

rison soldiers. These Kansas had been very numerous, but the ~~war~~ which they had kept up against the Pawnees and the scourge of smallpox had reduced them to 250 or 300 men. It was on their lands that were found the quarries of red stone from which they made calumets for all the nations".* (Margry, Ori. Fr., VI, p. vi of Introduction.)

*There were several localities whence red pipestone was formerly obtained by the western tribes. That which was obtained on their own territory by the Kansas Indians and ~~mmmm mmm~~ used by them for making pipes and as an article of trade, was probably of a softer quality than that from the famous pipestone quarry of the Coteau des Prairies, in Minnesota, if that of the Kansas Indians was obtained from quarries, as the quarries of northeastern Kansas would be of Carboniferous age while those of the more northerly occurring true catlinite belong to the ~~mmmm mmm~~ geologically much older Cambrian. It is possible, however, that the pipestone of the Kansas Indians was ~~mmmm mmm~~ true catlinite, obtained in fragments from the glacial drift.

We observe in the above, that Margry spells the name of this fort, "Cavagnal"; but the spelling here adopted is that of the Marquis' own autograph, "Vaudreuil Cavagnal", fac-simile of which is given on page 57, Volume V, of the Narrative and Critical History of America.

Of when Fort Cavagnal was finally abandoned, the writer has found no record.

The condition of the ruins in 1804, as described by Lewis and Clark, indicate that it must have been several decades before the time of their expedition. These explorers tell us that about thirty years before they saw the ruins of the ~~mmmm mmm mmm mmm~~ "small fort, built by the French" at the lower "old village of the Kanzas" on the bank of the Missouri, the Kansas nation had been reduced in numbers and driven back from that river by the hostile "Sacs and Ioways", who, being nearer to the whites, had secured better equipment and fire-arms. Assuming that Lewis and Clark were correctly informed as to the period that had elapsed since that event, the withdrawal of the Kansas nation from the Missouri river would date about 1774; which is, then, the latest time up to which Fort Cavagnal is at all likely to have been occupied. But it is more probable that the fort was abandoned a few years earlier than this, since the French military officer and garrison were presumably withdrawn some time in the period of 1763 to 1770; the former year being that in which the inhabitants of the Mississippi valley first heard of the transfer of the western part of that valley from France to Spain; and the latter year, that in which (May 20th) Spain assumed actual control ~~mmmm mmm mmm mmm~~ at St. Louis, Captain Pierre Joseph Piernas having been appointed, by O'Reilly, as the first "lieutenant-governor and military commandant of the upper portion of the province". (Billon, Vol. I.)

"The exclusive trade with the Indians of the Missouri, claimed by the house of Maxent, Laclede & Co., under their license from Gov.

Kerlerec in 1762", of course, as remarked by Billon, "came to an end with the establishment of the Spanish authority in 1770; when the trade was opened to all who chose to embark in it".*

Footnote *Annals of St. Louis, Vol. I, p. 133; where he adds: "In the year 1776 there were some six or eight merchants in St. Louis then engaged in it."

In his North American Fur Trade of the Far West, Chittenden cites

Footnote *Page 948.

Bogé as saying, in his history of Missouri, that the French government had a regular post and officer at the mouth of the Kansas river. But this appears to refer to Fort Cavagnial, the post ~~located~~ above the mouth of the Kansas, at the lower Kansas village; for, with the exception of one or more small and temporary posts that may have been built at the ^{mouth of} Kansas river by ~~and~~ a Company of the Upper Missouri in 1792*,

Footnote *According to Perrin du Lac ("Travels in 1801, 1802, & 1803", p. 52), a fort was built at the mouth of Platte river at this date and by a company of this name. I know of no other evidence for a company of such name at that date. Possibly his name and date are both erroneous, and refer to the Missouri Trading Company, organized by the leading merchants of St. Louis in 1794, at the instance of the Spanish Lieutenant-Governor Zenon Trudeau. ~~See~~

by the Missouri Trading Company in 1794-'6, or earlier or later by other such company or individual traders, and the still more transient huts of hunters and voyageurs, and excepting "the Four Houses", built

Footnote **So called from its being built on the four sides of an open square. (Andreas, Hist. Kan., 9.49.) It was built for the Kansas Indian trade, and perhaps used in succession by two or more of the kaleidoscopically changing series of fur companies of those years.

some 20 miles up the Kansas river at a date, difficult to ~~estimate~~, between 1808 and 1821, there seems to have been ~~seems~~ to have been no establishment ^(and the latter none of permanency) at or in the close vicinity of the mouth of the Kansas river, until the year 1821, when the trading post of Francis G. Chouteau was established ^{on an island} opposite Randolph Bluffs, three miles below present Kansas City.

