), vol. 863, no. 66, 134 and vol. 865, no. 16.
- Nova Scotia A (Nova Scotia Correspondence), vols. 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, 19, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35
- Nova Scotia B (Executive Council Minutes), vols. 1, 4.
- MG 18 F 6, Oath Taken by Inhabitants of Port Royal, 1690.
- F 10, A Brief Survey of Nova Scotia, probably by Charles Morris.
- T 13, Lawrence Papers.
- MG 21 E 5, Rev. Andrew Brown MSS, 19071.

(2) PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

Akins, T.B., Selections from the Public Documents of the Province of Nova Scotia, Halifax: Charles Annand, 1869.

Brodhead, J.R. and O'Callaghan, E.B., (eds.) Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, vols. V, X, Albany, 1853.

Collection de Documents Inédits sur le Canada et l'Amérique, 3 vols., Quebec: Demers & Freres, 1888-1891.

Collection de manuscrits relatifs à la Nouvelle-France, 4 vols., Quebec: A. Côté, 1883-1885.

Doughty, A.G. (ed.) Captain John Knox: An Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America, vol. 1, Toronto: Champlain Society, 1914.

Faillon, M., Memoires Particuliers pour servir à l'histoire de l'église de l'Amérique du Nord. Paris: V^e Poussielgue & Perisse Frères, 1853.

Fergusson, C.B. (ed.), Nova Scotia Archives IV: Minutes of His Majesty's Council at Annapolis Royal, 1736-1749, Halifax, 1967.

Ganong, W.F. (ed.), Nicholas Denys: The Description and Natural History of the coasts of North America Toronto: Champlain Society, 1908.

"Memoir of the Sieur de la Mothe Cadillac," New Brunswick Historical Society, no. 13, 1930.

Hale, Robert, "Journal of a Voyage to Nova Scotia made in 1731 by Robert Hale of Beverley," Historical Collections of the Essex Institute, vol. XLII, July, 1906.

Little, Otis, The State of trade in the Northern colonies with an account of their produce and a particular description of Nova Scotia. London: G.Woodfall, 1748.

Macmechan, A.M. (ed.) Nova Scotia Archives II: A Calender of two letter-books and one commission-book in the possession of the Government of Nova Scotia, Halifax, 1906.

Nova Scotia Archives III, Original Minutes of His Majesty's Council at Annapolis Royal, 1720-1739, Halifax, 1908.

Morse, W.I. (ed.) Acadiensia Nova, (1598-1779), 2 vols., London: Bernard Quartich, 1935.

Nova Scotia Historical Society:

Vol. I "Journal of Colonel Nicholson at the Capture of Annapolis."

Vol. III "Journal of Colonel John Winslow"

Vol. IV Patterson, Rev. George (ed.) "Papers Connected with the Administration of Governor Vetch."

Paltsits, Victor (ed.) The Journal of Captain William Pote, Jr.,
New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1896.

Public Archives of Canada, Annual Reports

- 1885, Index to MG 1, C¹¹A Series
1886, same, continued
1887, same, completed, and indexes to MG 1, C¹¹B and C¹¹D
1894, Index to MG 11, Nova Scotia A.
1899, Index to MG 1, B Series.
1904, Same, continued, and Appendix H, Letter of Father Ignace re Acadia to Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.
1905, Part 1, Index to MG 1, B, completed. Part 2, Acadian Genealogies and Documents concerning the expulsion.
1912, Appendix E, "Journal of the Expedition under Sir William Phipps" against Port Royal, 1690."
Appendix F, "Account of the Capture of Port Royal by the Inhabitants of Boston and Salem under the Command of William Phipps, 21st May, 1690."
Appendix H, "Report by Captain Morris to Governor Shirley upon his Survey of lands in Nova Scotia available for Protestant Settlers," 1749.
1949, Index to MG 11, Nova Scotia B.

Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Quebec, vol. 7, 1926-7,
Letter of Frontenac to King, 6 November 1679, p. 111.

Têtu, Mgr. Henri (ed.), Mandements, lettres pastorales et circulaires des Guêques de Quebec, vol. 1, Quebec: A. Côté & Cie., 1887.

Thwaites, R.G. (ed.), Baron de la Hontan: New Voyages to North America,
Chicago: A.C. McClung & Co., 1905.

Webster, J.C. (ed.) Acadia at the End of the Seventeenth Century:
The Letters and Journals of Joseph Robinau de Villebon,
Saint John: New Brunswick Museum, 1934.