Footnote ~~For~~ This post remained an important trade and distributing point until washed away by the great flood of 1826, when it was ~~soon~~ re-established 10 miles up the Kaw, on the ~~south~~ ^{opposite} side of the river, opposite present Muncie, at what was afterward noted as the "Lower Delaware Crossing". Both the old and the new establishments were known as "Kansas Post"; though the new one was on land that in 1825 had been set apart for the Shawnee Indians, but not occupied by them until the arrival of the "Fish Band" from the old Shawnee village near Cape Girardeau, Missouri, in 1828. The latter post was for many years in charge of Cyprian Chouteau, Francis' brother, ~~and~~ ^{in association with} whom the explorer Captain Fremont stopped for twenty days in May and June of 1842. On the north side of the river, in 1849, was established Delaware Post Office, with James Finley as postmaster.

Footnote For the occupancy of Fort Cavagnial from 1736 to 1758, ^{including} a period of 23 years, we have ~~available~~ proofs from contemporaneous records. If we assume that it was maintained from about 1734 till ~~about~~ about 1770, or say 36 years, we shall probably not be far out of the way.

Footnote ~~For the benefit of one of our readers we do not mean to take it for granted that the name of the fort is pronounced Ca-vah-nee-ah.~~

The First French Fort in Kansas.

(Y. & P. 200.)

1st French Fort in Kansas.
See p. 332, T. 1. Hist. Col. X, "Bouquinville's French
Fort, in 1757, says: "Kansas, - In ascending this
stream [the Missouri river] we meet the village
of the Kansas. We have there a garrison with a
commandant, appointed, as in the case with
Pimatisou and Fort Chartres, by New
Orleans. This post produces one hundred
bundles of furs." ^{See} George P. Bere-
hous quoted this from Bouquinville, & in
footnote, refers for it, to "Statutes, Documents
and Papers Bearing on the Boundaries of the
Province of Ontario. 1878, page 81."

In 1744, the Marquis de Vandreuil, Gov-
ernor of Louisiana, granted to Joseph
Le Febvre D'Inglebert Debrunneaux (an
old friend of St Ange de Bellierive)
the exclusive right of the Indian
trade in all the country
watered by the Missouri and
its tributaries, for a period begin-
ning January 1, 1745 and ending
May 20, 1750; ^{By the terms of the}
~~and Debrunneaux bound~~ ^{was by the terms of the}
"to finish the fort established on the
Missouri territory, to keep in it a suf-
ficient stock of merchandise to satisfy the
wants of the Indians, to maintain, at his own
expense, the several Indian tribes of that dis-
trict in a state of amity among themselves and
with the French, to supply the garrison of
the fort with the necessary means of sub-
sistence, to pay to its commander an annual
bounty of one hundred pistoles [= \$390; a "pistole"
being French name for a Spanish coin worth about
\$3.90. ^{in 1744}] and to transport to the fort, without
charge, all the provisions and effects of that
commander." [p. 23 of Gayarre's Louisiana;
3rd Series of Lectures. John Wiley, N. Y.,
1852; and p. 30 of Billon's Annals of St.
Louis under Fr. and Span. Domination.] ^{See}

222KBH vii 1707 Account 1757-95T

It is ~~not~~ supposed that Debrunneau
~~ever~~ carried out his contract and made
good use of his monopoly, till it ex-
pired by limitation in 1750, subsequent
to which he ~~settled~~ at Fort Chartres where
he officiated for some time as Judge of the District, and
where he seems to have lived till in 1765,
he moved to St. Louis, ~~Debrunneau~~
at St. Louis Judge before
where he was associated with Jo-
seph Labuscire in assuming to set in operation a
provisional civil government, ~~of the~~ pending the arrival
of Spanish officials to take possession of the
country. He was associated also with St. Ange in the
granting of lots and lands.

He died in St. Louis, ~~on~~ on the 3rd
of April, 1767.

^(P. 10, 1767)
Lefebvre, Joseph (17--to 1767,) called "Judge Lefebvre."

See Debrunneau

(= "Leur Reissane", of Margriff.
(= "Debrunneau", of Billon, t.)

For Capt. at the First French Fort in Kansas,

See footnote, p. 65, Vol I, of
Original Journals Kansas & L. S. 1846-1851

Fort Orleans;

A document given on page 388 of the 6th vol. of Margry's, *Origines françaises*, shows that the Company of the Indies had designated Sieur de Bourgmont as early as August 12, 1720 to establish a fort on the Missouri. But though admonished soon after this by the Villesur expedition and the likely retaliation of the Spanish, it was not until the fall 1823 that this fort was built to protect the French frontier and its prospective mining territory and actual trading ground from Spanish invasion. To protect the fur trade and the Indians from the slave trade carried on by the Spanish. This was a small fort its construction superintendent by De Bourgmont, who was appointed its commandant by St Ange.

Fort Orleans

In 1719, Philippe Francis Renault, was sent over from France by the Company of the Indies, to work the mines of the Illinois. On the way, he stopped at St. Domingo and bought 500 ^{Negro} slaves, with which he arrived in the Illinois in 1720. This, says Albach's Annals, was the first introduction of slavery in the Northwest. It was introduced in the Southwest at about the same time. Becoming rapidly a popular institution in the settled portions of Louisiana, it soon began to make trouble in an unexpected way for the company that had introduced it. Independent and unscrupulous hunters and traders in the Missouri country began to traffic in Indian slaves; and to create a supply, they encouraged the Indians to go to war, and, by coups and reprisals, to obtain captives, which these Frenchmen would buy. The intertribal discord thus sown was very prejudicial to the commercial interests of the Company, and the latter was compelled to take measures to check it.

On the 12th of August, 1720, the Sieur de Bourgmont, who had been resident among the Missouries since 1703, had received from the Company of the Indies, a commission to establish and command a post on the river of the Missouri in Louisiana. Although he did not actually build the fort ~~there~~ until over three years later, he seems to have assumed the office in 1720 and ~~the command of the Company~~ in the latter part of that year, as the Company's commandant in that country, he was authorized to confiscate the merchandise of all travellers who should come to trade within the limits of his jurisdiction without first getting his permission and declaring the tribes with which they intended to trade. At the same time, Governor Bienville and other officials of Louisiana were instructed to co-operate with him in carrying out the Company's orders. The repression of the traffic in slaves from the Pawnee, Padouca and other western nations, was, therefore, one of the duties which would be required of the commandant and garrison of the proposed fort on the Missouri.

This fort, as we have already observed, was not built at once after de Bourgmont's commission of August, 1720; neither in 1721, nor in 1722. On January 17th of the year last named, a letter of instructions to him, reads in part as follows: "The said Sieur de Bourgmont, knowing that the principal object of a post on the Missouri is to approach the Spaniards as much as possible, in order to establish a trade connection with them, and at the same time to fortify there the post in which we shall establish ourselves, so as to be able to withstand them in case of rupture, he can not give too much consideration to the choice of the place where he will make the establishment, because on its situation, depends the success of the plans which have been made".*

*Margry, Or. Fr., VI, 390; The succeeding quotations, 2-3, 393.

And further, Renaudière, ^{having just referred to the village of the Missouries,} in his Mémoire of August 23, 1723, ^{remarks,} "It is in this place that Sieur de Bourgmont should establish himself" (that is, establish his post), indicating that the long contemplated post on the Missouri river, had not even yet been established.

Fort Orleans.

Fort Orleans.

A letter of instructions written in Paris on the 30th day of September, 1726, and addressed to Governor Périer of the Colony of Louisiana by the Directors of the Company of the Indies, or Council of the Colony, contained the following:

"There is still kept up, on the River of the Missouri, at nearly 180 leagues more distant than the Illinois, a fort where there are ~~about~~ now twelve to fifteen men, although the total ought to be reduced to eight. If this expense should appear to Mr. Périer useless, he will cause it to cease, and will content himself with sending to that place the missionary who is destined there".

Margry, Orig. Fte, Vol. VI.