Dièreville: Relation of the Voyage to Port Royal in Acadia or New France, Toronto: Champlain Society, 1933.

(3) SECONDARY SOURCES

Albéric, Maurice, "Les Capucins en Acadie" La Nouvelle France,
vol. XIV, 1915.

Arsenault, Bona Histoire et Généalogie des Acadiens. Quebec,
Conseil de la vie française en Amérique, 1965.

History of the Acadians (English translation of above,
without the genealogy), Quebec: Conseil de la vie française
en Amérique, 1966.

Bernard, Antoine Le Drame Acadien depuis 1604, Montreal: Les Clercs
de Saint-Viateur, 1936.

Brebner, J.B. New England's Outpost: Acadia before the Conquest of
Canada, New York: Columbia University Press, 1927.

"Paul Mascarene of Annapolis Royal," Dalhousie Review,
January, 1929.

The Neutral Yankees of Nova Scotia, New York: Columbia
University Press, 1937.

Brown, G.W. (ed.) Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Toronto: University
of Toronto Press, 1966.

Calnek, W.A., & Savary, W.A., History of the County of Annapolis,
Toronto: William Briggs, 1897; Supplement, 1913.

Candide de Nant, le R.P., Pages Glorieuses de L'Epopée Canadienne,
Paris: Librairie Saint-François, 1927.

Church, Thomas The History of the great Indian war of 1675 and 1676,
Hartford: Silas Andrews & Son, 1852.

Clark, A.H., Acadia The Geography of Early Nova Scotia to 1760,
Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Comeau, Ambroise The Oldest Parish in Canada, Yarmouth: Lawson Publishing
Company, 1962.

Herbin, John, The History of Grand Pré, St. John: Barnes & Co. Ltd.,
n.d. [1913].

Lauvrière, Emile, La Tragédie d'un Peuple, Paris: Librairie Plon, 1924.

MacVicar, W.M., A Short History of Annapolis Royal, Toronto: Copp, Clark Company Ltd., 1897.

Massignon, Geneviève Les Parlers Français d'Acadie Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, n.d.

Murdoch, Beamish, A History of Nova Scotia, 1st 2 vols., Halifax: James Barnes, 1865.

Rameau de Saint-Père, Edme, Une Colonie Féodale en Amérique, L'Acadie 1604-1881, 2 vols., Montreal & Paris: Granger Fr. and E. Plon, 1889.

Rawlyk, G.A. (ed.) Historical Essays on the Atlantic Provinces. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1967.

Waller, G.M., Samuel Vetch, Colonial Enterpriser. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960.

(4) MAPS

Public Archives of Canada, Map Division (copies at National Historic Sites Service).

"Plan Tres Exact du Terrain ou sont scituees les maisons du Port Royal et ou lon peut faire une Ville considerable". De Meulles, 1686.
VI/240 Port Royal - 1686

"Plan du Port Royal et de son fort"
HI/240 - Annapolis - N.D. [1688].

"Carte du Bassin Du Port Royal"
F/210 - Annapolis Basin - 1701.

"Plan de la Banliene du Fort Royal ALACADIE Et de ses Environs"
H9/239 - Port Royal - [1708].

"Plan de l'entrée du Bassin du Port Royal a LACADIE" 1708, Delabat.
H2/240 Port Royal 1708.

"Plan du Cours de la Rivière du Dauphin, et du Fort du Port Royal y scitué avec la Banlieue du d^e fort, a la Cadie en la Nou^{lle} france 1710, Delabat
VI/210 Annapolis [1710].

"A Plan Drawen x Annapolis Royall Octo^b - Y^e: 18th 1716" George Seely
VI/210 Annapolis 1716.

"A Draught of Part of the British River and of the Fort of Annapolis
Royal in Nova Scotia. 1725."
H9/240 - Annapolis Royal [1725].

"A Plan of the River and Bason of Annapolis Royal in Nova Scotia, 1741."
HI/210 Annapolis Royal - 1741

"Annapolis - Royal, Fort and (what is called Y^e) Town." William Bontein,
October 1754.
H9/240 Annapolis Royal - 1754.

Other:

"Map of Basin of Port Royal by Saccardy Fils, c. 1690," Morse, W.I.,
Acadiensia Nova, vol. 1, opposite p. 218.

"Map of Port Royal and River of Annapolis," Delabat, 1710-11, in Morse, W.I.,
Acadiensia Nova, Appendix to vol. II.

"Survey of Lands in Nova Scotia available for Protestant Settlers,"
Captain Morse, Report of the Public Archives of Canada, 1912,
Appendix H.