The fate of Fort Orleans now therefore remained with Périer. What decision he made about it, does not appear. The Directors' letter required something like three months for its passage from Paris to New Orleans; and even if, after receiving it, Périer decided promptly to abolish the post (which it is not certain that he did), his order to that effect would probably not have reached Governor Boisbriant of the Illinois much, if any, before February of 1727, nor ~~had~~ found opportunity to be forwarded ^{to} the Missouri country till the following spring. We may therefore safely conclude that Fort Orleans was not vacated ~~until~~ until some time ~~in spring or later~~ in 1727; if, indeed, Périer did not allow it to remain till a subsequent year. We only know that it was not abandoned earlier than 1727 nor later than 1732; the only nearly contemporaneous reference to it as having been abandoned, being that on D'Anville's map of Louisiana, drawn in 1732. *On that map it bears the legend, "Fort d'Orleans, abandonné."* An additional consideration which renders it certain that Fort Orleans was abandoned not later than 1732, is the fact that in the operations of the ~~Company~~ were ended, the Company surrendering ~~it~~ to the crown of France, all of its charter privileges.

De Bourgmont: Fort Orleans on the Missouri.

It was Captain Villasur's expedition; the fear of Spanish retaliation for its destruction; and to protect the ~~French~~ ^{French and its perspective} frontier ~~of the French~~ mining territory from further Spanish invasion; as well as to promote the ~~same~~ ^{with} trade ~~among~~ the Indians; that caused the French Company of the Indies, in the fall of 1723, to build Fort Orleans on the Missouri river, opposite the village of the Missouries; though a document given on page 388 of the sixth volume of Margry's Origines Francaises, shows that the company had designated ^{Sieur} De Bourgmont, as early as August 12th, 1720, to build a post on that river.

Note on De Bourgmont (Follow the ~~Dubois~~ ^{MS. best})

[Indicate in the full name or given by Margry on title page of his version of the Relation. Also the different spellings of Bourgmont (in Narr., Crit. Hist.!) Statement (in Margry) that De B. had lived — yrs (hence since 1703) with the Missouries. But note inconsistency of that with statement in "Avant-Prop." of Dubois MS., that De B. was sent to Detroit in 1700 to relieve Sieur de Jonci. The explanation may be that De B. first ~~had~~ visited or knew the Missourie in 1703 but did not ~~take up~~ residence among them till some years later. From Margry, it appears that De B. went to France in (1720?). etc.]

De Bourgmont and Fort Orleans.

— "Etienne Vénard De Bourgmont établit le Fort d'Orleans sur le Mis- souri". [Margry, O. F. Fr., VI, 383.]

For "romantic" treated (are, to Avant-Prop. of Dubois De Bourgmont MS.) precisely & perhaps the cause of the destruction of New Orleans, see Dubois's Manusc. (A translation of these is in Vol. V. of French's Hist. Collects. of La.)

"There is maintained still on the ~~Missouri~~
of the ~~Missouri~~ ^{beginning tooting in front of fort} river at nearly ~~180~~ leagues, more distant
than the Illinois ^{for Ft. Chouteau, Memphis, etc.} [2 c. than Raskassee], a fort where
there are at the present time twelve to fifteen
men, although the ~~total~~ ^{total} should be reduced
to eight. If this ~~the~~ expense should appear to M^r.
Périer useless, he will make it cease, and
will content himself with sending to that
place the missionary who is destined thither."

[*Masry's Origines Françaises*, Vol. ~~5~~6, p. 452.]

Fort Orleans. (Fall of 1823 to fall of 1826.)

Speaking of 1722, — ~~the~~ ^{Mahgrebi} this year some voyageurs arrived at the Illinois,
Origines Francaises, Vol. VI, Introduction, p. V.

Foot-note. * *Origines Financières*, Vol. VI, Introduction, p. V.
after having wintered with the Otoes and the Kansas, nations which had defeated the Spaniards
come to attack our western frontier, and Monsieur de Boisbriant [late in 1723, as shown on p.
393 of Vol. VI of the "Origines"] sent to found the Fort Orleans. In 1726, the Company of
the Indies suppressed this post." [Page 452 of Vol. VI of the *Origines* shows in the following words
(translated) that the abandonment of Fort Orleans was not until some time after September of 1726, the
same being an extract from a letter of instructions, dated September 30, 1726.]